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Abstract

The purpose of this single-case study was to examine the impact that the Young Moviemakers of America (YMA) after-school program had on the self-efficacy levels of six student-participants. Self-efficacy is considered a strong predictor of students’ academic success and social-emotional intelligence that influences life trajectories. YMA was formed to provide an outlet for youth in south Los Angeles to express their creative voices through a project-based, hands-on model where participants write and produce an original short documentary film.

This study was conducted to examine how YMA’s use of self-efficacy building strategies might impact students’ personal perceptions of general self-efficacy. Various data collection methods were used in the study to triangulate data in order to form some basis to address the research question. The General Self-Efficacy scale was issued in a pre and post format and a t-test conducted to determine the statistical significance of the results. Structured and unstructured interviews and field notes were also used to gain deeper insight into each learner’s experience.

Results from the study support the idea that self-efficacy levels were impacted by the efficacy building strategies embedded in the intervention.

Keywords: autonomy, extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, out-of-school time (OST) programs, resilience, self-efficacy, self-regulation, social-emotional learning.
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Chapter One: Introduction

While many after-school programs focus solely on improving academic performance, some encourage children to engage in a variety of recreational and enrichment activities, while others promote social-emotional health and provide opportunities for skill development (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007; Heckman & Sanger, 2013; Wong, 2008). Of the factors that contribute to personal and social growth, Bandura (1994) stressed the importance of positive self-appraisal and how it affects one’s self-belief in their capability to exercise control over a given scenario. Learners with an “optimistic sense of personal efficacy” (p. 8) within a specific functioning domain tend to approach difficult situations with assurance that they can, and will, persist to a successful outcome. Although much of the research on after-school programs focused on how programs serve the needs of school districts to improve academic performance, there is a need to examine the growth in non-academic areas such as self-efficacy, which many researchers consider an antecedent to positive self-appraisals.

After-school programs have become a vital part of the K-12 educational experience. They emerged in the early part of the 20th century to meet various social needs due to urbanization, shifts in the labor market, and the increasing need to provide safe places for children (Mahoney, Parente, & Zigler, 2009). Over the last two decades, policymakers, educational leaders, and parents have continued to focus much of their attention on addressing the increasing number of risk factors that impact children during
after-school hours (Halpern, 2002; Wong, 2008). This conversation is ongoing as more focus is centered on creating spaces for addressing the cognitive, affective, and social needs of children.

Evidence-based research has concluded that high-quality after-school programs not only aim to increase academic outcomes but also seek to strengthen life skills, build resiliency, enhance self-perception, and help students develop the grit needed to meet the demands of life (Heckman & Sanger, 2013). Nevertheless, not much research has been done to explore how these sources of personal and social development are specifically enhanced in an after-school environment. One study, conducted by Durlak and Weissberg (2007), explored after-school programs through a meta-analysis of 73 programs. The study examined the strategies used in these programs to enhance personal and social skills. It was concluded that influences on personal and social development were programs that are “sequential, active, focused, and explicit” (p. 4). The findings in this study support the notion that programs that follow this “evidence-based” (p. 6) approach to learning have several positive benefits such as increasing the positive self-appraisal and self-confidence levels of participants in after-school programs.

The specific wondering explored in this study was to examine how an after-school program might impact the perceived self-efficacy levels of participants in an after-school program in south Los Angeles. Distinguishing the difference between self-efficacy and self-esteem was important. According to Bandura (1997), “perceived self-efficacy is concerned with judgments of capability, whereas self-esteem is concerned with judgments of self-worth” (p. 11). Therefore, this study examined how the use of self-efficacy building strategies in an after-school program might impact the self-efficacy
levels of participants.

**Statement of the Problem of Practice**

The chosen PoP in this study was centered on examining the perceived self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age students in the Young Moviemakers of America (YMA) program. Niehaus, Rudasill, and Adelson (2012) believed that these years are particularly challenging because of the various biological and social changes and the decline in “self-concept and school performance” (p. 119). These internal characteristics are equally as important as in the areas of academics (Kuncel, Crede, & Thomas, 2005; Niehaus, Rudasill, & Adelson, 2012).

While observing several participants in the YMA program in the spring of 2017 workshop, the researcher noticed that several participants appeared to be immersed in the excitement of learning and motivated intrinsically despite the challenging task of making a short movie. The teacher’s constant verbal persuasion and positive reinforcements appeared to impact their perceived self-efficacy as they became more confident in their abilities to write their stories, operate the camera, and articulate their ideas clearly and confidently. One hypothesis that arose as a result posited that youth who are new to making a short film will not experience levels of mastery at the same rate as those who are efficacious and intrinsically motivated to complete a project as a result of learning from a knowledgeable and supportive instructor-coach. The researcher wondered if the YMA program would impact the perceived self-efficacy levels of six participants in the study.

This study examined the YMA program to determine whether the program had any effect on participants’ perceived self-efficacy levels. Bandura (1994) believed
instructors who are successful at building efficacy do more than just prepare students to understand the content and confirm success through what he called “positive appraisals” (p. 4), he believed effective efficacy builders increase a person’s belief in their capabilities. Consequently, this led the researcher to the theoretical proposition that the use of efficacy-building strategies in instruction affect self-efficacy levels of learners. This proposition led to the following question:

**Research Question**

What impact will the Young Moviemakers of America program have on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact the Young Moviemakers of America program had on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants.

**Young Moviemakers of America**

Young Moviemakers of America was formed with the mission of exposing children to the basics of filmmaking using a project-based, hands-on model of instruction. Workshops cover the various aspects of filmmaking where students work collaboratively to develop a story concept and move through the production phase to complete a short film project of 30 minutes or less. The inaugural workshop for YMA occurred during the spring of 2017 with seven children from Compton, CA.

Ms. Sasha, the creative director and instructor at YMA, started the program with the goal of developing a creative space for children to develop and share their stories. She earned a degree in Film and Video Production and has two years of experience working as a production assistant on commercials, music videos, and short films. Ms.
Sasha believed that giving children the opportunity to create their own ideas would build their self-efficacy and help them learn how to become better critical thinkers and problem-solvers.

The YMA curriculum is a 10-week course covering a wide range of topics such as building a story using a three-act structure, using a digital camera, lighting, sound recording, and the basics of editing. Students are expected to engage in various interactive activities and exercises to build a strong understanding of group collaboration. Each lesson is sequenced, builds on prior knowledge, and is hands-on, focused, and explicit.

**Brief Overview of Methodology**

An action research approach was used to conduct this study instead of traditional research since it is participatory and “seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues” (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, & Maguire, 2003, p. 11). This approach was chosen because of its cyclical nature and systematic approach to identifying a problem and working on improving a condition. The researcher embarked on this study in order to gain insight into how to solve a problem that is unique to YMA and in the hopes such a study would enhance his ability to improve the “quality or effectiveness” (Mertler, 2014, p. 4) of a program geared to enhance self-efficacy and build technical skills. Due to the personal nature of action research, relevant problems are explored and self-reflection allows the researcher and the instructor to think of ways to improve instruction, use data to drive intervention and decision-making, and to continuously examine best practices.

The immediacy of results can play a significant part in how quickly YMA can
make decisions to improve instruction. The researcher used the cyclical nature of an action research approach to carefully examine how self-efficacy levels might have been enhanced by the training intervention. This allowed the researcher to build a collaborative model with the instructor at YMA that addresses educational questions from within, forming much more sustainable processes to improve practice (Mertler, 2014). Prior to study, the researcher had several meetings with the instructor to discuss the scope of the research project, curriculum design, and the process for communicating findings.

A single-case study design was chosen because it allowed the researcher to thoroughly examine a contemporary phenomenon in a real-world context using various data collection methods (Yin, 2018). These methods were employed to give the researcher closer insight into the problem, which supported Mertler’s (2014) claim that using a case study design allows the researcher to discover new direction or next steps for the study while concurrently collecting data. This approach was useful and provided the researcher the opportunity to discover the “boundaries between phenomenon and context” (Yin, 2018, p. 15) while simultaneously conducting the study.

The participants in this study were selected using a convenience sampling. Of the nine students who signed up for the YMA workshop for spring 2018, six agreed to participate in the study. The sample size of this study was set at six students ($N = 6$), which was optimal for collecting the substantial data needed to address the research question. After week three, one of the participants dropped out of the study due to other unforeseen commitments.

The research site consisted of a small multi-purpose room at a local church.
There was a large section of the room that provided adequate space for whole group activities and lectures, and a smaller section that was used to create interview sets. In addition, each project required exterior shots that were coordinated by the instructor.

The researcher served the role of a participant as observer in this study. He had an active role engaging with the instructor and participants during the study. Mertler (2014) believed that this vantage point gives the researcher an opportunity to get a good sense of what is taking place in the learning setting. This decision proved to be invaluable in collecting data from various sources where the researcher gained deeper insight into the experience.

In order to capture participants’ voice in this study, the researcher chose to use structured and unstructured interviews. Field notes were used to document pertinent instructor-to-student interactions, student-to-student interactions, and emotional expressions. Additionally, pre and post-surveys of the General Self-Efficacy (GSE) scale were administered to participants. Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2014) believed using multiple sources “can enhance your inquiry as you gain different perspectives” (p. 134), and if there are discrepancies in the data that arise from analyzing different sources, this might initiate new wonderings for future research.

The researcher used these data collection strategies to search for emerging themes and evidence to determine if the YMA program had an impact on the self-efficacy levels of the six participants. These data were collected and entered in qualitative data analysis software called MAXQDA, where they were coded and analyzed.
Significance of the Study

After-school programs have become a vital part of the K-12 educational experiences in the United States. There is consensus among researchers that these programs provide benefits to children, but “the debate continues about the range of academic, social, and other types of knowledge and skills that young people will need to succeed as workers” (Wong, 2008, p. 1). While increasing accountability appears to be a viable and logical response to these concerns, many schools have used after-school programs to aid in closing the achievement gap. As a result, many after-school programs have aligned their focus to support results-based accountability that aligns more closely with academic improvement goals to meet state and local standards in core content areas (Black, Doolittle, Zhu, & Unterman, 2008; Bodily & Beckett, 2005; Dynarski et al., 2004; Surr, 2012). Much of the alignment to school outcomes is a direct result of external influences. As much as these efforts were made with positive intent, there is less focus on non-academic influencers such as perceived self-efficacy.

This study, therefore, was significant because it focused specifically on self-efficacy and how students might engage intrinsic motivation in the process of making a short documentary film in the YMA program. Bang and Reio (2017) believed self-efficacy is an “important aspect of motivation” (p. 149) and influences outcomes. The YMA model of instruction aimed to make learning fun and enjoyable, allowing children the opportunity to work collaboratively within a structured setting where they learned the fundamentals of filmmaking. The results of this study can help inform us as to how to improve pedagogical practices and expand the program to schools in the region.
Limitations of the Study

This was a single-case study that examined the self-efficacy levels of six participants in the YMA program. The research study spanned a 10-week period in the spring of 2018. Since the sample size of the study was limited to six ($N = 6$), generalizations cannot be extended to external populations. Yin (2018) supported this assertion and stressed the importance of focusing on the case(s) studied and maximizing what researchers can learn from close examination, not how findings can be generalized to external contexts. Additionally, Creswell and Poth (2018) emphasized the importance of collecting qualitative data from various sources. Through an in-depth understanding of this single case, the researcher’s goal was to collect quality data from various sources in order to adequately address the research question.

Dissertation Overview

Chapter One of this dissertation gave a brief introduction of the problem, stated the research question, and the proposed plan of action that the researcher chose to embark upon in this study. In Chapter Two, there will be an extensive and in-depth look at the literature on after-school programs, motivation, and self-efficacy. In Chapter Three, a detailed look at the methodological approach that was used in this study will be introduced. It will explore the participants and research design in more detail. Chapter Four presents an extensive analysis of the research findings. Data collection methods are covered in-depth and connections made to address the research question. Chapter Five includes the implications of the research, action steps, and recommendations for future research based on the findings.
Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarity and to reduce ambiguity, the following terms are defined and will be used throughout this research study:

*After-school programs* are programs that function during times when children are not at school. They are programs that can run during after-school hours on school days, on the weekend, during holiday breaks, and during the summer (Utah Afterschool Network, 2007). For the purpose of this study, the researcher will consider this broad definition of after-school programs. It should be noted that the focus of this study is currently running as a weekend program.

*Autonomy* refers to the need to control one’s own life (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004).

*Extrinsic motivation* is motivation that comes from external rewards such as pay, awards or recognition. Those who are extrinsically motivated engage in activities for the reward that comes with completing the activity (Keller, 2010; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

*Intrinsic motivation* is a motivation that is driven by the activity itself (Keller, 2010). For instance, a person who loves to read books might be intrinsically motivated if there are no external rewards attached to reading.

*Perceived self-efficacy* refers to one’s belief in their ability to perform at designated levels regardless of obstacles that may impede them (Bandura, 1994).

*Resilience* is having the ability to withstand or overcome obstacles “in the face of severe adversity” (Bandura, 1997).

*Self-efficacy* is one’s belief in their ability to exercise control over their own functioning (Bandura, 1997).
Self-regulation is having the ability to assess task demands and generate “courses of action, setting proximal goals to guide one’s efforts” (Bandura, 1997, p. 51) while managing stress and thoughts that might hinder one’s ability to complete a task.

Social-emotional learning is being aware of one’s emotions, feelings, behaviors, and interactions with others in a social learning setting.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

After-school programs have emerged as a viable enrichment to the traditional educational experience, and many of them are formed to not only meet academic needs, but to also meet the personal and social-emotional needs of student as well. This chapter will begin with an overview of the history of after-school programs in the United States and then examine theoretical frameworks for motivation and self-efficacy.

After-School Programs: A Brief History

After-school programs provide various educational options for learners such as remediation, enrichment, special interests, hobbies, and prevention of problematic behaviors (Bodily & Beckett, 2005; Dynarski et al., 2005). These programs operate on an ongoing basis outside of normally scheduled school times. They typically run 10 or more hours per week and provide various types of activities for school-age children (Nevada Afterschool Network, n.d.). Despite recent demands for quality after-school programs, these programs have been around since the 1880s (Bodily & Beckett, 2005). To add to the complexity of after-school programs, goals are broad across a full spectrum of services and funding sources are typically limited to fee-for-service, private donations, and some public subsidized funding (Bodily & Beckett, 2005).

After-school programs began to emerge in the late 1800s due to social and political influences (Halpern, 2002; Mahoney et al., 2009). The declining demands for child labor in the industrialized workforce coupled with the passage of compulsory laws created a need for children to go to school. In addition, Seppanen (1993) noted that the
mission of some of the early organizers was centered on helping immigrant children become more acclimated to America society. During the first part of the 20th century, children began attending school through the eighth grade, which created more discretionary time for youth during after-school hours (Halpern, 2002). The increase in discretionary time created demand for more well-structured after-school programs that were safe and provided opportunities for youth to engage in activities.

