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ABSTRACT

Global simulation is described as “simultaneously an approach, a set of classroom techniques, and the conceptual framework for a syllabus” (Levine, 2004, p. 27). Students create a fictive yet culturally grounded world, assume the role of a self-developed character, and collaborate with fellow community members (Magnin, 1997). Despite its numerous cited advantages, there are no known empirical studies evaluating the influence of global simulation on language learners. This study evaluated how global simulation influenced the development of intermediate-French students’ writing self-beliefs and text quality. Significant differences were found in Intermediate French students’ writing self-efficacy, writing self-concept, writing anxiety, and text quality in organization, content, and creativity after participation in a global simulation curriculum. No significant differences were found in students’ self-efficacy for self-regulation, perceived value of writing, or text quality in grammar and expression. Implications for researchers and educators are discussed.
Introduction

Often referred to as experiential learning, global simulation has been described as a course format that is “simultaneously an approach, a set of classroom techniques, and the conceptual framework for a syllabus” (Levine, 2004, p. 27). Through the creation of a fictive yet culturally grounded world, students assume the role of a self-developed character and collaborate with other members of their community as creators and inventors of their own world (Magnin, 1997). Language learning activities and assessment are contextualized within the global simulation framework and students gain cultural and linguistic knowledge by means of a simulated yet structured environment.

Global Simulation, which emerged from the BELC (Bureau d’enseignement de la langue et de la civilisation françaises à l’étranger) research center in France in the late 70s, is commonly associated with Francis Debyser’s *L’Immeuble* (the building) initially published in 1980. In this simulation, students become the tenants of a building and they recount their lives, encounters, and happenings in a personal journal. Other examples of global simulations include the formation of a community on a deserted island, the creation of a village and its inhabitants, or the development of a business enterprise (Magnin, 1997). These simulations have been integrated into conversation, culture and civilization, advanced writing, or specialty language classes such as Business English, English for hotel management, or English in the health professions (Magnin, 1997). With each simulation students develop new identities and develop, negotiate and define new communities while simultaneously gaining cultural and linguistic knowledge (Levine, 2004).

Despite its numerous acknowledged advantages and the increased recent scholarly interest (see Caré, 1995; Cheval, 1995; Debyser, 1996; Dupuy, 2006a; Dupuy, 2006b; Garcia-Carbonell, Rising, Montero and Watts, 2001; Kovalik & Kovalik, 2002, Magnin, 2002; Yaiche, 1998), global simulation is rarely implemented in university level FL classes and even less frequently applied at the intermediate levels of language instruction (Levine, 2004). Furthermore, publications supporting the implementation of global simulation curricula are often presentations and guidelines for course design. There are no known empirical studies available demonstrating the influence of global simulation on language learners. Levine (2004) suggests that empirical research evaluating the efficacy of global simulation curricula is essential, namely longitudinal quantitative research. This study aims to evaluate how the affective and cognitive influences of global simulation influence the longitudinal development of intermediate-level language learners’ writing self-beliefs.
Review of literature

Intermediate Level of FL Learning

The intermediate level of college FL study provides issues in college students’ perception of self, as the level has long been considered problematic in terms of overarching goals and continuity with the elementary and advanced levels (Henning, 2002). Intermediate courses are often viewed as the ambiguous passage to advanced-level language study and as a “tangle of divergences” (Jurasek, 1996, p.22) consisting of de-contextualized and unconnected information. Content rigor and coherence, hallmark features of sound curricula, have been claimed to be absent from intermediate-level language courses (Jurasek, 1996). Levine (2004) claims that second year published university materials continue to wrongly present the acquisition of a FL and culture as the acquisition of discrete grammatical structures, vocabulary lists, and de-contextualized pieces of information. Because this approach fails to stimulate enthusiasm and imagination among language learners, Levine (2004) proposed that alternative formats to mainstream intermediate-level curricula be established that provide opportunities to accommodate varied student interests and learning styles. Furthermore, advanced-level instructors often question the adequacy of students’ prior intermediate-level preparation (Kern & Schultz, 1992). Particular challenges are presented at the advanced-level and students often feel overwhelmed by the high expectations placed upon them. To more adequately bridge the gap to advanced-level language study, Harlow & Muyskens (1994) claim that intermediate level curricula should focus on developing overall self-confidence in the target language, increasing use of technology, reviewing grammar structures, researching cultural knowledge, and encouraging writing development.

