

Comparing Pre-test and Post-test Self-Efficacy Ratings of Participants Attending the Executing with Excellence Conference

Jordan Stanford and Dr. Candis Carraway, Stephen F. Austin State University



Stephen F. Austin
State University

Introduction

- Research has shown that leadership skills are one of the soft-skills that employers are seeking in their employees.
- FFA strives to develop its members leadership potential.
- Texas FFA conducts a series of “Excellence” workshops to enhance members’ leadership skills. These “Excellence workshops are “Made for Excellence” for sophomores, “Building Excellence” for juniors and “Executing with Excellence” for seniors.
- The “Executing with Excellence” workshop has never been evaluated to determine its effectiveness.
- There were seven locations around the state where the “Executing with Excellence” workshop was conducted between October 2019 and January 2020.
- The workshop presenters and leaders developed the workshop which included 13 objectives used to guide the workshop.
- There were three presenters trained to teach the workshop, but each workshop was taught by one or two presenters.

Theoretical Framework

This study used Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory as a guide and therefore used the self-efficacy of the participants to analyze the effectiveness of the conference.

Methods

- Used a one-group, pre-test post-test design
- 13 objectives taught and researchers developed an instrument item to gauge participants’ self-efficacy for each objective.
- A Likert-type scale for each statement was used (0 = Strongly Disagree, 1 = Disagree, 2 = Slightly Disagree, 3 = Slightly Agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree).
- 127 workshop participants took both a pre-test and post-test to gauge their self-efficacy in each objective
- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used to conduct a paired-samples t-tests ($p < .05$).

Results

All 13 objectives showed a significant difference in the pre-test and post-test self-efficacy means. “I am able to describe the intent of interviewers’ questions.” was the statement with the most significant difference from pre-test to post-test scores.

Table 1.

A Comparison of Pre-Test and Post Test Students Self-Efficacy (N = 127)

| Variable | Pre-Test | | Post-Test | | t | p |
|--|----------|-------|-----------|-------|---------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | |
| I can list my participation in FFA and high school. | 5.58 | 0.556 | 5.78 | 0.453 | -4.146 | .000 |
| I <u>am able to</u> differentiate between experiences and skills. | 5.03 | 0.776 | 5.82 | 0.426 | -11.332 | .000 |
| I <u>am able to</u> describe the intent of interviewers’ questions | 4.48 | 0.942 | 5.70 | 0.582 | -13.988 | .000 |
| I <u>am able to</u> create a message based on skills obtained through experiences. | 4.59 | 0.954 | 5.62 | 0.692 | -12.018 | .000 |
| I can articulate “verbal” messages based on the audience. | 4.51 | 1.061 | 5.50 | 0.641 | -11.410 | .000 |
| I can articulate “written” messages based on the audience. | 4.43 | 1.043 | 5.50 | 0.665 | -12.301 | .000 |
| I can define the concept of “humble confidence” | 4.74 | 1.017 | 5.80 | 0.455 | -11.468 | .000 |
| I can implement the concept of “humble confidence” | 4.65 | 1.003 | 5.77 | 0.522 | -12.074 | .000 |
| I can identify what makes me the best version of myself. | 4.91 | 0.904 | 5.64 | 0.651 | -9.044 | .000 |
| I can establish expectations for growth and lifelong learning. | 4.98 | 0.797 | 5.72 | 0.559 | -10.071 | .000 |
| I can categorize the time, talent, and/or treasures I <u>have to</u> give. | 4.73 | 0.830 | 5.70 | 0.568 | -12.021 | .000 |
| I can explain why I should invest in myself and others | 4.83 | 0.949 | 5.76 | 0.515 | -11.255 | .000 |
| I can <u>compare and contrast</u> ways I can invest in myself and others. | 4.64 | 1.067 | 5.70 | 0.539 | -11.726 | .000 |

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Slightly Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree;



Conclusion and Recommendations

Since all 13 objectives showed a statistically significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores of self-efficacy, it can be concluded that the conference was effective in accomplishing its objectives. One must take notice that one statement showed a significantly lower difference but this is also the objective the participants scored the highest on during the pre-test so there was not as much room for change to occur within this objective. Recommendations for practice are to continue this conference as it has been successful in increasing participant’s self-efficacy in all 13 objectives.