By the early 1920s, Halpern (2002) reported that nearly 80% of the children in the United States attended school in a structured setting. While many children still assisted their families during after-school hours, there was a large number of children who resorted to spending this time on the streets and finding other things to do (Gayl, 2004; Halpern, 2002). This caused great concern for parents and community members who saw this as opportunities for children to get involved in crime, juvenile delinquency, and other potentially dangerous situations. According to Mahoney et al. (2009), the after-school programs during this period started as boys clubs and eventually transformed to centers with specific missions to develop youth in various ways.

As noted, one of the major factors contributing to the expansion of after-school programs was the change in the labor force. There was a sharp increase in demand immediately following World War II (Mahoney et al., 2009). As more women entered the labor market, many children returned home from school with no parent present in the household. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2005), 33.9% of mothers were actively working in 1950 and women 16 to 24 had the highest rate of participation at 46%. This number continued to increase steadily over the last several decades in response to the demand for women to continue to participate in the expanding workforce
(Seppanen, 1993). While the demand for women in the workforce continued to grow, there was a definite need for quality and affordable after-school care for children.

During the 1960s through the 1990s, the demand for after-school programs continued to rise, but there were many issues with funding these programs. Mahoney et al. (2009) pointed out that the first major comprehensive childcare initiative was presented in 1971, called the Comprehensive Child Development Act. It would have allotted two billion dollars for childcare services, but after passing Congress, it was vetoed by President Nixon. Twenty years later, the Clinton Administration was successful at passing the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Dynarski, 2004) legislation in 1994 to provide support specifically to after-school programs (Afterschool Alliance, n.d.). The annual funding increased steadily over the next few years from “$40 million in 1998 to $1 billion in 2002” (Mahoney et al., 2009, p. 8). 21st CCLC was reauthorized in 2002 under the No Child Left Behind Act (Afterschool Alliance, n.d.).

While one of the leading focus areas of after-school programs has centered on supporting the academic growth of youth to meet strict mandates, recent studies have shed new light on the impact that they have on the personal and social development of youth (Durlak & Weissberg 2007; Niehaus et al., 2012). Much of the research points to internal characteristics as significant contributors to positive life experiences (Six Seconds, 2012). Researchers agree that these qualities are essential to building resiliency and developing emotionally intelligent youth who can regulate their emotions, navigate social settings, and work collaboratively with others to complete tasks. There were only a few studies on after-school programs that examine these areas (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007). The results of these studies were worth exploring.
A 2007 meta-analysis conducted by Durlak and Weissberg explored the impact that after-school programs have on the personal and social skills of youth. The study examined 73 after-school programs that attempted to develop these qualities in youth enrolled in their programs. Of the programs studied, 39 embedded evidence-based skill development strategies into their program delivery. The findings were overwhelming in suggesting that programs that are sequential, active, focused, and explicit about building personal and social development skills produce positive benefits for youth. These benefits include enhanced “feelings and attitudes” and “increases in positive social behaviors” (p. 8). Similarly, Bodily and Beckett (2005) maintained the importance of youth building positive relationships with adults in after-school programs as a major benefit to their personal and social growth. Conversely, programs that did not follow these same evidence-based approaches were not successful at producing these same benefits for youth (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007).

In another study, Niehaus et al. (2012) explored self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and academic outcomes in after-school programs with middle school-aged Latino students. Though the topics areas are similar to the areas investigated in this study, it focused on a specific group and analyzed academic outcomes.

The study examined 47 Latino students participating in after-school programs from the Midwestern region of the United States. At the conclusion of the yearlong study, one major finding revealed that self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation impacted academic outcomes. The results support findings from the Durlak and Weissberg (2007) study that after-school programs that are intentional in their focus and incorporate personal and social skills development into their plans affect outcomes. Deci and
Vansteenkiste (2004) believed strongly that intrinsic motivation is the “prototype of autonomy and embodies the growth tendency” (p. 28) while Keller (2010) extended this assertion and believed individuals intrinsically motivated find value in the activity itself. In line with this belief is the importance of the individual's perception of their ability to complete the task in a specific functioning domain. These studies highlight the non-academic factors that influence student outcomes.

Lastly, Digital U is a community-based digital storytelling program that integrated technology, performing arts, and self-expression in a comprehensive experience for youth (Alrutz, 2015). The program created a space for youth from under-represented areas to engage “in the social/cultural economy of the media” (p. 17) by producing their own original products. Participants were involved in collaborative projects with a broad focus to not only create authentic stories, but they used digital storytelling for community and social engagement.

**Motivational Theory**

The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) focuses on the “social-contextual conditions that facilitate versus forestall the natural processes of self-motivation and healthy psychological development” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 68). These sources are critical in establishing a tested theoretical framework that examines motivation as it relates to psychological needs—competence, autonomy, and relatedness—which, when addressed, yield increased self-motivation and mental well-being and, when suppressed, lead to diminished motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The work of Sandra Graham and Bernard Weiner (1996) offered an excellent historical account of the research on scientific motivation dating back to the early twentieth century. Their work broke down
scientific motivation into periods from the 1930s through the 1990s to show how the study of motivation started as a broad topic, with research conducted mainly on animals and limited in scope, focusing on essential reactions to conditions such as hunger and thirst. Contemporary research has grown from theory-based to attribution, cognition, and self-efficacy. Table 2.1 highlights the progression of the field.

Paul Young's work in the early 1930s centered on the “need and activity” levels in response to some condition. In the 1960s, Melvin Marx linked motivation with energy and drive level that broadened the scope of motivational research and explored connections between topics such as drive and learning, rewards, fear and anxiety, and knowledge of results (Graham & Weiner, 1996). As the study of motivational psychology expanded, four theoretical approaches dominated the field in the late 1960s and moving into the 1970s. These approaches were associationistic theory, drive theory, cognitive theory, and psychoanalytic theory (Graham & Weiner, 1996). The main shift in psychology during this period was from mechanism to cognition, where more focus was on one’s thinking about why certain decisions are made. Graham and Weiner (1996) concluded that contemporary research on motivation consisted of “cognitions (e.g., causal attributions), individual differences in motivation (e.g., need for achievement), and environmental influences on motivation (e.g., competitive versus cooperative contexts)” (p. 67).

These periods can be grouped into three major eras: The Mechanistic Period (1930-1960), The Arrival of Cognition (1960-1970), and Contemporary Motivation Research (1970-1990) (Graham & Weiner, 1996). During the early years, motivational psychologists focused on “what moved a resting organism to a state of activity” (Graham
& Weiner, 1996, p. 65). Many studies consisted of depriving animals of basic needs like food and, after periods of deprivation, observing responses when food was reinstated.

Psychologists theorized that it was the goal of living organisms to be in a state of balance and it is the need to be in this state of equilibrium that drives motivation.

Table 2.1

*Contents of the Chapters on Motivation in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1941-1990*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need and activity level</td>
<td>Theories</td>
<td>Theories</td>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>Cognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appetite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equilibrium and</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Causal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeostasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>attributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical controls</td>
<td>Drive and</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drive and</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>helplessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural structures</td>
<td>Activation of</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic</td>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drives and</td>
<td></td>
<td>(exploratory</td>
<td>differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motives</td>
<td></td>
<td>behavior)</td>
<td>Need for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Imbalance</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense mechanisms</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>(dissonance)</td>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of results</td>
<td></td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>determinants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear and</td>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td>versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational applications</td>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>Relation to</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>processes</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Graham & Weiner (1996)*
According to Graham and Weiner (1996), the focus of psychology shifted “from the creation of all-encompassing, broad theories to a focus on narrower, more bounded mini-theories and the analysis of specific aspects of motivated behavior” (p. 64).

During the early development of motivational theory, the research focused intently on topics such as choice of activity, appetite, incentives, and other endeavors that resulted in external rewards. During this period, research was limited to animals because human beings were viewed as far too complex. The study of motivation was expanded to include the examination of determination and drive as they relate to cognition (Graham & Weiner, 1996). During this era, there was a definite shift away from the view of motivation as an automatic reaction to a psychological need to one that focused on cognition and the ability of one to think about why a particular action is initiated and the implications of this act. Conventional views centered on the idea that the reward triggered the response but did not delve into the cognitive realm of discovering how the response impacts the individual. For instance, a typical reward for some useful activity might come in the form of money. According to Graham and Weiner (1996), a personal reward can be linked to various types of cognition. A reward might convey to the recipient that “he or she is being coerced or that the expectations of others are low” (p. 66) and have a far different impact on one's motivation to engage in this activity in the future. As human beings, we have the ability to think, reason, evoke emotion, and a number of other complex features that separate us from animals. One of the key highlights from this era was the study of cognition and how it affects motivation, which was a profound shift from the study of animals to human beings.

In contemporary motivation research, the field has continued to evolve, and a
greater emphasis is placed on explaining what goals people choose to pursue and examining how intently they are pursuing these goals (Graham & Weiner, 1996; Keller, 2010; Locke & Latham, 2006). This represents the main focal areas of modern research on clear motivation. In a learning context, more specifically relating to educational institutions, schooling is generally viewed as an institution that one enters with the goal of achieving some future outcome. Many studies have concluded that students who believe schools are essential in helping them reach their career goals or admission to college are more motivated to achieve than students who do not have these same beliefs (Kover & Worrell, 2010). As mentioned, with the diverse nature of many classrooms across the nation, it is incumbent on schools to have an understanding of the research around what motivates students to learn.

Motivation can be driven by deep interest, intellectual curiosity, enjoyment, external controls, or many other factors that influence a person to engage in an activity (Deci, 1995; Heckman & Sanger, 2013; Keller, 2010; Locke & Latham, 2006). Ryan and Deci (2000) extend this understanding and believe that humans reach optimal levels of humanity when they are curious and motivated. Motivation is more than just initiating an action; it encompasses the initiation of the action, persistence, and the ability to stay focused on achieving a goal (Ryan & Deci, 2000). People are more likely to persist through an activity that is stimulating, gives rise to curiosity, and is personally fulfilling. Graham and Weiner (1996) suggested that “it is common knowledge that if a person is engaged in an activity that is interesting, engrossing, and involving, and the person is oblivious to all else, then motivation is high (p. 63). Heckman and Sanger (2013) claimed that curiosity is rooted in interest, and the more students exhibit curiosity
towards an activity, the more they can and will persist and stay engaged in the activity. As mentioned, while engagement is associated with the physical evidence of motivation, the focus of motivation explores the internal sources that influence behavior.

The initial studies on motivation were conducted during the Skinnerian era where there was a major focus on external incentives and contingencies (Lepper, Corpus, & Iyengar, 2005). Motivation is essentially the answer to the simple question: Why do people do what they do? On the contrary, a person who feels no motivation or impetus to do a particular thing can be characterized as unmotivated or uninterested by others (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Examining motivation has never been an easy task. In everyday life there is an “ease with which artificial and extraneous motivations can be induced in human beings [that] has prevented us from studying the motivational factors that take control when these are lacking” (Berlyne, 1960, p. 1). There is a need to explore motivation further and examine its impact on learners.

In much of the research on motivation, it is categorized into two distinct areas: intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. The clear distinction between these two areas is that intrinsic motivation refers to the drive to do something because it is inherently enjoyable or fulfilling, and extrinsic motivation designates engaging in some activity because of some external reward (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004; Locke & Latham, 1997; Ryan & Deci, 2000). These two forms of motivation are contrasted thoroughly, and distinctions made on how they impact learning. During several studies, motivational psychologists have carefully examined the activities individuals engage in, the amount of time it takes them to initiate the action, how long they persist, and the cognitive and emotional effects visually tracked during a specific period. The next section will explore
intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in more depth.

**Intrinsic Motivation**

Individuals who are intrinsically motivated towards an activity are more likely to undertake the action without external prompting or controls (Amabile, 1997; Deci, 1995; Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004; Froiland, Oros, Smith, & Hirchert, 2012; Keller, 2010). In many ways, intrinsic motivation can lead to rich learning experiences, increased conceptual understanding, and improved problem-solving without the need for some external reward that might come as the result of involvement in an activity (Deci, 1995; Hennessey, 2015). Deci and Vansteenkiste (2004) suggested that intrinsic motivation involves engaging in an activity with a full sense of volition. Froiland, Oros, Smith, and Hirchert (2012) supported this theory and believe intrinsic motivation deals with choosing to engage in an activity for one’s own sake and fulfilling a core psychological need. Those who are motivated intrinsically are moved to act because of curiosity and challenge as opposed to the expectation of any external reward, and as Ryan and Deci (2000) put it, the action is not initiated for any particular reason, but merely the enjoyment that comes with engaging in the activity.

Deci and Vansteenkiste (2004) also believed that intrinsic motivation is associated with the instantiation of action and the growth-oriented nature of humans. Ryan and Deci (2000) added, “from birth onward, humans in their healthiest state, are active, inquisitive, curious, and playful creatures” (p. 56). Based on Deci’s initial research, it was determined that when people received rewards for doing an activity that was considered interesting, the likelihood of repeating the action decreased as opposed to those who engaged in the same activity and did not receive a reward (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004).
Conversely, when the desire to complete a task is associated with an external reward, intrinsic motivation is somehow disrupted, undermined, and replaced with a control: the reward. In other words, Kover & Worrell (2010) believed learners are motivated intrinsically toward some action because they have some choice and freedom as to when and how they will engage in the activity. Ryan and Deci (2000) viewed this undermining as a shift from internal to an external locus of causality.

External rewards based on completing a task or meeting performance goals diminish intrinsic motivation because reward acquisition is linked to behavior, not based on inherently interesting activities that one might engage in (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004; Hennessey, 2015). Other than rewards, people are often recognized for their actions and given feedback from others. This response can lead to improved autonomy where outcomes have lasting impacts due to the inherently gratifying nature of engaging in the act opposed to an external reward (Ryan & Deci, 2000). For instance, a child who plays a musical instrument and is self-determined to play better might spend much of his or her free time practicing. If practicing is not linked to a reward, Deci (1995) believed this is a sign of intrinsic motivation because the learner is engaged in the act freely and being fulfilled spontaneously as they engage in the activity, creating genuinely authentic experiences void of external controls. He also stressed the importance of exploring the impetuses of motivation that engender intrinsic motivation.

**Extrinsic Motivation**

Most activities that human beings engage in are not driven by intrinsic motivation, particularly after early childhood years, as opportunities to engage in intrinsically motivated activities give way to social demands with external controls (Ryan
Ryan and Deci (2000) supported the notion that “extrinsic motivation is a construct that pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome” (p. 60). This is contrasted sharply with intrinsic motivation where an activity is initiated because of the personal enjoyment or fulfillment obtained by simply engaging in the activity itself. For example, a student who has an affinity for reading mystery novels might decide to read books several times throughout the day during free-choice intervals such as during lunch, break, or during classes. Here, there are no external rewards attached to reading or instruments that would incentivize the activity. Extrinsic motivation can be viewed as contingent self-esteem.