Writing in a Foreign Language

Despite claims that writing development will enhance the transition to advanced-level language study, writing has often been neglected at the intermediate-level. In the last known published survey of student and instructor goals for intermediate-level language learning, writing was ranked tenth in importance by students and eighth by instructors (Harlow & Muyskens, 1994). Writing at the elementary and intermediate levels is often considered an “adjunct to a more worthy goal,” the mastery of grammar” (Greenia, 1992, p. 30). Greenia (1992) claimed, however, that consistent writing practice in a variety of forms is essential at the earlier levels of language instruction. In particular, trends toward context-oriented language instruction have supported the development of contextualized writing assignments (Campbell, 1998). Through context, students’ creativity, self-expression, and enthusiasm may be enhanced for both writing and language learning (Omaggio, 2000). The course format, global simulation, may potentially maintain the importance of writing within the intermediate-level curriculum while simultaneously contextualizing language learning activities.
**Advantages of Global Simulation**

Through the creation of this culturally meaningful and relevant framework or context (Debyser, 1996; Dupuy, 2006a), scholars suggest that global simulation enhances the cognitive development of FL students through opportunities to develop communicative competence, interact meaningfully, scaffold peers (Levine, 2004), and solve and troubleshoot problems (Jones, 1984). Global simulation re-centers the instruction toward students who play an active role in their learning process as their role “is no longer to listen and regurgitate information but to pull content together, negotiate meaning, reflect on learning” (Dupuy, 2006b, p.21). In response, the teacher then becomes a resource person and architect who orchestrates the simulated context (Dupuy, 2006a; Dupuy, 2006b; Levine, 2004; Caré, 1995).

In addition to the transformation of the classroom dynamic and roles, the affect of language learners is also influenced through global simulation’s accommodation of a variety of interests and personalities and promotion of independent and self-directed language learning (Dupuy, 2006a; Dupuy, 2006b; Levine, 2004). As such, global simulation serves as a powerful intrinsic motivation that enables students to forget that they are learning (Levine, 2004) and instead engage in self-reflection and participation in the collaborative project (Dupuy, 2006a; Dupuy, 2006b).

**Global Simulation Writing Tasks & Identity**

More importantly, this course format is also claimed to “validate students’ sense of self” (Levine, 2004, p. 27). Because writing continually transmits a representation of self, one can establish his/her identity through discourse choices (Ivanic & Camps, 2001). Through particular writing choices, FL writers may assert authority and ownership (Tang & Suganthi, 1999) and their FL identity may be continually created and redefined (Spiliotopoulos & Carey, 2005; Tang & Suganthi, 1999). FL learners may therefore invent and reinvent themselves through their vocabulary, content, stylistic, and grammatical choices. In a global simulation context, the FL writers may break free from traditional and expected textual roles and inhabit different roles and writer identities. Through this process, students may experiment with discourse and creatively write their culturally-based persona into the text.

In addition to developing a FL writer identity through discourse choices, students in a global simulation curriculum may also participate as members of a simulated yet culturally-based community. One of the goals of language learning, according to socio-cultural theory, is to participate in and become a member of a particular community (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000). Global simulation, specifically, may assist in establishing a collective identity among a community of learners (Spiliotopoulos & Carey, 2005). Collective identity is established when a group experiences a shared sense of “we-ness” and a “collective agency” (Snow, 2001, p. 5). As part of the collective group or community, the members are motivated to act in the interests of the collective entity. This collective “sense of we” (Snow, 2001, p. 5) then becomes interconnected and intertwined with the individual’s personal sense of self and identity (Gamson, 1991).
Self-Efficacy Beliefs

A means of assessing FL students’ self-beliefs is through the evaluation of students’ self-efficacy beliefs or “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Self-efficacy beliefs, grounded within the larger theoretical framework of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997), are dependent on what one believes may be accomplished with one’s personal skill set. According to Bandura (1986), “what people think, believe, and feel affects how they behave” (p. 26). Thus, the beliefs that students develop and deem true about themselves, therefore, are essential forces in their academic success.

Writing self-efficacy beliefs, in particular, may be defined as “individuals’ judgments of their competence in writing, specifically their judgments to write different writing tasks and of their possession of various writing skills” (Pajares & Johnson, 1993). Research suggests that a strong sense of efficacy or confidence in first language writing is associated with greater perceived value and interest in writing (Pajares & Johnson, 1994), increased effort and perseverance in the face of adversity when writing (Schunk, 1995), stronger feelings of writing self-concept (Pajares, 1995), decreased writing anxiety (McCarthy, Meier, & Rinderer, 1985), increased self-efficacy for self-regulation (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994), and stronger writing performance (Pajares, 2003).