There are long lists of activities that are common in our daily lives that might include jobs, earning high grades in school, practicing long hours to earn a position on an athletic team, etc. In these cases, individuals are expecting some type of external reward that is different from the activity itself and oftentimes performed “with resentment, resistance, and disinterest or, alternatively, with an attitude of willingness that reflects an inner acceptance of the value or utility of a task” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55). This is particularly challenging for schools “because many of the tasks that educators want their students to perform are not inherently interesting or enjoyable, knowing how to promote more active and volitional (versus passive and controlling) forms of extrinsic motivation becomes an essential strategy for successful teaching” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55).

One of the challenges that teachers face with regards to student motivation is the natural decrease in opportunities to engage in intrinsically motivated activities as children advance to higher grades. Schools are structured settings that do not allow for much variety and variation to instruction because many are driven by school norms high-stakes
testing. There is an obvious need to design systems to increase intrinsic motivation and, according to Ryan and Deci (2000), “many of the educational activities prescribed in schools are not designed to be intrinsically interesting, a central question concerns how to motivate students to value and self-regulate such activities, without external pressures” (p. 60).

Schools play a significant role in maintaining safe and nurturing environments conducive to student cognitive and social development. When students feel that their coursework is relevant, purposeful, and intriguing, they will function autonomously and find connections between the work and other contexts beyond the classroom experience. The basic definition of “autonomy literally refers to regulation by the self. Its opposite, heteronomy, refers to controlled regulation, or regulation that occurs without self-endorsement” (Ryan & Deci, 2006, p. 1557). Using the Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET), viewed as a subset of the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Ryan and Deci (2000) assert “social-context events (e.g., feedback, communications, rewards) that conduce toward feelings of competence during an action can enhance intrinsic motivation” (p. 70). Kover and Worrell (2010) believe “that individuals desire to feel both competent and autonomous” (p. 473). There are distinct differences in autonomous motivation and controlled motivation. Leon, Nunez, and Liew (2015) clearly pointed out that students with “autonomous motivation engage in learning from their own volition and interest without an external force or pressure” (p. 1).

Students who engage in learning based on some outside reward function under controlled motivation. There are many examples of classroom settings where students functioned as passive observers and were limited in their ability to provide constructive
input in what was learned or how it was delivered. Students feel that their sense of autonomy is satisfied when they have a voice and choices and when teachers are responsive and supportive of their needs (Leon, Nunez, & Liew, 2015). One crucial facet of motivation that deals with an individual’s personal perception of his or her own functioning in a specific domain is called self-efficacy.

**Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy is an important element of intrinsic motivation and plays a crucial role in a student’s belief about their capabilities, levels of motivation, and affective state towards a situational context (Bandura, 1994; Bang & Reio, 2017; Locke & Latham, 2006). Simply put, self-efficacy is one’s belief in their ability to exercise control over their own functioning (Bandura, 1995). Locke (2006) acknowledged that self-efficacy extends beyond expectancy and addresses internal processes that influence behavior. Self-efficacy is distinguished from other constructs such as self-esteem, which deals with how people feel about their personal self-worth, whereas self-efficacy deals specifically with self-judgment of capabilities (Bandura, 2006). In addition, self-efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, and motivate themselves towards completing a task (Bandura, 1995; Bang & Reio, 2017). Shelton (1990) concluded that the most influential antecedent to general self-efficacy is the aggregation of past experiences, both positive and negative experiences. Bandura (1997) strongly supported this and added “powerful mastery experiences that provide striking testimony to one’s capacity to effect personal change can also produce a transformational restructuring of efficacy beliefs” (p. 53). Dweck (2006) conducted extensive research on growth mindset and determined that mindsets are essentially powerful beliefs. These personal beliefs can have a strong
influence on goal setting and individual outcomes.

People with high self-efficacy are more likely to set goals that are challenging and exercise the grit and determination needed to move towards goal attainment (Bandura, 1994; Locke, 1996). In these situational contexts, difficulties and setbacks are not viewed as failures, but as opportunities to conquer challenging endeavors on one’s way to a mastery experience (Bandura, 1994). According to Bandura (1997) self-efficacy is achieved when a person is able to use strategies and master the knowledge rules in a particular area and is capable of utilizing these tools when needed. This is an important aspect of personal self-efficacy. Bang and Reio (2017) believed self-efficacy is a powerful indicator of performance because people tend to engage in tasks they feel capable of completing successfully.

There are four primary sources that influence beliefs in capability; these areas are mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological state (Bandura, 1994; Bang & Reio, 2017). The best way to increase self-efficacy is through mastery experiences (Bandura, 1994; Bang & Reio, 2017). This determines whether a person is optimistic or pessimistic, positive or negative when confronted with a challenge (Bandura, 2006). When faced with stressful endeavors while attempting to complete a task, people with high self-efficacy display confidence and believe they can exercise controls over the event (Bandura, 1995). Once the task is completed, Bang & Reio (2017) asserted that the successful completion of the task becomes evidence that this event can be accomplished successfully again in the future. This influences whether a person visualizes “success scenarios for performance in their analytical thinking, [and] how well they motivate themselves and guide their actions” (p. 150). It is important for
teachers to understand the significant link between positive self-appraisal and student success.

Educators can be builders of self-efficacy by delivering instruction in ways that build resilience through well-designed and well-supported frames that promote success rather than placing students in situations prematurely (Bandura, 1994; Bethea & Robinson, 2007). In the classroom setting, learners with low self-efficacy tend to focus on themselves more than the task itself, leading to low performance and unfortunate experiences (Keller, 2010).

Mathisen & Bronnick (2009) believed teachers are in a critical role to boost self-efficacy by convincing students that they are capable of acting creatively. Without the support of adults, particularly parents and teachers, students’ confidence in successfully mastering an experience is affected by external influences such as attitudes, messaging, and previous experiences (Bentley-Edwards, Agonafer, & Flannigan, 2016). Keller (2010) claimed that self-efficacy is a reliable indicator of academic performance and achievement. In order for students to increase performance and develop positive outlooks on learning, training on self-efficacy can help the teacher understand its importance and implications for learning (Mathisen & Bronnick, 2009).

A high level of self-efficacy also enhances goal commitment and has an impact on outcomes (Bentley-Edwards et al., 2016; Locke & Latham, 2002). Bandura (1994) contended that goal setting is influenced by personal self-appraising of capabilities to complete an experience successfully. Bentley-Edwards, Agonafer, and Flanigan (2016) expanded on the belief that goal efficacy is achieved when the expected goal and expected outcome are directly aligned. There is evidence that personal achievement is
attached to having an optimistic mindset, due to the difficulties that nearly all personal endeavors have embedded into them (Bandura, 1994). This is a result of positive thinking, optimism, and self-assuredness that when a goal is established, knowledge of rules and strategies understood, there is a greater chance that a learner will persist through setbacks and obstacles on his or her way to successful outcomes.

Teachers have an impact on student motivation in the classroom setting (Keller, 2010). Classrooms where students are immersed in experiences that are authentically related to their lives and allow them some choice and voice in their learning can increase engagement levels, creative self-efficacy and students’ intrinsic motivation to learn. Amabile (1996) asserted “most people will be creative when they are primarily intrinsically motivated, rather than motivated by expected evaluation, surveillance, competition with peers, dictates from supervisors or promises of rewards” (p. 39). Similarly, Meng and Ma (2015) believed that having the opportunity to choose will likely increase intrinsic motivation. Teachers who are aware of the impact that self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation have on student outcomes can use efficacy-building strategies to increase student success.

**Summary**

Much of the research on after-school programs has been inconclusive on determining whether these programs impact academic outcomes. While the focus of many after-school programs over the last 20 years has been on improving student performance on standardized tests, particularly in areas of math and reading, research has revealed that there is a need to focus on non-academic influencers of success such as intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy.
High levels of student engagement lead to deeper, sustained learning (Bang & Reio, 2017). Student engagement can be viewed as the physical evidence of one’s motivation to learn. Much of the research on learning theories and modalities fails to mention internal contributors such as self-efficacy as major contributors to student academic success. One common question that a student might ask a teacher when trying to find meaning in schoolwork is: Why is this important for me to learn? As frustrating as it might be for teachers to process and respond to this question, it is legitimate in trying to connect the work to some meaningful outcome. Supporting this notion, Ryan and Deci (2000) addressed the internal influencers such as the attitudes and goals that give rise to action, while addressing the “why” question. This is a major factor in determining one’s motivation towards a particular activity.

Educators are all too familiar with common extrinsic motivators such as grades, awards, and happy faces stamped on student assignments. The motivation that is associated with curiosity to learn rather than external reward is a form of intrinsic motivation. Students who are intrinsically motivated to learn are not only interested in the formal indicators of success, but they are interested in understanding how the material relates to them and ways of internalizing it. (Bang & Reio, 2017; Saeed & Zyngier, 2010). In addition, an underlying source of self-efficacy is intrinsic motivation. Self-efficacy deals with one’s personal belief and confidence in their capabilities to complete a particular task and serves as an indicator of academic performance (Bandura, 1994; Keller, 2010). In short, self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation are crucial in examining the influencers that help learners stay engaged in the learning process and persist to the successful completion of a task. Durlak and Weissberg (2007) recommended that after-
school programs develop approaches that are sequenced, active, focused, and explicit in delivery. To this end, more research on efficacy-building strategies in after-school programs are needed.
Chapter Three: Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine the self-efficacy levels of six participants in the YMA program over a 10-week course on producing a short documentary film. While observing a class offered during the previous year (spring of 2017), the researcher noticed that the confidence levels of participants appeared to increase as they worked through several challenging scenarios to complete a short film project. This informal assessment led the researcher to have conversations with the instructor on how her use of hands-on practice as an instructional model along with constant positive reinforcement may have impacted participants’ perceived self-efficacy. Through these conversations, it was determined that self-reflection and constructive feedback could help inform changes needed to improve student outcomes. Therefore, the researcher decided to embark on this study to examine the self-efficacy levels of six participants in the YMA program during the spring of 2018.

Action research was chosen in this study because of its iterative and self-reflective nature with the overarching goal of improving pedagogical practices. Mertler (2014) believed that action research is a process of collecting data systematically and self-reflecting on practice, which is embedded in the process. Dana & Yendol-Hoppey (2014) supported this same assertion and believed action research is an on-going inquiry that gives the teacher-researcher a built-in process for self-reflection, evaluation, and improvement that is tied to curriculum and its implementation. In these cases, the
teacher-researcher is directly involved in the research process from start to finish and able to iterate through the process several times in order investigate and continually reflect on how to improve. As Mertler (2014) claimed, researchers “often find themselves repeating some of the steps several times or perhaps doing them in a different order” (p. 16). Action research is not a linear process and at times there is no clear end to the study. This model worked well for the researcher in this study, using several data collection methods and communicating findings to the instructor with hopes of improving practice.

This research study aimed to explore the YMA program and analyze its impact on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants. For the purpose of this research study, an after-school program was classified as an out-of-school program and included any program operating outside of the realm of a traditional school schedule.

**Research Question**

What impact will the YMA program have on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the YMA program on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age student participants.

**Action Research Design**

This study was a single-case research study. Creswell and Poth (2018) believed that case studies are bounded by time and space in a contemporary context where the researcher carefully collects data using multiple methods. Examining data collected from various sources allowed the researcher to capture pertinent data such as student engagement, instructor/coach-to-student communications and interactions, peer
interactions, and students’ personal reflections and thoughts on the learning experience. Triangulation was employed by the researcher in order to increase validity, reliability, and trustworthiness (Mertler, 2014). Merriam (1998) added, observations are “used in conjunction with interviewing and document analysis to substantiate findings” (p. 96). These various methods proved to be invaluable and allowed for an in-depth analysis of the various data sources.

The purpose of this research design was to see if data from each source would yield consistent results, which would give the researcher an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the experience (Axinn & Pearce, 2006). Mertler (2014) supported the idea that data collected in research, particularly data collected using qualitative methods, “use systematic observation in order to gain knowledge, reach understanding, and answer research questions” (p. 11). A qualitative case study approach using methods such as observations and unstructured interviews was useful in capturing pertinent teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions that are critical to positive learning results (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The General Self-Efficacy scale was also used in this study as a predictive measure of general self-efficacy. Student-participants took a pre-post survey of the GSE.

Through these various data collection methods (field notes, structured interviews, unstructured interviews, and the GSE scale), the researcher was able to examine possible corroborating evidence from these different independent sources. The researcher’s approach to data analysis was influenced by Stake’s (1995) assertion that analysis was about “taking something apart” (p. 71). Through this process, deeper meaning was attained and evidence revealed.
Ethical Considerations

In this study, the researcher made certain that pseudonyms were used for the names of students, the instructor, and the research site. Parents were required to sign consent forms (Appendix A), while student-participants signed assent forms (Appendix B) to be a part of the study. Student-participants and parents were informed on safety and the importance of student-participants being open to collaborative work.

This study was conducted in a way to ensure that all student-participants had equal access to resources and services regardless of their race, ethnicity, class, religion, or sexual orientation.

Setting and Time Frame of the Study

The main classroom instruction took place in the multi-purpose room at Rosegreen Church, which is on the border of Los Angeles and Compton, CA. The room was rectangular in shape with long tables, cushioned chairs, and a small room used for setting up equipment and conducting interviews. The time frame for this study was ten weeks, from early April to mid-June, for ten consecutive Saturday mornings. One Saturday was skipped during the study due to a holiday. Each session lasted three hours and there were four times when student-participants and the instructor had to capture footage outside of class time.

Participants in the Study

There were a total of nine students who took the course, and six elected to be a part of the study. After three weeks, one student-participant dropped from the study due to other unforeseen obligations. The remaining five student-participants (N = 5) continued with the study. Of those in the study, three (60%) were male and two (40%)
were female. They were all in middle school and ages ranged from 12 to 14.

The five students who participated in the study are listed below with pseudonyms to protect their identity:

Amber is an 11-year-old, African-American female who was quiet and somewhat disengaged during the first two sessions. She appeared to be overwhelmed when asked to work with the camera, but much more comfortable working with the audio recording equipment. She struggled with taking initiative during the story-building phase.

Braylin is a 13-year-old, African-American female who was proactive and always contributing to classroom discussions. She came up with the idea of making a movie on self-esteem and articulated the idea in front of the class in the second week of class. She was comfortable with performing various roles during production.

Cory is a 13-year-old, African-American/Hispanic male who was shy and expressed that he wanted to find a hobby that he enjoyed. He shared that he tried several other activities but had not found anything that was interesting to him. He is a great artist and though he is shy, he processes ideas and articulates them well.

Micheal is a 12-year-old, African-American male who was eager to start the program. He did not have much prior experience with technology but was always willing to assist other groups. He was somewhat talkative, but always courteous and respectful to everyone.

Timothy is a 13-year-old, African-American male who was always energetic and volunteering to assist with production tasks. He needed prompting from the teacher at times to stay focused on the project goals, but nothing too disruptive that it impeded progress.
**Role of the Researcher**

The researcher is an assistant principal at a high school and has implemented motivational strategies into lesson planning in previous roles as a teacher and an instructional technology specialist. He has personally observed increases in student engagement through his use of various instructional models. For this study, the researcher functioned in the role of *participant as observer* and provided ongoing feedback to the instructor at YMA.

**Research Methods**

A research question was used to guide the study (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam, 1998; Mertler, 2014). Various collection methods were employed to capture pertinent data needed to address the research question. While conducting a case study, Yin (2018) emphasized the importance of collecting data from various sources. The following are six sources of data that are “commonly found in case study research” (p. 113): 1) documentation, 2) archival records, 3) interviews, 4) direct observations 5) participant-observation, and 6) physical artifacts. The researcher used three of these sources of evidence in this study (interviews, direct observations, and participant-observation). Additionally, the General Self-Efficacy survey was administered in a pre-post format.

Each instrument was critical to examining whether the YMA intervention had an impact on the self-efficacy levels of the student-participants. Yin (2018) claimed that a major strength of case studies is the ability to use “many different sources of evidence” (p. 126).
Data Collection

Observations

Field notes were collected during all observations. The researcher functioned as a participant-observer in the study and captured various actions such as conversations, instructor/coach-student interactions, activities, cooperative work, verbal persuasion, students’ responses to vicarious experiences, nonverbal communication, and mastery experiences.

Field notes. The researcher took careful notes at each lesson during the intervention. This consisted of scripting dialogue, logging student-to-student and instructor/coach-to-student interactions, recording questions posed by the instructor/coach and students, documenting students’ initiative to engage in an activity without prompting and students’ response to motivational tactics and verbal persuasion. Merriam (1998) believed qualitative researchers must be systematic in their approach and have a carefully thought out plan. Likewise, Mertler (2014) contended that the researcher must be able to write field notes that describe what is “seen and heard” (p. 41) in great detail. The notes were unstructured and taken on a small iPad using word processing software. This data collection method aided the researcher in developing rich narratives.

Structured Interviews

Structured interviews were conducted during the first session of the program and the same questions posed to each participant at the end of the data collection period. For consistency, Mertler (2014) suggested that structured interviews consist of a set of predetermined questions that are posed to each person. For this research study, unstructured interviews were also conducted to provide flexibility for unique themes to
emerge.

Each participant was given the set of questions and asked to answer each question individually. This gave participants an opportunity to gather their thoughts and to be prepared for the one-on-one interview. After completing the questions, the researcher interviewed each participant to expand on their initial responses. Each interview took between 15 to 20 minutes and provided an opportunity to conduct an in-depth analysis on participants’ perceptions of self-efficacy.

**Unstructured Interviews**

Unstructured interviews were also used in this study in order to conduct a thorough analysis of participants’ perceptions of their personal self-efficacy. Unlike structured interviews, Mertler (2014) believed unstructured interviews give the researcher flexibility and latitude to customize questions based on the unique experience of each participant. In many instances, clarifying questions and probing can be used to gain a better sense of the participant’s feelings and to better understand the problem (Creswell and Poth, 2018). This data collection method was a critical part of this study and allowed the researcher to delve into each experience, which was most appropriate for the wide range of skills needed to complete the projects.

**Participant-Observation**

Using a case study approach, the researcher served as an important instrument of the study by collecting, organizing, analyzing, interpreting findings, and making recommendations for future research (Stake, 1995). This special role in inquiry allows the researcher to “perceive reality from someone inside a case rather than external to it” (Yin, 2018, p. 124). Through this lens, the researcher was able to document subtle
nuances about the study that are difficult to capture from an external position.

General Self-Efficacy Scale

In addition to the data collection methods mentioned above, the GSE scale (Appendix C) was used in this research study as the only quantitative collection instrument. The scale was taken in a pre-post format and scored by the researcher. Results ranged from 10 to 40.

The survey was administered at the beginning of the intervention and the end. This was a one-shot pretest-posttest, single group assessment. The one-shot pretest-posttest is an improvement to the one-shot posttest method because, as Mertler (2014) noted, “a pretest has been added prior to the introduction of the treatment” (p. 101) whereby baseline data becomes accessible. This design was exclusive to a single group; there was no control group in this study. This data collection method was chosen because the researcher was interested in examining the relationship between self-reported assessment results collected from the first administration of the assessment compared to the posttest using numerical data for analysis. In this study, a one tailed t test was conducted to test the statistical significance of the means scores from the first administration of the GSE to the final one.

Procedure

This single-case study examined the impact that the YMA program had on the self-efficacy levels of six participants. Case studies are best supported by various forms of data collection methods that allow for emerging themes to surface during the research (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Stake, 1995). Participants in this study met one day per week, on Saturday mornings from 9 a.m. to 12 noon. See Appendix F for a detailed program
During Week One the researcher administered the GSE scale to each participant. This assessment took approximately five minutes to complete. The results were tallied and scored directly on the form. Additionally, structured interview questions were completed by the six participants during Week One. Student-participants were given the structured interview questions (Appendix D) where they jotted down answers. Afterwards, they were interviewed by the researcher for 10 to 15 minutes to elaborate on their responses written on the form.

Field notes were taken during each session and unstructured interviews conducted. Data collected from these two methods were reviewed and uploaded to MAXQDA, a qualitative analysis software program. Data were organized according to file type for easy retrieval and analysis.

During the last week, a post-GSE scale was administered to each student-participant and scored accordingly. Structured interviews were conducted to document any changes in student-participants’ perceived self-efficacy.

**Analyzing Data**

In this single case, several instruments were used to analyze the results of the study. To maximize efficiency and ensure data were safe and able to be retrieved with ease, all field notes and interview responses were transcribed and uploaded to MAXQDA, as a working file and a backup file. This process, consisting of data collection, data analysis, and reporting, was iterative and often considered a spiral as the researcher worked through the data continuously organizing and analyzing (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Mertler (2014) believed that this inductive analysis helps the researcher
become well acquainted with the data. Once all of the data were gathered, the researcher began sorting the data through a process called coding.

The researcher carefully reviewed all notes from various sources. During this process, common words, phrases, and expressions were identified. A lexical search was conducted and the automatic coding feature in MAXQDA was used to identify word matches across several documents. This allowed the researcher to group these patterns into themes in order to form some basis for addressing the research question with corroborative evidence from several data sources. The single quantitative instrument used in this study was the GSE scale. The researcher was interested in examining the results of this instrument to see if it supported the findings from the other sources of data. The triangulation of data from various sources gave the researcher enough content to write a detailed description of findings.

**Plan for Reflecting with Participants on Data**

A debriefing session was conducted on the last day of the study. Action research is cyclical and gives the researcher the opportunity to continually improve teaching practices. Mertler (2014) believed that introspection is an integral aspect of reflective practice and embedded in the process. The researcher valued the voices of the participants and believed that the conversation with participants at the conclusion of the study provided useful insight into the thoughts and feelings of participants. This discussion was open-ended and gave participants an opportunity to share how they felt about the motivational tactics, interview questions, and the intervention as a whole. The results of this session helped guide future interventions to better meet the needs of learners.
Plan for Devising an Action Plan

This action research study aimed to examine the impact that the YMA program had on the self-efficacy levels of six participants in the program. The researcher was interested in working with the instructor at YMA to continually improve practice. The action plan created by the researcher was based on the results of the study and useful to better understand how increased self-efficacy levels might help youth in this program build resiliency and become problem-solvers and critical thinkers.
Chapter Four: Findings from the Data Analysis

This single-case study examined the self-efficacy levels of six participants in the Young Moviemakers of America program while considering what Bandura (1994) called major contributors to enhanced self-efficacy levels: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological state. The researcher was interested in exploring how these sources of self-efficacy, when embedded in instruction, might impact the general self-efficacy levels of the six participants. The research findings highlighted in this chapter are centered on the analysis of the various data collection sources used to address the research question.

Bandura (1994) claimed that self-appraisal of capabilities is directly linked to personal goal setting in which we view our “affective arousal as an energizing facilitator of performance” (p. 3). Using a project-based model, participants in this study were expected to explore the various aspects of filmmaking and complete a short documentary film based on a topic of their choosing. Larmer, Mergendoller, and Boss (2015) believed student voice and choice are critical prerequisites that drive autonomy, competence, and intrinsic motivation. Based on self-reports from the participants, many of them had little to no hands-on experience working with video/film equipment prior to the study. This chapter will show the findings of the research and analyze how conclusions are drawn based on the results.
Over a 10-week period from April 7, 2018, to June 23, 2018, sessions were scheduled on Saturday mornings from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. The lessons were geared to immerse participants in hands-on practice with each session focusing on a specific area of filmmaking. The researcher was curious as to whether creating a supportive environment where participants could take calculated risks, master various aspects of filmmaking, learn from the successes of others in their peer group, and stay encouraged through verbal persuasion from their teacher might affect their self-efficacy levels.

The researcher scribed field notes after each session to capture various classroom interactions and student/teacher comments. All six participants were given the General Self-Efficacy scale in a Likert-type format on the first of class and during the last week of the program. Structured interview questions were administered during the first session and a post-survey issued on the last day to analyze participants’ self-report of changes in their self-efficacy towards making a film and their overall general self-efficacy. In addition, unstructured interviews were conducted during each session to probe for any changes in participants’ perceived self-efficacy and also allowed for new themes to emerge. Lastly, artifacts such as storyboards and concept maps were gathered throughout the study to document participants’ progress throughout the program.

**Research Question**

What impact will the Young Moviemakers of America program have on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact that the Young Moviemakers of America programs had on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-
Findings of the Study

Multiple data collection methods were used in order to extract meaning from what participants self-reported, from what was observed during instruction, and from what was interpreted from the GSE scale. Creswell and Poth (2018) claimed that a thorough qualitative case study “presents an in-depth” analysis of the case that “integrates multiple forms of qualitative data” (p. 98). The results of this study were written in narrative form in order to seamlessly blend various data elements such as field notes from direct observation, structured interviews, and unstructured interviews. The data collected from these instruments were examined and analyzed in detail with the goal of determining how the identified sources of self-efficacy (mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological state) affected self-efficacy levels.

The use of multiple sources helped the researcher gauge participants’ perceptions of personal self-efficacy and also allowed for the common themes among the participants to be explored. This process afforded opportunities for the researcher to compare data collected from various forms to determine if self-efficacy levels were impacted. In addition, three themes emerged and were constructed from the data analysis: (a) making learning fun, (b) student voice and choice, and (c) establishing a positive mood.

Data Analysis

This section will cover the findings from structured and unstructured interviews, in addition to field notes from direct observations. Participants had little to no experience working with audio-video equipment prior to the start of the study. Some expressed interest in learning about specific areas of filmmaking, while some even expressed
interest in pursuing this area as a possible career choice.

Amber. During the first issuance of the structured interview questions, Amber shared that she was “interested in learning about filmmaking, but didn’t have prior experience working with video and film equipment.” She spoke freely and appeared to be quite comfortable answering questions. She shared, “I want to learn about lighting, sound, and acting,” but also added, “I don’t know how I could learn all of this.” When asked if she gets excited when faced with challenging situations, she said, “No, because I won’t know what to do.” She was then asked how she expected the program to be different from school, to which she responded, “it’s different because it’s more interesting than school” and “it would help me because it’s teaching me stuff I never did before.” Her attitude was upbeat most of the time, but she did show signs of nervousness whenever confronted with a question that required her to collect her thoughts prior to offering a response.

During the first cooperative activity on brainstorming, Ms. Sasha eased into Amber’s group area:

So…I see you guys are working on your idea. It seems like everything is going okay. So, you are thinking of doing something on sports. That sounds really good. Later, you will be working on how you will turn this idea into a movie. But for now, I want you guys to only think about the story idea. C’mon Amber, you can do it. I want you to discuss story ideas with your team (Ms. Sasha, personal communication, April 7, 2018).

Ms. Sasha directed and encouraged her on a few occasions to engage in the cooperative activities with, “C’mon, you can do it,” and “that’s fantastic that you are
working with your team.” With these words of encouragement, Amber appeared to feel more comfortable interacting with her peers.

Student-participants were tasked with creating and shaping their story ideas in Weeks 1 and 2. At the beginning of the second session, Amber asked the teacher if she could work with another group and the teacher allowed her to change groups. Larmer et al (2015) strongly supported student choice and believed this has “consequences on both learning and motivation” (p. 42). In addition, Bandura (1997) identified moods as an important “source of affective information for judging personal efficacy because they often accompany changes in quality of functioning” (p. 111). While completing the brainstorming activity with her new group, Ms. Sasha asked, “Amber, do you have some ideas about the film?” Amber smiled and replied confidently, “Yes. We will be talking about self-esteem and how people can build their self-esteem.” The teacher responded, “I just love this idea. That’s fantastic.” When the activity was completed, the researcher asked Amber, “So, tell me how things are going with the story?” Amber replied, “Everything is going okay.” The researcher continued, “Is it easier for you to come up with your story by doing this activity?” Amber answered, “Yes. It makes it easy because we can talk about our ideas and stuff. Everybody in the group can see what you are talking about.” Amber was actively involved and worked attentively throughout the story development phase.

The next two weeks in the program introduced student-participants to some of the audio and video equipment used in the program. After setting up a digital camera on a tripod with a monitor, student-participants were able to test out the equipment by framing shots and thinking about lighting. Initially, Amber stood behind other students and
watched as others explored the equipment. After some verbal persuasion from the teacher, “Amber, I want you to come over here and take a look at how this shot is framed,” Amber appeared more comfortable after being shown how to frame a shot. After transitioning to the next activity where student-participants were expected to identify various types of shots, again, Amber appeared to be somewhat disengaged initially. With some direction from the teacher, Amber and other students took turns framing shots and directing interviewees. When asked if she understood how to conduct an interview, she replied, “Everything is easy. All you have to do is look through the camera and see the person. We have to make sure they are in the camera before you start recording.”

By the fifth session, student-participants had been exposed to digital cameras, sound equipment including microphones, a basic lighting setup, and how to set up a background for interviews. Amber was asked, “How do you feel about your self-efficacy in general? Remember, that has to do with having confidence in being able to something.” She replied, “I think my self-efficacy is okay. I mean, sometime things are a little hard but when you start doing them they get easy.” She was then asked to give some examples, and she responded with, “Like when we learned about the cameras and stuff. The sound is easy to learn. I feel like I can do the sound.”

The next several weeks of the program consisted of storyboarding, conducting interviews, and story revisions. Amber attributed some of her success directly to her teacher, “Ms. Sasha explains things a lot so things get easier.” Amber began to take more initiative in her cooperative group. She drew many of the images for the scenes and developed questions that anchored the project. She set up the background at the start of
class for several consecutive weeks and was actively involved in setting up the lights in a three-point arrangement, preparing the audio recorder and microphone, and managing the camera. When asked about her self-efficacy, she responded with, “I feel like I can do almost everything to make my movie.” She also indicated that she felt better at problem solving in general and her self-efficacy was “higher.”