Despite the wealth of studies on first language writing self-efficacy, there is no known published research evaluating FL writing self-efficacy and its correlation with other writing self-belief variables and few studies have evaluated the role of affect in FL writing processes (Cheng, 2002). Several studies have evaluated the role of writing anxiety and its relationship to FL writing performance (Wu, 1992), concern for content (Masny & Foxall, 1992), and interest in advanced writing courses (Gungle & Taylor, 1989). Results from these studies, however, yielded varied results (Cheng, 2002).

Developing and Enhancing Writing Self-Beliefs

In addition to correlational studies, some researchers have evaluated the first writing self-efficacy developmentally for elementary, junior high, and high school student populations (Pajares & Valiante, 1999; Shell et al., 1995). Shell et al. (1995) found that students’ first language writing self-efficacy beliefs increased as students progressed from grade 4 to grade 10. Other researchers found that middle school students reported a greater sense of confidence in their first language writing competence at the beginning of middle school than at the end of middle school (Pajares & Valiante, 1999; Wigfield, Eccles, Maclver, Reuman, & Midgley, 1991). From an analysis of these results, Pajares (2003) concluded that students’ sense of efficacy and confidence in writing skills does not necessarily develop linearly.

This conclusion would suggest that writing self-beliefs are not necessarily nurtured in writing programs. For such reasons, researchers in both first and foreign language contexts have provided a variety of suggestions for the enhancement of writing self-beliefs. These suggestions
include creating authentic writing contexts and tasks that interest and “hook” students (Bruning & Horn, 2000; Campbell, 1998; Walker, 2003), encouraging peers to read each other’s writing (Pajares, 2003), giving learners choice and ownership opportunities (Spaulding, 1995; Walker, 2003), encouraging collaborative writing and discussions (Walker, 2003), providing opportunities for students to write consistently in a variety of forms (McConochie, 2000; Wachholz & Etheridge, 1996), and allowing students to observe and reflect upon their improvement (Collins & Bissell, 2002).

Methodology

Because global simulation possesses many of the characteristics shown to enhance writing self-beliefs, the purpose of this study was therefore to evaluate whether a global simulation curriculum enhances intermediate-level French students’ writing self-efficacy beliefs, writing anxiety, perceived value of writing, writing self-concept, self-efficacy for self-regulation in writing, and text quality. A description of the writing self-belief constructs follows in the instrumentation section.

Research Questions

In light of the review of literature and the paucity of existing empirical studies evaluating the efficacy of global simulation curricula, this study will address the following research questions:
1. Is there a change in intermediate French students’ overall writing self-efficacy and writing self-efficacy in the areas of creativity, organization, grammar, content, and expression after global simulation?
2. Is there a change in intermediate French students’ writing self-beliefs in the areas of writing self-concept, writing anxiety, self-efficacy for self-regulation in writing, and perceived value in writing after global simulation?
3. Is there a change in participants’ composition text quality in the areas of content, creativity, grammar, organization, and expression after global simulation?

Participants and Setting

Participants consisted of 148 college students enrolled in third semester French courses at a university in the northeastern United States. The undergraduate student body at this university consists of approximately 10,500 students, 49% male and 51% female. The university’s student admissions process is defined as “most selective” by US News & World Report (Zuckerman, 2003) and the average SAT score is 1430. The highest possible score for the SAT exam is 1600 and the average SAT score for all college-bound students in 2007 was 1017 (College Board, 2008). Characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Characteristics of Study Participants (n=148)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73 (49.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>84 (56.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>31 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>18 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>8 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>31 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>20 (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>23 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/ Science</td>
<td>31 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>26 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native language</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>129 (87.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Selection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>17 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>127 (85.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Fall 2005 and Spring 2006, French students enrolled in eleven sections of Intermediate French I (French 130) participated in the study. The intermediate French curriculum in all sections was standardized including common assessment and content. The third semester Intermediate French course emphasized the development of interpretive and presentational skills through an integrated global simulation curriculum for learning French language, culture, and grammatical concepts. The course met 4 hours per week and class size did not exceed 18 students. There were 7 French instructors, 2 native French speakers and 5 non-native French speakers.