When the researcher asked Ms. Sasha about Amber’s progress throughout the study, she offered the following:

Amber made huge steps during the class. At first, she was really quiet but I knew she could contribute to the conversations. At times, it is hard for some children to adjust to the freedom that I like to give them during my workshops. After the first few sessions I really saw her contribute a lot to the project. She was actively working with the recording equipment, working on the interview set, and making sure her group was on task. She also did an excellent job on one of our exterior sets where we interviewed a therapist. So, all in all, she did fantastic and I did feel her efficacy grew from the start of the class (Ms. Sasha, personal communication, June 23, 2018).

During the post-interview, Amber appeared to be much more comfortable with her responses. She stated that the program was “very fun” and she believed she could “grow a lot from it.” She self-reported that she is “very good using the video camera” and believes she is much better at solving problems and more confident working “all of the equipment,” which suggests an improvement in her perception of her general self-efficacy. She also noted that she was comfortable setting up lighting for a shoot and is most confident in her acting ability. Amber believed that the workshop is “different”
from other ways she has learned and “it’s way more fun.” Lastly, she shared that the program has helped her “come out of her shell.”

**Braylin.** Braylin was eager to share that she expected the program to be “fun” and wanted to learn how to make a film. When asked if she gets excited when confronted with a challenging situation, she said, “not really.” She shared that she had some experience working with video cameras and rated herself at an “8” out of ten. She was unaware of three-point lighting, reported that she could “edit a little bit,” but was interested in learning about various aspects of film production.

Braylin actively participated in all classroom exercises and activities from the onset of the class. By the second session, Braylin became the spokesperson for her group and was always willing to share ideas on her group’s story. She volunteered to stand in front of the class during session two to take notes for her group. As her group began to shape story ideas, Braylin became the center of the story as several themes were discussed. During session five, Braylin was heard discussing the story topic with her group as they worked on storyboards:

> I think we should ask people how they feel about their self-esteem and maybe we can have them rate how they feel about their self-esteem. I think my self-esteem is high…like a eight or a nine. Since our movie is going to be about self-esteem…what do y’all think? (Braylin, personal communication, May 5, 2018).

The group reached a consensus and the story would center on self-love, or, as Braylin explained, “how to look into the mirror and appreciate the reflection.” Braylin was active in finalizing the story idea and also instrumental in conceptualizing how the group would approach interviewing actors for the film. Braylin’s group completed their story idea
before other groups. To help other groups, she volunteered to assist in various roles such as sound recorder, assistant director, and production assistant.

Braylin was inquisitive and actively participated in interactive activities. During the first day of class, she voluntarily read from the board and passed out materials to other student-participants. While working with her group to decide on a story idea, she led the discussion. She introduced the idea of creating a film on self-esteem, “Let’s do something about self-esteem and how people feel about how they look.” The group’s idea was listed on the board with other topics and chosen as one of the documentary topics. Ms. Sasha helped Braylin shape the story idea.

Braylin was asked, “Do you think it is going to be a challenge to create a documentary film?” Braylin replied, “I think it will be kind of hard. I want to do one on self-esteem because I think it is important for people to have self-esteem.” She was also asked about her thoughts on her personal self-efficacy and her response was, “I think it is okay. I mean, there are some things that I can do well but there’s other stuff that might be hard for me to do.” When asked, “What do you do when it gets hard?” She answered, “I try to think about how I can figure it out, or I can asked somebody.” She also shared that she gets “excited about what [she] is about to learn on different days [she] comes to class” and she believed she would learn what she needed to learn to be successful in the program. Braylin led her team in many instances throughout the program. She provided content to the story and was actively involved setting up lighting, backdrops, conducting interviews, and recording audio for several of the projects. In Week 4 she self-reported that her self-efficacy was “high because [she] could use the camera and the other equipment” and felt her group could “easily complete the project” because she knew how
to “interview people…and add other stuff like pictures.”

During the final sessions of the program, Braylin set up the lighting and backdrop, recorded sound, conducted interviews, and framed shots with the camera. She rotated through several roles and assisted other groups. When asked about her self-efficacy on the last day of class, she said, “I feel like my self-efficacy is high. I know how to do most of the stuff to make my movie. When I have a problem I try to figure out how to solve it and Ms. Sasha helped me a lot.”

While capturing additional footage for one of the films at an outside location, Braylin and Cory were on set and expected to take initiative in conducting the interviews. They were both quiet and appeared to be intimidated. This was noted by the researcher and supported by Ms. Sasha who identified this as an area of focus for future workshops.

During Braylin’s post-interview, she reported that the program was “interesting” and [she] gained a lot of information.” Though Braylin shared that the program helped her become a better problem-solver, when asked if she gets excited when faced with a difficult challenge, she responded with “Um…not really.” Braylin was asked to further explain why she did not get excited when confronted with a problem. She shared that she feels more confident in solving problems and responded, “I just don’t get excited about it.” She shared that she is “very good” at using the camera, knows how to light a scene, and is most “confident when [she] uses the sound mixer.” Her new interests are learning more about the camera, being filmed, and using the sound mixer. She also shared that the program has helped prepare her for the future and she might want to become a “photographer later in life.” When asked about her self-efficacy levels, Braylin reported, “they are high” and “I feel confident in myself.” Ms. Sasha offered a perspective on
Braylin’s growth in the program:

Braylin grew tremendously throughout the program. She went from being somewhat nervous and not so sure of herself to being the focal point of one of the movies. She is credited with constructing many of the questions for the story and creating many of the narrative portions of the film. She also understands how to record audio, prep an interview set, using the camera and she has also gotten comfortable interviewing actors. She had made tremendous growth in such a short time. Her personal confidence has soared (Ms. Sasha, personal communication, June 23, 2018).

Braylin served in many roles throughout the program. She offered help to many of the other groups and learned things rather quickly. As she noted, her perceived self-efficacy levels increased as evident in her personal admission. Additionally, she was observed initiating various tasks without prompting such as setting up the lights (sessions two and five, preparing the sound recording (session seven), and interviewing actors (session eight).

Cory. During Cory’s pre-interview, he mentioned that he believed the program would be “very fun and beneficial.” When asked if he gets excited when faced with a difficult challenge, he shared “it depends on the subject” and he was “okay” with solving problems. Cory indicated that he was “not good at all” with cameras but was most confident in his ability to “pitch ideas.” He shared that he was interested in filmmaking, modeling, or acting. He also believed that the program would be different from other ways of learning because he would be “more free and could do more” in the program.

Cory’s group decided to produce a documentary film on how shoes can help
express one’s personality. As an avid shoe lover, Cory was extremely excited to work on a project idea that was personally intriguing to him. Allowing students to create their own film topics through a collaborative process appeared to increase their motivation. Not only was this a unique story topic, it spoke to “students’ personal concerns, interests, and issues in their lives” (Larmer et al, 2015, p. 40). Ms. Sasha placed him in a group with two other participants who liked and supported his story idea. They decided that the story would include an element where shoes would be donated to less fortunate children.

Cory was somewhat shy during the first few weeks of class. Although he actively participated in his small group, he was apprehensive when asked to engage in whole-group activities. When prompted to discuss story ideas, Cory immediately shared his desire to do a film on shoes. His vision was clear, “I want mine to be on Vans,” he said. Ms. Sasha immediately affirmed, “That’s amazing.” When asked if he thought the making of a documentary film would be challenging, he replied, “Well, it might be a challenge because I don’t know a lot about the equipment and stuff.” He also shared that he “did not see himself as a problem-solver.”

During hands-on activities, Cory was always attentive but not willing to take many risks. While playing a game of Charades, he took a step back away from the group until being prompted by the teacher to participate. By Week 3, he appeared to be much more comfortable and actively participating in whole-group activities. While working with his team to flush out story ideas, Cory talked to his teammates about how he would “interview a manager at a Van’s store” and “how shoes helps to express your personality.” When the whole group reconvened, Cory shared the group’s story idea in a 30-second elevator pitch, while his teammates chimed in at various points. This
corroborating evidence supports what Cory shared in one of his structured interviews when he said, “I like to pitch ideas.”

When introducing student-participants to production processes and equipment, Cory rotated in the role of interviewer and director. He appeared to be more interested in the story and spent a great deal of time working on the storyboard. When asked about his perceived self-efficacy, he said, “I think it is high. We just have to get the questions answered, do the interviews and pictures, and then we are going to give some shoes away at the end.” The researcher also asked, “Why do you have such high self-efficacy for this project?” He replied, “I like doing it. This is something I thought about and I love shoes.” Here, Cory sees the work as enjoyable and interesting, which is what Froiland et al. (2012) and Amabile (1997) clearly identified as signs of intrinsic motivation toward a particular activity.

During the final few weeks of the program, Cory was involved in interviewing subjects for his movie, recording audio, writing narrative sections for the film, and acting in the film. When asked if he sees himself as a problem-solver, he replied, “I think I am. I mean, I can solve problems and if I can’t, I can asked someone.” Cory appeared to be more comfortable in front of and behind the camera by the end of the program, especially in the classroom setting. When expected to apply what he learned to external contexts, he appeared to be overwhelmed at times. When questioned about how he felt in these moments he said, “It’s just different.”

Cory and his group partners conducted two interview sessions at external locations. During these sessions, it appeared that Cory lacked some of the same confidence that he exhibited during the classroom interview sessions. Ms. Sasha
recognized this and encouraged them through the interview sessions.

The post-interview provided an opportunity for Cory to share more of his experience and growth in the program. He mentioned that he was happy that he “got to experience making something and being in front of the camera.” He also shared that he feels like he could “overcome any obstacle in his way.” Though he did not feel extremely confident in using the camera, he added, “but with some guidance I can.” He shared that he felt more confident in his ability to solve problems and “being in front of the camera.” Cory was open when he spoke about how the YMA way of learning was different from how he typically learns, adding, “I feel more free and able to not be interrogated if I did one thing wrong.” When asked about his self-efficacy levels, Cory reported that he “felt much more confident” in himself and “believed his self-efficacy has increased.”

Ms. Sasha discussed Cory’s progress:

He became more comfortable over the weeks, especially when we started to interview people on the set. He became less nervous and appeared to get more comfortable with others. Once he was given an opportunity to express his own ideas I feel that made him more confident and open. He began to engage with others more freely. He came up with an amazing story. By the end of the entire process, I feel like he felt proud of himself because he did something he actually wanted to do. I feel his confidence soared because he was doing something he cared for. (Ms. Sasha, personal communication, June 23, 2018).

By the end of the course, Cory was much more willing to take on various tasks associated with filmmaking. He assisted other groups with minor production tasks but appeared to
be much more confident with story creation and directing.

**Michael.** In the pre-interview with Michael, he shared that he “wasn’t that good at problem solving.” He added, “I do get excited when faced with a challenging situation.” He mentioned that he was good at using a video camera but did not know anything about lighting or other aspects of filmmaking. He shared that he was most confident in his ability to make a video but needed someone to help him because this was “new to [him].” He is interested in playing football and believed the program would be different in that he would be able to “make a video.” At the start of the program, he was unsure on how the program would help him.

Michael was quiet and had to be prompted initially prior to engaging in conversations with others, but he did participate in the group activities. When asked if he thought it would be a challenge for him to complete a documentary film, he replied, “It’s going to be kind of hard.” He also indicated that the way he learned in the program was quite different from the way he learned at school. He said, “I like the way we learn here. I like the games we play and how people are able to talk to each other. At school, we do stuff like math and science…stuff like that.” His apprehension with engaging with others was confirmed when he said, “It’s kind of hard to talk in front of people.” Michael did not come up with a story idea on his own, he joined the group that decided to make a story on shoes.

After deciding on the story idea, Michael began learning about equipment used to make the film. He worked directly with Ms. Sasha on how to frame a shot and also rotated in the role of sound engineer, interviewer, and lighting tech. Michael also assisted in setting up the backdrop at various sessions. When asked about his perception
of self-efficacy, he believed his self-efficacy was “okay because [he] learned how to create a story.” When also asked about his confidence in solving problems, he smiled, and then said, “Well, it depends. Like, if I’m doing something I know then it’s okay. But, if I don’t know anything about it, then I’m not that confident.” He also added that he was confident that he would be able to complete the film because “Ms. Sasha is helping us and we talk to our group about the movie…it’s easy.”

During the last two weeks of the program, Michael had chosen to focus on setting up the backdrop, recording sound, and conducting interviews. He was involved in doing in-classroom interviews in addition to interviews at various outside locations. When asked about his self-efficacy at the end of the program, he shared, “My self-efficacy is high. I know how to do a lot of stuff on the movie and I like interviewing people.”

Michael was a collaborative worker and by the end of the program, he was active in ensuring questions and shot plans were discussed prior to capturing content for the film. He was instrumental in helping his group interview subjects at external locations. Ms. Sasha recognized Michael’s growth in his self-confidence:

Michael wasn’t afraid at all to interview people for his film. He asked questions and wasn’t afraid to take the initiative. He appeared to be intimidated in the beginning to express his feeling about his project and all of the elements that went into the film. I believe once he became more comfortable, you could see a tremendous boost in his confidence. He did not seem to be afraid to make mistakes. That’s something I try to instill in all of my students. I want them to feel like they can explore and perhaps make a mistake or two. As long as they learn from the experience, it can only help them grow. (Ms. Sasha, personal
By the time of the post-interview, Michael reported that he “felt better when dealing with challenging situations” and did not feel as “pressured.” He was much more confident in his ability to use the camera and felt a “little bit” more confident in lighting a scene. He reported that he was most confident in “lighting” and he was interested in learning more about cameras in the future. He noted that in the YMA program “you get a little more time” to complete projects and the program has helped him learn how to “make a movie.”

**Timothy.** During Timothy’s pre-interview, he mentioned that he gets excited when faced with a difficult challenge in the classroom. He shared that he was “good” at using the video camera but would like to learn more about “different stuff that a camera can do.” He indicated that he understood lighting “somewhat” and expressed that he thought it might be “kind of hard” to learn. He expressed an overall interest in the program and thought he was “okay” at solving problems. Timothy believed that the program would be “funner” than how he learned in school because he would get the opportunity to make a video. He shared that the program would “help [him] be successful.”

Timothy was actively involved in every aspect of the instructional process. He expressed his confidence in his ability to “work with cameras and other equipment.” He also shared that he sees himself as a “problem-solver” but believes he can “get better.” He indicated that he “liked the way [he] learned” in the YMA program because “they don’t really explain things in school;” he continued, “it’s more help here and they let you give ideas. They don’t do that in school.”
When asked about his general self-efficacy and his thoughts about making a film, he said, “I think I have high self-efficacy. That’s a hard word, but I think we can do our project because it’s going to be on something I like, sports.” He worked attentively in his group to outline a story that centered on exploring the importance of sports in the lives of youth. When his group was asked to present their 30-second elevator pitch, Timothy quickly volunteered to speak to the group about his team’s idea. He was involved in setting up the lights and backdrop. Timothy also used the audio equipment to record the audio from interviews.