Global Simulation Project

For this global simulation project, the students created French or francophone characters that lived virtually in the same Parisian building and recorded their eventful lives in their respective memoirs. Designed around the weekly themes and the grammatical, linguistic, and cultural functions of the course, the common scenarios served as the framework of the students' memoir chapters written in the first person. The course's weekly themes varied within the three overarching dossiers of lodging, cuisine, and leisure activities. Among others, the themes included living in a community, the Montmartre quarter, French cuisine, healthy lifestyles, reality television, love stories, and murder mysteries. In addition to incorporating the themes discussed in class, these bi-monthly writing assignments included various genres such as portrait, descriptive, narrative, dialogue, and persuasive essays (See Appendix A). The linguistic objectives were for the students to improve their writing skills by broadening their vocabulary, refining their style, learning how to use a dictionary sensibly, mastering different tenses, and recognizing and using idiomatic expressions. The main cultural objectives were for the students to explore Paris and the Montmartre quarter, to learn how people live in Paris and France, and to explore various French customs.

Blackboard and Discussion Boards

Acting as an extension of the classroom, Blackboard was used as a common space where students could find the material necessary to create a sound cultural backdrop for their stories, to write a lexically and grammatically rich narrative, and to weave their stories together. Blackboard provided a reserve of thematically organized cultural online website references in addition to grammatical and lexical website references. To reinforce the interactive nature of the project, the students posted and read each other’s chapters on the class Discussion Board. In addition, they created their character’s blog which was accessible to their classmates and fellow “neighbors.”

Grading System

The bi-monthly writing tasks were 1-1 ½ pages in length with revisions due every other week. The grading system aimed at encouraging the students to work on the grammatical accuracy as well as to explore and experiment with the language, style, and linguistic complexity of their
compositions (See Appendix B). The first draft counted for 30% of the final grade and only penalized mechanical mistakes within the students’ control including conjugation, agreement, and spelling. In their feedback, the instructors commented on two levels: the form and the content. The instructors alerted students to necessary grammatical revisions, but also encouraged the students to vary the vocabulary and complexity of their syntactic constructions, to refine their style, and to develop the content and creativity of their compositions. The final draft counted for 70% of the grade and assessed grammar, expression, organization, content, and creativity. All course instructors attended a grading workshop to ensure common evaluation procedures.

Class Integration
To further integrate the immeuble context into the classroom, texts, in-class activities, and writing workshops played a key role. Texts, in particular, held a double function in the global simulation project. These “texts” included dialogues from films, journalistic excerpts, literary texts, and song lyrics and worked as both a trigger of the imagination as well as the holder of linguistic and cultural information (Caré, 1995). The information gained from the texts was a valuable student resource for the writing assignments.

While the weekly themes and the linguistic and cultural objectives delineated the prompt of the memoirs chapters, the building happenings were also used as a backdrop for integrating the immeuble context into the classroom. Various acts of in-class communication, such as role-plays and weekly resident meetings, were set in the context of the building. Furthermore, the oral exam required students integrate linguistic and cultural information learned in class while playing the role of their character in a role-play topic contextualized around Montmartre and the immeuble characters. This back and forth movement between the students’ written creations and their oral character development during class time aimed at both actively engaging students in their learning process and at developing a strong sense of ownership in both the collective story and their character’s integrity. In addition, through in-class writing workshops organized every other week, students were given the opportunity to learn strategies to refine their style, to enrich their expression, and to translate sensibly and appropriately incorporate idiomatic expressions.

Final Portfolio
At the end of the semester, the students were then asked to submit a final portfolio. This included a compilation of the finalized versions of all the chapters and a self-evaluation paper. The students reviewed all the previous chapters which had already been graded and made the ultimate revisions suggested by the instructor’s annotations. The complete “memoirs” were followed by a one page self-reflective paper in English in which the students were asked to evaluate their perceived writing progress including areas of improvement, employed strategies, and areas of difficulty when writing.
Instrumentation

To evaluate the influence of the global simulation curriculum on the students' writing self-beliefs, one survey with multiple components was used to evaluate students' French writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety in French, writing self-concept in French, self-efficacy for self-regulation in French writing, and perceived value of writing in French. Participants provided responses to all instruments on a 10-point Likert-type scale from 0 (not confident at all) to 100 (completely confident). Pajares, Hartley, and Valiante (2001) found that a writing self-efficacy scale with a 0 to 100 response format was psychometrically stronger than one with a traditional Likert format.

Writing self-efficacy in French items asked participants to evaluate how confident they are in their ability to write in French. The instrument was adapted from Mills, Pajares, and Herron’s (2006) French self-efficacy scale in reading and listening. Face validity was established through the review of the instrument by the intermediate language coordinator and an expert in academic self-efficacy research. The scale includes 26 items evaluating students' writing self-efficacy in the areas of expression (8 items), grammar (6 items), organization (4 items), creativity (2 items), and content (6 items) (See Appendix C). Directions on the self-efficacy instrument asked students, "how sure are you that you can perform each of the French writing skills below?"

According to Pajares & Miller (1995), the relationship among variables and effect sizes are enhanced when self-efficacy instruments and performance measures are closely matched. For this reason, the investigators developed the writing self-efficacy measure to closely match self-efficacy items with the composition grading rubric used by the intermediate French instructors. Similar to the writing self-efficacy in French scale, the composition grading rubric included the categories of grammar, content, creativity, expression, and organization. For example, one writing self-efficacy item evaluates student's competence to write in French with a clear sense of beginning and closure. Within the composition grading rubric, there is a corresponding description of writing organization in the "very good" category as "writing follows logical plan with a clear sense of beginning and closure."

The results of the French self-efficacy instrument were computed by the principal investigator. The psychometric properties of the scale were evaluated for internal consistency. Mills, Pajares, & Herron (2006) obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .97 and .95 respectively for a similar scale evaluating reading and listening self-efficacy. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the present study was .97.

Writing anxiety in French, or the state of anticipatory apprehension related to writing in French, was measured using an adapted version of Betz’s (1978) Mathematics Anxiety Scale (MAS). Each of the anxiety items was adapted to the writing domain, totaling 9 items. A sample writing anxiety item in French was “writing in French makes me feel uneasy and confused.” Students responded to questions about feelings of stress and uneasiness associated with writing in French. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the present study was .90.

Writing self-concept in French, or descriptive judgments of one’s perceived self as a French
writer, was measured using an adapted version of Marsh’s (1990) Academic Self Description Questionnaire (ASDQ-1). The writing self-concept in French scale included 6 items including generalized self-perceptions of French writing competence. An example of an item assessing French writing self-concept is “Compared to others in my class I am a good French writer.” The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the writing self-concept in French scale for the present study was .86.

Self-efficacy for self-regulation in French writing, or one’s perceived ability to use the appropriate strategies to plan, monitor, and complete a writing task (Bandura, 1997), was assessed using an adapted subscale from Bandura’s (1995) Children’s Multidimensional Self-Efficacy Scales. Eight of the 11 original items were used in the present study to evaluate students’ perceptions of competence in using various self-regulated learning strategies (sample item: “How well can you finish your French compositions on time?”). Students responded to questions that self-evaluate their capability to complete and concentrate on French writing assignments. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the scale used in the present research was .92.

Perceived value of French writing was assessed by an adapted measure from Eccles’ (1983) Student Attitude Questionnaire and evaluated students’ interest, enjoyment, and perceived importance of writing in French. Nine items evaluated students’ perceptions of the value of writing in French. A sample item assessing perceived value of writing in French was “I enjoy learning about different French writing techniques.” The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of the perceived value of writing in French measure in this study was .92.

Composition text quality was assessed using the composition grading rubric designed for the course (See Appendix B). The assessment criteria included grammar, content, creativity, expression, and organization. All Intermediate French instructors used the same grading rubric and participated in writing assessment workshops to ensure common assessment. The grades from the first composition (1) and the final composition (6) were utilized. It should be advised that grades were only available for 65 of the participants. Because of the late decision to evaluate change in text quality, we were only able to obtain the breakdown of the composition grades from those instructors still teaching at the institution who kept detailed grade records.

Procedure

In Fall 2005 and Spring 2006, the survey evaluating the students’ writing self-beliefs was administered to students in their third semester French classes. Administering the survey on writing self-beliefs took place during one class period in the first week of the semester. The French instructors were not present during the survey administration to encourage participants’ honesty and candor in responding to attitudinal items. The principal investigators read aloud the written directions for each subscale and encouraged the participants to ask questions if they did not understand the directions. During the last week of classes, the principal investigators returned to the third semester French classes to administer the same writing self-beliefs survey. Identical procedures were then followed.

The composition text quality was evaluated by the students’ Intermediate French instructors.
Because the raters in this study were instructors, the grading was not conducted blindly. As a result, it is expected that the instructors' expectations of students' writing performance increased from the first to the last composition. This serves as an important limitation. At the beginning of the semester, however, the Intermediate French instructors participated in two assessment training workshops. To ensure uniform assessment procedures, instructors received a detailed description of the grading rubric and examples of compositions at different writing proficiency levels. Workshop training included collective grading of identical compositions followed by discussions and consensus of appropriate composition grades. At the end of the semester, the principal investigators requested the breakdown of the first and last composition grades from instructors.