Timothy was much more focused and direct about the roles he played on the production team. He stepped in on two occasions and helped another team prep the interview set. He discussed various shot angles with his team and prepared audio equipment to capture audio for his group. When asked if his self-efficacy levels had increased, he said, “Yes. I feel like I can do more now. I understand how to set up most of the stuff and start interviewing the people.” He also shared that he felt more confidence in ability to deal with challenging situations. He attributed much of the improvement in his personal self-efficacy to the teacher’s ability to “make things fun.” He also indicated that he “used to be scared to talk…but starting to break out of his shell.” Ms. Sasha offered some insight on Timothy’s progress in the program:

Timothy is a self-starter who enjoys solving problems. From the beginning, he expressed confidence in his ability to speak in front of others. He offers ideas to his group, worked with much of the production equipment, and stayed engaged throughout the process. I believe his confidence grew throughout the program. He was able to set up the backdrop, the lighting, work with the recording
equipment, and use the camera. (Ms. Sasha, personal communication, June 23, 2018).

The post-interview gave the researcher an opportunity to explore Timothy’s perception on his ability in more depth. Timothy mentioned that he felt most confident in his ability to “use the camera” and “interview people.” He shared that he felt better about being able to solve problems and is considering a career making videos. He reiterated that his experience in the program was “fun” and “much different from how [he] learned at school.” He shared, “this program has helped understand how to do a lot of stuff with the cameras and stuff and I think I can do this for real.”

In summary, there were various opportunities for the researcher to capture pertinent data from various sources to draw conclusions based on the evidence gathered. Through the analysis of these qualitative data sources, the researcher was able to form a deeper understanding of the YMA program using structured and unstructured interviews as well as field notes through direct observation. The next section will explore the single quantitative instrument used in this case study. The use of various methods of data collection is necessary to thoroughly define the case. Yin (2018) believed this is a “core characteristic” (p. 18) of a case study and what makes it a unique approach to inquiry. In the next section, the results of the General Self-Efficacy survey will be highlighted.

**Overall Results from the General Self-Efficacy Survey**

This section highlights the analysis for the GSE scale. The results of the General Self-Efficacy scale show that all of the participants in the study believed that their self-efficacy increased by the end of the study (see Figure 4.1). A one-tailed $t$ test was conducted on the paired data using an alpha value of 0.05 to check for significant
difference in the mean values from the pretest to posttest results. The probability value, or \( p \)-value, was calculated at 0.039, which is lower than the critical value on 0.05. Additionally, the group’s mean score from the initial survey to the post survey went from 30.0 to 33.6, which is a 12% overall increase in reported self-efficacy. There were two participants who showed significant change. Based on Michael’s survey results, he showed a 40% increase while Amber’s results showed a 16.6% increase.

Based on the results of the General Self-Efficacy scale, the data showed that the YMA program had a positive effect on the self-efficacy levels of the participants.

![Results from General Self-Efficacy Scale](image)

*Figure 4.1. Results of the GSE Scale.*

**Analyzing Questions in the General Self-Efficacy Survey**

The researcher examined each of the questions in the survey to closely analyze how each participant responded to each scenario. The first question required participants to think about how they might respond when confronted with difficult problems, while considering if they could solve the problem “if [they] try hard enough” (see Figure 4.2). Only one participant (Amber) perceived that there was an increase in her ability to persevere through challenging scenarios when she tried hard enough, while three reported that there was no change. One participant’s (Michael) score decreased by one point from
the initial survey to the post-survey.

The results of this question showed that the efficacy-building strategies used in instruction did not have a significant impact on participants’ overall perceived self-efficacy. Based on the self-beliefs of all participants, they felt they could solve problems if they try hard, and the intervention had little to no impact on these feelings.

The results from Question 2 from the General Self-Efficacy scale indicate that four out of the five participants (80%) self-reported that there was an increase in their ability to get what they want when someone opposes them (see Figure 4.3). The average gain from the initial-survey to the post-survey was 1.2 points. Amber and Braylin showed the greatest changes with 2.0 point increases for each participant. Based on pre-survey results, three out of the five participants (60%) self-reported they could not find a means to get what they want when opposed by others “at all.” The results were quite different on the post-survey: Amber and Braylin posted 2.0 point increases and Michael increased by 1.0 point.

Here, participants’ self-beliefs about their ability to find ways to get what they want when confronted with opposing interests have an impact on their perceived self-efficacy.
The next question required participants to think about their ability to stay focused on their aims and accomplish goals. Two of the participants (40%) reported that it was easy for them to stick to their aims and accomplish their goals from the pre-survey to the post-survey (see Figure 4.4). Michael showed the greatest change with a 2.0 point increase, while the others stayed relatively consistent, with Amber and Braylin self-reporting “Exactly True” on both surveys. The overall average was 3.8 (close to ‘Exactly True’) for this area. Overall, the YMA program positively impacted students’ self-beliefs in their ability to stick to their aims and goals.

The fourth question in the survey explored participants’ self-reported confidence in their ability to work efficiently through unexpected events. While taking the pre-
survey, Amber and Michael asked for clarity on the word “efficiently” and it was explained to them in clear, age-appropriate terms. 100% of the participants self-reported on both the pre-survey and the post-survey that it was “moderately true” to “exactly true” that they were confident in their ability to deal efficiently with unexpected events; only Amber’s self-beliefs increased (3.0 to 4.0) from the pre-survey to the post-survey.
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**Figure 4.5.** Results from Question 4.

Question five from the survey indicated that three out of the five participants (60%) showed no improvement in their self-beliefs on having the resourcefulness to handle unforeseen situations (see Figure 4.5). Cory and Timothy self-reported “Exactly True” on this item on both surveys, where Amber and Michael showed a 1.0 point increase from the pre-survey to the post-survey. Braylin marked “moderately true” on both surveys.

Since two of the five participants self-reported an increase in their ability to handle unforeseen situations while the others remained constant, these results are consistent with the overall results of the survey that shows an increase in perceived self-efficacy.
Figure 4.6. Results from Question 5.

The next question in the survey required participants to self-report how they felt effort might impact their ability to solve problems. Four out of the five participants (80%) showed no increase from the pre-survey to the post survey. Michael showed a 1.0 point increase in his self-reported perceptions of ability to solve problems successfully when applying more effort.

Figure 4.7. Results from Question 6.

The overall average on Question seven from the post-survey showed a -0.2 decrease from the pre-survey (see Figure 4.8). While three out of the five participants showed no change in their self-reported ability to remain calm when faced with difficulties, Amber went from feeling extremely confident in her ability to remain calm to
“Hardly true.” Braylin self-reported a 1.0 point increase in her ability to stay calm when faced with challenging situations.

![Graph showing the change in ability to stay calm between Survey 1 and Survey 2 for Amber, Braylin, Cory, Michael, and Timothy.]

**Figure 4.8.** Results from Question 7.

The results of Question eight on the survey showed that only one out of the five participants (Amber) perceived an increase in her ability to find several solutions when confronted with a problem. Amber went from feeling “Hardly true” to “Exactly true” in her ability. Three out of the participants self-reported that there was no change in their ability to find several solutions when confronted with a problem. Michael went from a self-belief rating of “Exactly true” on the pre-survey to “Moderately true” on the post-survey.

![Graph showing the change in ability to find several solutions between Survey 1 and Survey 2 for Amber, Braylin, Cory, Michael, and Timothy.]

**Figure 4.9.** Results from Question 8.
The ninth question on the survey asked the participants to think about how confident they were in coming up with a solution to a problem when in trouble. Three out of the five participants (60%) self-reported an increase in their ability to find a solution to a problem when in trouble.

Amber and Michael’s belief in their ability to think of a solution when in trouble increased by 2.0 points, Timothy’s increased by 1.0 point, while Braylin and Cory remained constant from the pretest to the posttest.

Figure 4.10. Results from Question 9.

Figure 4.11. Results from Question 10.
Amber and Michael both showed a 2.0 increase, while Cory and Timothy increased by a single point. Braylin’s perceptions of ability remained constant at “Exactly true” from the pre-survey to the post-survey.

**Interpretation of the Results of the Findings**

This single-case study examined multiple forms of data to determine if the YMA program impacted the participants’ perception of self-efficacy. The instructor used a project-based model of instruction that required student-participants to engage in various methods of learning such as cooperative groups, whole group, and hands-on practice. Student-participants were given opportunities to self-select different roles of their liking as they progressed through the program. A major portion of the program utilized hands-on practice where student-participants had various opportunities to learn by doing, in addition to working with concept maps, storyboards, and other manipulatives. Some of their personal success may be attributed to their familiarity with the equipment over time and the mode of instruction, or perhaps simply their own personal growth over the duration of the study.

Based on the analysis of the four methods of data collection covered in the previous section, the findings support the idea that YMA program contributed to participants’ perception of self-efficacy by the end of the program. First, the results of the *t* test show that there is a less than 4% chance that the results are random. Structured and unstructured interview questions offered insight on each participant's unique experience as they progressed through the program. Field notes were used to describe what the researcher saw and heard throughout the study (Mertler, 2014). In addition, three themes emerged from the analysis that will be explored in detail that likely
contributed to participants’ self-reported increase in perceived self-efficacy.

The results of the General Self-Efficacy scale show that the perceptions of self-efficacy levels of all student-participants increased by the end of the study. The scale measured the belief of the student-participants’ confidence in their ability to respond favorably in challenging situations (Schwarzer, 1993). Of the five student-participants in the study, two were female and their average score increased by 9% from the initial survey to the post-survey. The other three participants were boys and they showed a 14% increase from their pre- to post-intervention scores. Also, based on the t test results, the p-value was calculated at 0.039 against a 0.05 critical value and shows statistical significance. There is a 96% chance that there is a significant difference in the means of the pretest and the posttest. The results support the claim that the intervention impacted self-efficacy levels of the six participants. The overall increase in participants’ perceived self-efficacy is supported by the results of the General Self-Efficacy scale.

Of the various data collection methods used, the structured interviews allowed the researcher to gain insight on each student participant’s perception of their self-efficacy with pre-determined questions. The responses provided an initial baseline for each participant’s perception of self-efficacy and also gave the researcher the opportunity to probe for deeper insight. When asked if they get excited when they are faced with a difficult challenge, three out of five (Amber, Braylin, and Jonathan) of the participants, or 60%, reported that they do not get excited, with Cory stating that it “depends on the subject.” Michael was the only student who mentioned that he “gets excited” when confronted with a challenging situation. All student-participants shared that they were unfamiliar with lighting and some of the other various areas of filmmaking. When asked
how they thought the program might be different from how they learned in school, they indicated the following:

“It’s different because this is more interesting than school.”

“It’s different because here there is a lot of learning.”

“It’s more fun to use videos.”

“You are more free and can do more.”

Each participant appeared to be eager to construct a story and complete a film by the end of the program. Amber believed the program would “help [her] because it is teaching [her] things she never learned in life.” This thought is similar to Cory’s prediction that the program would help him “learned new things,” while Braylin and Timothy shared that the program would help them be “successful in life.” All students had a positive outlook on the prospects of the program and were able to articulate specific ways they thought the program might benefit them.

In the post-intervention structured interview questions, all student-participants indicated that they were good at working one or more pieces of equipment. Braylin shared that she is most confident in her “acting” ability while Cory was also “confident in acting and being in front of the camera.” Amber expressed her interests in “using the camera, being filmed, and using the sound recorder.” When student-participants were asked if they get excited when faced with a difficult challenge, there were no definitive answers to show an increase in their perceive self-efficacy. Amber responded with “I’m not really because some [problems] can be really hard.” After more probing she shared “I don’t get excited about a problem, I just try to solve it.” This sentiment is echoed in Cory’s response, “No, because it’s another obstacle in my way, but I feel I can overcome
it.” Michael, Braylin, and Timothy also expressed that they felt they could overcome challenging situations when confronted with them. From the initial responses, the researcher concluded that the word “excited” may have been misleading as student-participants did not view problems as something to get excited about. Based on the results of the structured interview questions conducted during the last week of the study, 100% of the participants expressed that they can solve problems when faced with challenging situations.

Unstructured interviews gave the researcher the opportunity to ask probing questions on the fly in order to gain a better understanding of the experience. Responses were oftentimes captured during instruction, while other opportunities arose during breaks or immediately after class. Stake (1995) believed interviews give the researcher an opportunity to aggregate “perceptions or knowledge over multiple respondents” (p. 65). This method was used to capture multiple voices at various points throughout the study.

Student-participants were introduced to the definition of self-efficacy on the first day of the program. Braylin, Cory, and Timothy were more actively involved in discussions and group activities during the first session. When asked, “What was the most difficult part of today’s lesson?” Braylin responded, “The most difficult thing today was trying to figure out what type of documentary. I think I can figure it out.” Braylin appeared to have a positive outlook on the experience despite her admission that choosing a documentary topic was difficult. Braylin’s pre- and post-intervention score on the GSE scale only increased by 1 point, whereas the average increases of all participants was 3.6. This showed that Braylin had already possessed a positive appraisal
of her self-efficacy prior to starting the program. With an increase of 2 points on the GSE, Timothy’s score was also below the average. While answering questions during the first two sessions, he shared, “Based on what I am learning I will be able to create a movie here. I will learn how to deal with cameras and stuff like that.” Responses from the unstructured interview support data from the GSE and the structured interview questions. Braylin, Cory, and Timothy showed incremental increases in perceived self-efficacy, as they appeared to enter the program with positive appraisals of their capabilities.

Michael showed the greatest increase on the GSE. His score increased by 9 points, which is supported by his quiet and apprehensive demeanor during the first few weeks of class. After learning how to frame shots, setting up the backdrop, and prepping for interviews, Michael appeared to be more engaged. When asked about his personal appraisal of self-efficacy during the production phase of the program, Michael shared, “If I’m doing something I already know then it is okay. But, if I don’t know anything about it, then I’m not that confident.” By the end of the program, Michael appeared to be much more confident through personal mastery experiences and witnessing his peers experience success. He also volunteered to assist other groups with production tasks.

Results from the various data collection methods provide evidence that the YMA program contributed to student-participants’ increase in their appraisal of perceived self-efficacy. While two of the participants showed significant gains on the GSE, three others showed slight gains. Data from the structured and unstructured interview questions and direct observations provided additional evidence that supported the results from the GSE. While these results appear to be conclusive and clearly address the research question,
three themes that emerged from the study may have also contributed to increased self-efficacy levels. These areas will be explored in the next section.

**Making Learning Fun**

The mode of instruction used in the YMA program was purely project-based, allowing the teacher to employ various instructional methods to appeal to various learning styles of student-participants. While interviewing student-participants, using both structured and unstructured methods, the common theme of “fun” surfaced several times from all participants. The idea of “having fun” appeared to heighten a sense of arousal that impacted student-participants’ appraisal of self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) believed that “moderate arousal levels affect attentiveness and deployment of skills” (p. 108). In addition, Bandura felt strongly that mood impacts one’s judgment of self-efficacy. He stated, “People can learn faster if the things they are learning are congruent with the mood they are in” (p. 111). The teacher made a concerted effort to ensure the class was upbeat, supportive, and safe for all student-participants to take risks.