Data Analyses

To determine the influence of the global simulation curriculum on the writing self-beliefs of intermediate French students, one-way repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted. In this repeated-measures design, participants' writing self-beliefs were assessed on two occasions, at the beginning and end of the semester. The purpose was to evaluate whether there were significant differences in the mean writing self-beliefs scores from the beginning to the end of the semester. A one-way repeated measure ANOVA was conducted with time as the within-subjects factor. The measures included writing self-efficacy and the subcomponents of writing self-efficacy (i.e., writing self-efficacy for grammar, content, creativity, expression, and organization). Each of the six scales had two levels (pre-test and post-test). For all significant findings, measures of effect size were calculated.

A second one-way repeated measures ANOVA was also conducted with time as the within-subjects factor. The measures included writing anxiety, perceived value of writing, writing self-concept, and self-efficacy for self-regulation. Each of the four scales had two levels (pre-test and post-test). For all significant findings, measures of effect size were calculated.

To assess the change in composition text quality over the course of the semester, a third one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with time as the within-subjects factor. The measures included creativity, content, expression, grammar, and organization. Each of the five scales had two levels (first composition and final composition). For all significant findings, measures of effect size were calculated.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Zero-order correlations for the writing self-efficacy variables (Table 2), the writing self-beliefs variables (Table 3), and composition grade criteria (Table 4) are presented. Results of the correlation analyses reveal that all of the correlations with writing self-efficacy were statistically
significant at both the pre-test and the post-test. Correlations ranged from $r = .79$ to $r = .97$. These results reveal that a stronger sense of writing self-efficacy was associated with a stronger sense of writing self-efficacy in content, creativity, grammar, expression, and organization. Results of the correlation analyses reveal that all pre-test variables had statistically significant correlations with their respective post-test variables. Correlations ranged from $r = .42$ to $r = .49$.

Table 2: Zero-Order Correlations for Writing Self-Efficacy Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Writing self-efficacy (WSE)</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WSE creativity</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WSE organization</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WSE grammar</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WSE content</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSE expression</td>
<td>.97**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Zero-order correlations are based on pre-test and post-test results.

The pre-test variable correlations are above the diagonal, the post-test correlations are below the diagonal, and the correlations between the pre and post-test variables are on the diagonal.

Data for the writing self-efficacy measure and the writing self-efficacy subscale measures was available for 145 participants.

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level.

Correlation analyses also reveal that, at the beginning of the semester, writing self-efficacy possessed statistically significant correlations with writing self-concept, writing anxiety, perceived value of writing, and self-efficacy for self-regulation. Correlations ranged from $r = .36$ to $r = .72$. Writing anxiety possessed a statistically significant inverse relationship with writing self-efficacy at the pre-test. There was, however, a non-significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and text quality at the beginning of the semester. These results reveal that a stronger sense of writing self-efficacy was associated with a stronger sense of writing self-concept, perceived value of writing, and self-efficacy for self-regulation and a decreased sense of writing anxiety at the beginning of the semester. A stronger sense of efficacy to write in French, however, was not related to a stronger text quality at the beginning of the semester. Results of the post-test writing self-efficacy correlations reveal that all of the correlations with post-test variables were statistically significant and ranged from $r = .28$ to $r = .71$. A statistically significant inverse relationship was present between post writing self-efficacy and post writing anxiety. These results reveal that, at the end of the semester, a stronger sense of writing self-efficacy was associated with a stronger sense of writing self-
Results of the correlation analyses reveal that all pre-test variables had statistically significant correlations with their respective post-test variables. Correlations ranged from $r = .45$ to $r = .65$.

### Table 3: Zero-Order Correlations for Writing Self-Efficacy, Writing Self-Belief, and Text Quality Variables (Pre-test and Post-test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST-TEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Writing self-efficacy</td>
<td><strong>.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Writing self-concept</td>
<td><strong>.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>.35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Writing anxiety</td>
<td><strong>-.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived value of writing</td>
<td><strong>.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>.46</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-efficacy for self-regulation</td>
<td><strong>.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Zero-order correlations are based on pre and post-test results. The pre-test variable correlations are above the diagonal, the post-test correlations are below the diagonal, and the correlations between the pre and post-test variables are on the diagonal.

Data for the writing self-efficacy and writing self-belief measures were available for 145 participants. Data for the composition grades were available for 77 participants.

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level
** Correlation is significant at the .001 level

The correlations of the first composition grading criteria ranged from $r = .13$ to $r = .68$. Results of the final composition grading criteria correlations reveal that all of the correlations were statistically significant and ranged from $r = .35$ to $r = .65$. The results reveal that a higher level of composition text quality in the first and final composition is associated with a higher level of grammatical competence, content, creativity, expression, and organization. In addition, all grading criteria from the first composition had statistically significant correlations with their respective grading criteria from the final composition. Correlations ranged from $r = .29$ to $r = .48$. 
Table 4: Zero-Order Correlations for Text Quality and Grading Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST COMPOSITION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINAL COMPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Text Quality</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expression</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creativity</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grammar</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organization</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Zero-order correlations are based on the first and final composition grades. The first composition correlations are above the diagonal, the final composition correlations are below the diagonal, and the correlations between the first and final variables are on the diagonal. Composition grades were available for 77 participants

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level
** Correlation is significant at the .001 level

Research Question 1

A one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the global simulation curriculum had an effect on participants’ writing self-efficacy beliefs (See Table 5). The sphericity assumption for the repeated measures ANOVA was met. The within-subjects factor was time and included two levels (pre-test and post-test). The measures included overall writing self-efficacy and the subcomponents of writing self-efficacy in content, creativity, grammar, organization, and expression. The results for the multivariate ANOVA indicated a significant time effect for the writing self-efficacy variables, Wilks Λ=.49, F (6, 125) = 21.8, p <.001, partial η2 =.51. Means and standard deviations are located in Table 5. The standard univariate ANOVA, sphericity assumed, indicated a statistically significant effect of time on writing self-efficacy, F (1, 130) = 119.6, p<.001, partial η2 =.48. The results indicated that the overall writing self-efficacy score at the end of the semester was significantly greater than writing self-efficacy at the beginning of the semester. There was also a statistically significant effect of time on writing self-efficacy in creativity, F (1, 130) = 109.1, p<.001, partial η2 =.46, organization, F (1, 130) = 124.2, p <.001, partial η2 = .49, grammar, F (1, 130) = 59.1, p<.001, partial η2 = .31, content, F (1, 130) = 104.2, p <.001, partial η2 = .45, and expression, F (1, 130) = 101.9, p <.001, partial η2 = .44. These results suggested that Intermediate French students’ beliefs in their ability to effectively use grammar, communicate content, write with appropriate choice and variety of vocabulary and sentence structures, and write in an organized and creative fashion increased after participation in this global simulation curriculum.
Table 5: Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs Before and After Global Simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pretest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Posttest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Effect size (Partial η²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing self-efficacy (WSE)</td>
<td>59.6 (14.5)</td>
<td>73.5 (13.5)</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>1, 130</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSE Creativity</td>
<td>61.4 (18.2)</td>
<td>78.2 (15.7)</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>1, 130</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSE Organization</td>
<td>63.7 (16.4)</td>
<td>78.3 (12.8)</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>1, 130</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSE Grammar</td>
<td>56.6 (17.2)</td>
<td>68.8 (17.3)</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1, 130</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSE Content</td>
<td>62.2 (16.2)</td>
<td>76.1 (14.0)</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>1, 130</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSE Expression</td>
<td>57.3 (15.8)</td>
<td>70.9 (14.8)</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>1, 130</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means for all writing self-efficacy variables are on a 10-point Likert type scale (ranging from 0 to 100)
Data for the writing self-efficacy measure and the writing self-efficacy subscale measures was available for 131 participants

Research Question 2

To assess the research question of whether there was a difference in writing self-beliefs of participants from the beginning to the end of a semester of Intermediate French in a global simulation curriculum, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted (See Table 6). The within-subjects factor was time and included two levels (pre-test and post-test). The measures included overall writing self-concept, writing anxiety, self-efficacy for self-regulation in writing, and perceived value of writing. The results for the multivariate ANOVA indicated a significant time main effect on the writing self-beliefs, Wilks Λ = .60, F (4, 118) = 19.8, p < .001, partial η² = .40. Means and standard deviations are located in Table 6. The standard univariate ANOVA, sphericity assumed, indicated a statistically significant effect of time on writing self-concept, F (1, 121) = 43.7, p < .001, partial η² = .27 and writing anxiety, F (1, 130) = 109.1, p < .001, partial η² = .46. The sphericity assumption for the repeated measures ANOVA was met. These results suggested that Intermediate French students' judgments of their competence in writing increased and their writing anxiety decreased after participating in this global simulation curriculum.