During interview sessions, it was evident that the all students perceived the experience as being “fun.” In Michael’s first semi-structure during the first session, he shared “Things were easy and very fun. I feel that I will be able to create a film.” Timothy indicated that the teacher “made it fun. We get to talk to each other and discuss how to do our plan.” Amber stated, “Learning here is fun. We don’t have a lot of fun learning in school.” These same sentiments were shared toward the end of the program. Timothy mentioned, “Ms. Sasha made everything fun,” and Braylin added, “The class was fun. We did a lot to make a movie.”

The overall mood of students during the course of the program appeared to be
calm and inquisitive. They asked questions, worked collaboratively, and maintained positive interaction with adults and their peers. It appeared that the lack of stress, willingness to work with others, and their overall perception that the experience was fun, all affected their perceived self-efficacy.

**Student Voice and Choice**

Student-participants in this study were expected to work with group members to create a short documentary film on a topic that they decided on as a group. The program was intentionally designed to help each student-participant learn how to work collaboratively, engage in constructive discourse, build consensus around the project goals, and execute a plan of action leading to the completion of the project. Larmer et al (2015) believed student voice and choice are critical to learning and also help to motivate students toward the project goal. When confronted with a dilemma, students should be able to “make choices about how to resolve it” (p. 41). Throughout the program, student-participants were confronted with various production or story-related issues that required their attention. With this, there was constant dialog amongst participants about how to proceed with their respective projects.

From the first day of the program, students were engaged in a brainstorming activity where they came up with potential story ideas. These ideas were written on the board and through teacher and student-participant input, eight potential story ideas were distilled to three story topics, one for each group. They decided to create films on self-love, the importance of sports in the lives of youth, and how shoes help express one’s personalities. Student-participants selected which group to join.

Questions were constructed around the topic and students shared their ideas.
Braylin said, “I would get everyone together and ask them how confident – say, how are you most confident in yourself?” Her question, with the questions of other team members, were added to the group’s list of questions and used to further shape the project. Michael smiled during one of his unstructured interviews and said, “We came up with our own ideas.” When asked, “Why is that important?” He replied, “Because we can tell our own story.” Cory was much more descriptive when asked how the way he learned in the program is different from how he learned in school: “At school you are like a robot. You can’t have your phone. You can express yourself here…in school you can’t be creative.” Additionally, Timothy’s response is more evidence of how student voice and choice affect their arousal for learning: “We can make our own film on what we like.”

These findings support the claim that student voice and choice are important factors in critical thinking, sustained inquiry, and problem solving (Larmer et al, 2015). This is not to suggest that guidance and supports are not needed through their learning endeavors, it simply suggests that voice and choice can be drivers of autonomy, which is essential to elevating levels of intrinsic motivation. Teachers play a critical role in the process to determine how much voice and choice are “beneficial to [student] learning to get the project done” (p. 42). The teacher was constantly communicating with student-participants and assessing their progress towards goal attainment.

**Establishing Positive Rapport**

The teacher established a classroom environment that was safe, supportive, and encouraged student-participants to take risks. Her upbeat and positive energy appeared to be reciprocated by students. She constantly expressed positive affirmations and words of
encouragement throughout the program. This helped to establish a calming and supportive mood centered on having fun while learning. Classroom norms were established at the beginning of the program and followed weekly by student-participants. Based on Bandura’s (1997) claim, “induced positive mood enhances perceived self-efficacy” (p. 112). Throughout this study, there was clear evidence that the establishment of a positive mood, through the use of positive affirmations and the emission of positive energy, had a significant impact on how student-participants felt about the experience. This is evidenced in the notes and interviews recorded by the researcher.

There were several instances when student-participants acknowledged how they perceived the teacher’s impact on the class. When asked about the challenges that she might be faced with when completing film, Braylin responded, “It seem like it might be hard but Ms. Sasha is going to help us finish our film. Ms. Sasha makes it fun…and it’s not all that stress, like doing hard work and stuff.” Other student-participants in the program also supported this sentiment. Michael shared, “Ms. Sasha is making sure that we learn how to make a film and she will show us how to work all of the equipment,” while Amber added, “Ms. Sasha helps us. I will be able to make my movie based on stuff she is teaching us,” and “Ms. Sasha explains things a lot so they get easier.” All of the student-participants shared some positive expressions about the teacher-student relationship during the program.

Lastly, there were specific moments during class where the teacher’s positive affirmations appeared to give the student-participant a sense of assurance and validation. After a student answered a question correctly, the teacher responded excitedly with common statements such as:
“Okay, Braylin! You are absolutely right.”

“Yes. That’s it! Great job Michael.”

“Great! Tell me more about what you visualize about your story.”

“I love that! That’s amazing. Did everyone hear that?”

“I think that’s beautiful.”

“That’s really good Timothy. I love that idea.”

“I like that you have already thought about it.”

“Great answers!”

“That’s fantastic.”

“I like that you are working on something you really enjoy.”

These comments were encouraging and in many instances they were immediately followed with a smile or a high-five from a team member. It appeared to be a huge confidence builder when student-participants were confronted with challenges. They felt confident enough they could ask a peer or their teacher for assistance.

**Conclusion**

The results of this single-case study show evidence that the YMA program had a positive impact on the self-efficacy levels of the student-participants in the program. Data gathered and presented support the findings that self-efficacy levels increased as a result of immersing students in an authentic learning experience where student voice and choice were recognized, learning was perceived as fun, and positive affirmation strategies were blended into instruction.

Bandura (1997) identified four major sources of self-efficacy as mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological state. Each of
these areas were embedded into YMA’s instructional program. Student-participants had various opportunities to master various aspects of the filmmaking process, especially with using production equipment. Working as a team, they observed their peers mastering specific roles, and these vicarious experiences may have had an impact on their perceived self-efficacy. The teacher was intentional about creating a positive mood in the classroom and constantly affirming and encouraging students through verbal persuasion.

As a result, data collected and analyzed from the four sources in this study reveal that creating multiple opportunities for mastery and vicarious experiences, encouraging student voice/choice, incorporating positive reinforcements into instruction, making learning fun, and establishing a positive mood all contributed to increasing the self-efficacy levels of participants in the YMA program. The results from the t test showed that the difference between the mean scores of the pretest and the posttest were statistically significant, with less than a 3.9% likelihood that the results happened by chance. Student-participants expressed a greater sense of self-efficacy in their ability to solve problems, which is documented in structured interviews, unstructured interviews, and field notes. In concluding this study, the findings support the implementation of self-efficacy building strategies into the classroom to increase students’ perceived self-efficacy.
Chapter Five: Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations

This single-case study was conducted to examine the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age student-participants in the Young Moviemakers of America program during the spring of 2018. The program has a workshop structure that provided an opportunity for children to learn the various aspects of filmmaking in a highly collaborative, hands-on approach to learning. The problem of practice centered on exploring how self-efficacy levels might be impacted when embedding self-efficacy building strategies into instruction. This chapter will begin with an overview of the findings, followed by implications and recommendations for future research.

Research Question

What impact will the Young Moviemakers of America program have on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact that the Young Moviemakers of America programs had on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants.

Overview/Summary of the Study

The researcher is a former teacher who had a particular wondering about how the self-efficacy levels of participants in the YMA program might be impacted. Data collected from various methods were synthesized in Chapter Four and the results of the analysis support the notion that the intervention had an impact on the students’ self-efficacy by the end of the study. The researcher observed the program over a 10-week
period where student-participants were actively involved in producing a short
documentary film (less than 30 minutes) on a topic chosen by the students. Prior to the
start of the study, the teacher shared “It’s important to build them up because learning can
get boring at times. I want my students to come here and feel like they can explore what
they are thinking without their ideas being shot down.” This statement further validated
the teacher’s approach to instruction and how much student voice was valued.

Themes emerged from the research that provides evidence that when student-
participants perceive the learning experiences as being “fun,” student voice and choice
are encouraged, and a positive mood is established, students’ perceptions of self-efficacy
increase. These themes addressed the research question and helped the researcher draw
conclusions based on the findings. The following sections will discuss an action plan
focused on themes, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

**Summary of Major Themes**

**Claim one: Making learning fun. (Intrinsic motivation).**

Throughout this study, student-participants constantly shared that they were
having fun while working on their film projects. Though many of the exercises and tasks
were challenging and required them to utilize various skill sets, it appeared that these
challenges did not impede their progress towards goal attainment. There were moments
when certain student-participants became more active than others when exploring certain
tasks or phases in the process, but it did not diminish the team approach to learning. For
instance, while certain members in groups were working on storyboards, others who were
more interested in operating the camera were free to assist another group with capturing
interview footage. This freedom allowed student-participants to select activities that
were personally stimulating and gratifying. At times, certain student-participants were off-task and needed to be re-directed. Additionally, there was a particular moment when one student-participant shared that one of his group members was not “helping [him]” with a part of their project. This created some tension between the two students. This information was shared with the teacher, who took a moment to reiterate the importance of being a good team player.

There was an expectation for students to have fun while completing their projects. There were interactive games played during several sessions that were built into the instructional process. During the first session of the program, parents were involved in a fun activity with their children where they were given newspaper and tape and asked to build a structure that was at least three feet tall and could withstand a shake test. This activity was well received by parents and student-participants. At the end of the activity, one parent shared how she “had never done anything like that before” and another asked, “Can I join the class?” In other weeks, they played a game of Charades as a way to quiz them on the different styles of documentary films and the various types of camera shots. These activities were well received by student-participants as many of them laughed and smiled while being assessed on their knowledge of important aspects of filmmaking.

When exploring the comments that were shared with the participant-observer, it was obvious that student-participants were intrinsically motivated toward the program in general. When asked, “What do you think about prior to coming to class?” they all shared that they “were excited” or expected to “have fun.” Upon entering the class on Saturday mornings, several asked the question, “What are we going to be doing today?” Heckman & Sanger (2013) stated, “the more a student exhibits curiosity, which is rooted
in interest, the more he or she can focus on, bring effort to, and engage in meaningful tasks” (p. 1). These comments support the visual evidence observed by the researcher throughout the program.

**Claim two: Student voice and choice.**

When discussing the goals of the program with the teacher, it was clear that one of the main expectations of the program was to allow students to create films that would give them an opportunity to express their own voice. One of the main issues that arose from the initial conversation was determining how many documentary films would be produced during the program. Since there were nine participants in the program, there would be the potential of creating as many as nine individual projects, which would have been overwhelming due to resource and time constraints. Through collaborative group activities, story ideas were distilled to three main topics and students self-selected the group they wanted to join.

When building story ideas, each student-participant had various opportunities to provide input on shaping the story. They discussed and decided on titles, developed questions, created storyboards, and created plans to capture content to go in their films. The teacher made sure to monitor the progress of groups to ensure all student-participants were actively involved and groups were on target to meet objectives. This was by far the most challenging phase of the program. Through this process, the teacher was able to determine which scaffolds and modifications were needed to support student success. This is supported by the idea of Larmer et al. (2015) that teachers must be able to know “what kinds of choices are most beneficial to [student] learning” that lead to the successful completion of the project.
The teacher organized in-class times for project interviews to take place. During this process, students had an opportunity to choose various roles such as director, interviewer, sound recorder, lighting technician, or a production assistant writing shot information in the slate. There were times when roles were vacant and the teacher had to assign someone to a role. This may have been caused when two or more students selected the same role, or because some roles were more popular than others.

While examining field notes and interview comments, there was well-supported evidence that the voices of student-participants were valued and choice encouraged, from constructing authentic stories to filling roles that appealed to their strengths and personal curiosity. From observations, the researcher believed that student-participants appeared to maintain high levels of engagement and genuinely vested in stories that they constructed collaboratively.

Claim three: Setting a positive mood.

The overall classroom climate was positive and the teacher was intentional in making sure that she established a positive mood at the beginning of each session. Students typically arrived just before 10 a.m., signed in, and took a seat in a half-circle. Here, the teacher was able to review previously covered material, ask each student how their week went, and introduced some of what would be covered during the session. Many of the student-participants’ comments were followed with positive affirmations from the teacher. In addition to establishing a positive and supportive classroom climate, learning objectives were clearly written on the board in clear, concise language. The researcher believes all of these techniques helped to establish a positive mood in the classroom.
When the researcher examined many of the interactions between the teacher and students, and also those between students, nearly all appeared to have been constructive and helpful. For instance, while interviewing a subject for her film, Braylin struggled to come up with the exact words for questions that she had rehearsed, the teacher said, “You are doing fantastic. Now, let’s think about what we are trying to gather from this question, not so much about what words we need to put in the question.” Braylin sighed and paused momentarily, then rephrased the question with words she was more comfortable with. After completing the segment of questions, the teacher acknowledged Braylin’s great work, “Excellent Braylin. That was fantastic.” This example of verbal persuasion occurred frequently throughout the program and had an impact on student-participants’ perception of ability. Locke (1996) further validated this point when he asserted “persuasion may include not only verbal expressions of confidence but also giving people information regarding what task strategies to use” (p. 120). This strategy helped Braylin complete the interview and move to the next phase of the project. Mathisen & Bronnick (2009) believed verbal persuasion helps to boost self-efficacy by providing “enactive mastery experiences” (p. 28) where students feel confidence that they have the skills to complete a task successfully.

After examining all of the notes and comments throughout this study, the researcher concluded that establishing a positive mood had an impact on the self-efficacy levels of the six participants in the study. All of the student-participants acknowledged, at some point in the program, that they felt supported by the teacher and believed she would help them complete their projects. These feelings of support were well documented throughout the study in the form of interview notes, both structured and
Claim four: Managing projects more efficiently.

Based on observations and conferences with the teacher, managing student projects was the most challenging task for the teacher. Since projects are undertaken based on students’ interests, the scope of the projects were not known prior to the start of the program. This created many potential issues with identifying and determining the availability of resources, shot selections, and skills needed to produce films because the skill levels of student-participants were not known prior to the start of the program. The program was scheduled for ten weeks with major topics covered in three to four week modules. The first three weeks of the program were focused on building the story, creating storyboards, and being introduced to production equipment. The next four weeks consisted of capturing content, and the last three weeks were dedicated to introducing student-participants to editing and capturing additional content needed to complete each film.

After the three story ideas were finalized, students worked in groups of two to four. Using a project-based model, there was an expectation for student-participants to engage in cooperative work to ensure each team member contributed to the project goal. The teacher saw her role as a facilitator rather than that of a project manager, and she wanted to give students some control and autonomy over projects. While this mode of learning can be optimal for producing a film, not many of the student-participants had prior experience as collaborative workers. Through fun activities and role-playing exercises, student-participants gained a better sense of what it meant to be a helpful and supportive team member, but this did not transfer to their understanding and confidence
in how to manage their projects.

As with many teachers who use a PBL model to teach, there is a need to constantly assess and reassess students’ understanding, knowledge, and skills, in addition to ensuring the project is progressing as planned. Based on observations, there were several instances where the teacher had to modify the schedule in order to meet the current needs of students. By the end of the third week, there was an obvious need for the teacher to give additional time for completing storyboards and shooting plans. After making these decisions, other topics had to be pushed back and this not only impacted the end-date of the program, but it shortened the amount of time that could be allotted to capturing additional footage and editing projects in the classroom.

There were several pieces of equipment needed to run the workshop including: a Digital Single-Lens Reflex (DSLR) camera, a microphone, microphone boom pole and shock mount, audio recorder, lighting set, several lighting stands, projector, slate, sandbags, reflectors, and diffusing materials. Student-participants were given cursory instructions on how to work equipment with the idea that they would learn by doing as opposed to gaining a depth of knowledge. This worked well for student-participants and they appeared to gain confidence with each session as they set up the backdrop, lighting set, wrote down important information on the slate, conducted interviews, recorded sound, and operated the camera.

Based on feedback from the teacher and observations, student-participants had a difficult time transferring what they had learned to new experiences. Amber, Braylin, and Cory worked extremely well in the classroom context with interviewing, asking questions, and seeking assistance when needed. When they were on sets outside of the
classroom setting, they appeared to be somewhat afraid and did not take initiative. The teacher had to prompt them several times to engage in the process. Michael was much more relaxed in these same settings with behaviors consistent with those exhibited in the classroom setting. When Cory was asked why he seemed apprehensive on settings in exterior settings, he shrugged and said, “I don’t know. It’s just…I don’t know.” Amber’s response was nearly identical to Cory’s reaction. It was concluded that there should be more focus on preparing student-participants for unfamiliar settings, perhaps through role-playing and easy-to-follow shooting plans.

**Implications**

This single-case study was explored through the lens of the researcher. Though the scope is limited to the YMA program, several implications arose that may have an impact on future workshops offered through YMA, other after school programs, and traditional classroom settings. First, teachers who are intentional about embedding efficacy-building strategies into instruction have a great chance of enhancing general self-efficacy levels. From the literature, there were strong claims that self-efficacy is a powerful determinant of performance and outcomes (Bandura, 1994; Bang & Reio, 2017; Bethea & Robinson, 2007). Teachers, who understand the importance of self-efficacy as a way to build social-emotional skills and self-regulation in students, can help children become better problem-solvers and adaptable learners. The teacher was able to connect with students in authentic ways and gave them a supportive space to take risks. This will likely impact student-participants’ ability to assess their personal efficacy when faced with challenges in the future. Therefore, sound pedagogy has implications beyond the bounds of this study and relates to all learning contexts.
The second implication from the study is that the PBL mode of instruction used predominately in YMA can be used in regular classroom environments to make learning more relevant and purposeful. This has implications for providing opportunities for more student-centered experiences where voice and choice are valued and encouraged. Though this area was not a main focal point of the study, the findings do suggest that students may have benefitted from a more structured plan for managing their own projects. The findings indicate that there was an increase in the general self-efficacy levels of all participants in the study. However, self-efficacy levels may have been impacted to greater lengths if participants were more involved in the management of their projects.

The researcher embarked on the research study to explore self-efficacy in an after-school program. Through this experience, the researcher examined multiple sources of data that supported the notion that the YMA program had a positive effect on the self-efficacy levels of the six student-participants. Speaking as a reflective practitioner, these findings are critical to the cyclical nature of action research and provide opportunities to improve practice (Mertler, 2014). Based on the results of the study, the researcher created a plan that will be discussed with the teacher in order to discuss the weaknesses and strengths of the YMA program and how changes might be made.

**Action Plan**

**Action Step One: Build a PBL Culture**

Using a project-based model gives the teacher a great deal of flexibility in how instruction is delivered to students. Without a clear path for guiding projects to successful completion that considers the age of the student-participants, it becomes
difficult for participants to take ownership in managing their own projects. Throughout the study, there were times when student-participants were not aware of how they were progressing through the project, were not made aware of key milestones, and not informed on what resources were needed to complete the project. Consequently, the teacher was left with managing the entire process for all three projects. Mertler (2014) pointed out that a PBL classroom “promotes independence, inquiry, and attention to quality” (p. 48). This level of control could also have an impact on students’ belief in their personal self-efficacy.

Learning to manage a project is a major skill that can be gained through this experience. Though the teacher touched on the topic at various points in the study, a basic project management template might be useful. The researcher will work with the teacher to design a basic template for managing projects to help establish a PBL culture.

**Action Step Two: Preparation for out-of-classroom experiences**

There were several interview sessions where productions teams were required to meet at locations away from the classroom. Based on observations and feedback from student-participants, it was during these times where student-participants felt less confident in what they learned in the classroom. Only Michael self-reported that he felt comfortable interviewing subjects in locations away from the classroom. This is also validated in the teacher’s report, “Michael wasn’t afraid at all. He interviewed people, asked questions…” Michael also had the greatest increase on the GSE survey with a 40% in his score from the pre-survey to the post-survey.

The researcher will work with the teacher to create activities that focus on applying what students learn in the classroom to external contexts. This will include
modeling and role-playing to demonstrate how to conduct an interview session efficiently and effectively. As well noted in this research, mastery experiences and vicarious experiences are sources of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1995; Mathisen & Bronnick, 2009). In addition, a greater focus will be placed on shot plans that consist of a checklist of tasks needed to complete an interview session and a mnemonic device to remember key steps to conduct effective interview sessions, in the classroom and at external locations.

**Action Step Three: Better equipment-to-student ratios**

Increasing the amount of equipment available to students will give them more opportunities to use the equipment and get better at using it. Observations and student interviews reveal that students had “fun” learning how to make short documentary films. With opportunities to increase the use of, and become more familiar with, cameras, sound recorders, lighting, and other filmmaking gear, it is likely that self-efficacy levels will be impacted in positive ways. There were two DSLR cameras used in the program with a Canon Rebel T2i being used almost exclusively because of its ease of use. Students learned the basic functions of several pieces of equipment, but deeper knowledge is needed for sustained understanding and application.

The researcher will work with the teacher to explore funding opportunities for resources acquisitions. This will help create better equipment-to-student ratios for cameras and sound recording equipment. Based on observations, all of the student-participants were more interested in learning about cameras and audio recording equipment as evident in their eagerness to use these items during class time.
Summary

This single-case study was conducted to examine the impact that the YMA program had on the self-efficacy levels of the six participants during the spring of 2018 workshop. This action plan identified three main areas that will be explored further with the goal of improving pedagogical practices. Building a project-based learning culture, preparing students for out-of-classroom experiences, and creating a better equipment-to-student ratio will all impact learner experiences in the YMA program in the future.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study was limited in that it focused on a specific age group of children in middle school from Los Angeles County. It explored an after-school program called Young Moviemakers of America, to see if the student-participants’ self-efficacy levels would change after completing a 10-week workshop on making a short documentary film. Based on qualitative data collected in this study, in addition to a single survey to measure general self-efficacy, the researcher concluded that there is evidence that the self-efficacy levels of the six participants changed from the beginning of the intervention to the end. The researcher makes the following four suggestions for future research.

Suggestion One: Add an Intrinsic Motivation Scale

As discovered in this research study, intrinsic motivation is an important source of self-efficacy. All of the participants in this study mentioned that the program was “fun” and they got excited prior to coming to the class. Locke (2006) claimed that not only does intrinsic motivation lead to deeper knowledge, it is also a “crucial component to the creative process” (p. 188). It is recommended that an intrinsic motivation scale be considered in order to measure how these levels might be impacted by the intervention.
**Suggestion Two: Specific Self-Efficacy Scale**

The General Self-Efficacy survey examined the student-participants’ self-reported feelings of general problem-solving ability. A survey that focuses on functioning in a specific domain would be useful and can target specific skills such as confidence in using the camera, recording sound, and setting up three-point lighting. This scale can be designed using a format similar to the GSE survey.

**Suggestion Three: Increase Length of the Study**

This study was scheduled for ten weeks but there were additional times beyond this period to capture additional footage and to edit the films in their entirety. Sessions on editing were limited and more time could have been spent introducing the basics of editing to student-participants. Increasing the time of the study would also allow for more time conducting more in-depth examination of various qualitative data such as journals and artifacts.

**Conclusion**

Research on self-efficacy supports the notion that self-efficacy beliefs are crucial to creative performance and personal outcomes (Bandura, 1995; Bang & Reio, 2017; Locke et al, 2006; Tierney & Farmer, 2011). Much of the research on self-efficacy in the academic arena focused on high school and college students. This study focused specifically on middle school-age children in the YMA program. Using field notes, structured and unstructured interviews, the General Self-Efficacy survey, and emerging themes, the researcher triangulated the data to form some basis to address the research question: What impact will the Young Moviemakers of America program have on the self-efficacy levels of six middle school-age participants?
This study revealed that self-efficacy levels of student-participants in the YMA program increased over the 10-week period. There was an overall increase in scores from the pre-survey to the post-survey on the General Self-Efficacy scale that shows statistical significance, in addition to interview data (student-participants and teacher), and field notes that also support the claim. Three themes emerged that allowed the researcher to gain a more in-depth understanding of the case. These themes were: (a) making learning fun, (b) student voice and choice, and (c) establishing a positive mood. These themes were critical to the final analysis and provide insight into how self-efficacy levels can be boosted when efficacy-building strategies are blended into instruction effectively.

The findings from the study will be discussed with the teacher. This will give the researcher an opportunity to present the action plan and discuss ideas for implementation. Through conversations with the teacher, it was disclosed that projects appeared to be “getting out of hand” at times. Creating a simple project management tool or template for students will help them manage project more efficiently. Another problem identified in the study was the inability of student-participants to maintain performance levels in unfamiliar environments, such as store scenes or outdoor locations. In these instances, it appeared that student-participants lacked the same self-confidence that they had exhibited in the classroom. Lastly, there is a need for better equipment-to-student ratios. From observations, it was obvious that student-participants had infrequent exposure to certain pieces of equipment. Increasing the number of cameras, audio recording devices, and computers will give students more opportunities for mastery and vicarious experiences, which are sources of self-efficacy as documented throughout this study.
In concluding this study, the researcher believes that teachers, who embed self-efficacy building strategies into instruction such by making learning fun and interactive, encouraging student voice and choice, and establishing a positive mood through the use of positive reinforcements, can boost self-efficacy levels of learners. Though this study was limited to five participants, 100% of the student-participants showed growth in their perception of self-efficacy from the beginning of the study to the end, as evident in the analysis of data collected and presented in this study.
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Appendix A

Parent Consent Form

April 4, 2018

Dear Parent:

My name is DuBois Teddy McMillan and I am a student in a doctorate program (Education - Curriculum & Instruction) at the University of South Carolina.

I am conducting a research study to examine the self-efficacy levels of middle school-aged students who participate in the program. I am specifically interested in exploring how the self-efficacy levels of participants might be impacted by the hands-on and highly collaborative nature of the program. I will be working with the teacher and discussing project-based strategies to increase engagement and ways to optimize learning. To examine the program’s impact, I plan to collect some data throughout the 10-week period, and I am asking for your child’s participation in the study.

If your child participates in the study, he/she will be given a short survey that will assess self-efficacy levels. This survey will be administered at two different points in the study. I will also ask students questions about how confident they are at completing specific tasks related to video/film production. Additionally, I will be observing each session and capturing participants’ interactions and expressions.

This study is not mandatory. You and your child can elect not to participate in the study. Your child’s participation is completely voluntary and he/she is free to withdraw from the study at any point without affecting your child’s participation in the study. The results of the study may be published, but your child’s name will not be used, an alias will be used instead. Data collected in this study will be kept in strict confidence and will not be shared.

Should you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to call me at 310-525-7235, or you can also email me at: duboismcmillan@gmail.com

Sincerely,

DuBois Teddy McMillan, MBA
Student
Doctorate Program in Curriculum and Instruction

By signing below, I give consent for my child to participate in the study referenced above.

Parent’s Name: ___________________ Child’s Name: ___________________

Parent’s Signature: ___________________ Date: _______________
Appendix B

Student Assent Form

April 4, 2018

Dear Participant:

My name is DuBois Teddy McMillan and I am a student in a doctorate program (Education - Curriculum & Instruction) at the University of South Carolina.

I am conducting a research study to examine the self-efficacy levels of middle school-aged students who participate in the program. I am specifically interested in exploring how the self-efficacy levels of participants might be impacted by the hands-on and highly collaborative nature of the program. I will be working with the teacher and discussing project-based strategies to increase engagement and ways to optimize learning. To examine the program's impact, I plan to collect some data throughout the 10-week period, and I am asking for your participation in the study.

If you agree to participate, you will be given a short survey that will assess self-efficacy levels. This survey will be administered at two different points in the study. I will ask you questions about how confidence they are at completing specific tasks related to video/film production. Additionally, I will be observing each session and capturing your interactions and expressions.

This study is not mandatory. You can decide that you do not want to participate in the study. Your participation is completely voluntary and you can withdraw from the study at any point without affecting your participation in

The results of the study may be published, but your name will not be used, an alias will be used instead. Data collected in this study will be kept in strict confidence and will not be shared.

Should you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to call me at 310-525-7235, or you can also email me at: dubois@mcmillan@gmail.com

Sincerely,

DuBois Teddy McMillan, MBA
Student
Doctorate Program in Curriculum and Instruction

By signing below, I give consent for my child to participate in the study referenced above.

__ YES, I want to be in the study and I know that I can change my mind later

__ NO, I do not want to be in the study

Your Name: __________________________  Your Signature: __________________________  Date: __________________________
### General Self-Efficacy Scale

**Student Name __________________________  Date _____________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Structured Interview Questions

Student Name ____________________________ Date ____________

1. Why are/were you interested in the program?

2. Do you generally get excited when you are faced with a difficult challenge in the classroom?

3. How good are you at using a video camera?

4. Are you able to create a 3-point lighting setup?

5. What are you most confident that you can do in video/film production?

6. What are your interests?

7. How is this workshop different from how you learn at school?

8. How will this or how has this program helped you?
Appendix E

Results From General Self-Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braylin</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total average</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Variable 1} \\
\text{Mean} & 30 \\
\text{Variance} & 22 \\
\text{Observations} & 5 \\
\text{Pearson Correlation} & 0.828176686 \\
\text{Hypothesized Mean Difference} & 0 \\
\text{df} & 4 \\
\text{t Stat} & 2.343400398 \\
\text{P(T<=t) one-tail} & 0.039541852 \\
\text{t Critical one-tail} & 2.131846782 \\
\text{P(T<=t) two-tail} & 0.079083703 \\
\text{t Critical two-tail} & 2.776445105
\end{array}
\]
Appendix F

YMA

Short Documentary Filmmaking Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Moviemaking Introduction &amp; Story Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>What is a Story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(review scripts, three-Act structure, creating a rough treatment, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Working with Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cameras, lenses, tripods, microphones, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Completing Treatments and Storyboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Lighting &amp; Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>Final Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Showcase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>