The results, however, did not reveal significant time differences in participants' self-efficacy for self-regulation in writing, F (1, 121) = 3.2, p = .08 or perceived value of writing, F (1, 121) = 1.2, p = .27. These results suggest that the Intermediate French students' writing beliefs in their ability to use the appropriate strategies to plan, monitor, and complete a writing task and their perception of the importance, interest, and enjoyment involved in writing did not change after participation in the global simulation curriculum.
Table 6: Writing Self-Beliefs Before and After Global Simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pretest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Posttest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Effect size (Partial η2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing self-concept</td>
<td>57.3 (16.2)</td>
<td>67.6 (17.2)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>1, 121</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing anxiety</td>
<td>43.8 (18.1)</td>
<td>30.6 (19.5)</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>1, 121</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-regulation</td>
<td>69.7 (16.9)</td>
<td>72.7 (20.5)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1, 121</td>
<td>p=.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value of Writing</td>
<td>59.3 (17.0)</td>
<td>61.2 (18.9)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1, 121</td>
<td>p=.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means for all writing self-efficacy variables are on a 10-point Likert type scale (ranging from 0 to 100)
Data for the self-efficacy for self-regulation measure was available for 110 participants. For all other measures, data was available for 122 participants.

Research Question 3

To assess the research question of whether there was a difference in composition text quality from the beginning to the end of a semester of Intermediate French in a global simulation curriculum, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted (See Table 7). The within-subjects factor was time and included two levels (first composition and final composition). The measures included creativity, content, grammar, expression, and organization. The results for the multivariate ANOVA indicated a significant time main effect on composition text quality, Wilks Λ=.62, F (6, 59) = 6.1, p <.001, partial η2 =.38. Means and standard deviations are located in Table 7. The standard univariate ANOVA, sphericity assumed, indicated a statistically significant effect of time on content, F (1, 64) = 6.8, p=.01, partial η2 =.10, creativity, F (1, 64) = 12.7, p=.001, partial η2 =.17, and organization, F (1, 64) = 27.4, p<.001, partial η2 =.30. The sphericity assumption for the repeated measures ANOVA was met. These results suggested that Intermediate French students’ text quality in content, creativity, and organization increased from the first to the last composition after participating in this global simulation curriculum. The results, however, did not reveal significant time differences in the text quality in grammar, F (1, 64) = .91, p = .34 or expression, F (1, 64) = 2.3, p=.14. These results suggest that the Intermediate French students’ text quality in grammar and expression did not change after participation in the global simulation curriculum.
Experimental & intervention studies

Table 7: Composition Grades Before and After Global Simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>Compo 1 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Compo 6 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Effect size (Partial η²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall grade</td>
<td>88.7 (6.1)</td>
<td>91.6 (4.6)</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18.4 (2.0)</td>
<td>19.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>9.1 (0.8)</td>
<td>9.5 (0.6)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>8.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>9.5 (0.6)</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>13.5 (1.2)</td>
<td>13.8 (1.3)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>13.6 (1.2)</td>
<td>13.7 (1.2)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,64</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means for the overall grade were calculated out of 100 points. Means for expression and grammar were calculated out of 15 points. Means for creativity and organization were calculated out of 10 points and the mean for content was calculated out of 20 points. Grades were available for 65 participants.

Discussion

Before drawing conclusions, it is important to stress that any implications should be interpreted in the light of the following limitations. The inability to access a control group to compare change in students' writing self-beliefs in a global simulation curriculum to that of a traditional intermediate-level curriculum is an important limitation. As a result, this is an evaluation study and no causal inferences may be made. Because departmental regulations require that curriculum and assessment are uniform at the intermediate level, access to a control group within the same university context was not possible. Because there is no known empirical research available on global simulation, however, the current study may provide valuable information about the relationship between global simulation, language learners' self-beliefs, and text quality.

A further limitation deals with the inability to consider the possible contextual influences brought about by different classroom settings. Each instructor likely had different pedagogical belief systems which may have in turn influenced students' writing self-beliefs. Similarly, despite uniform assessment procedures, language coordinator supervision, and assessment training workshops, different instructors graded the students' compositions. Such factors should be considered when analyzing the results. Finally, this study evaluates the development of writing self-beliefs as a result of participation in a global simulation curriculum. Because global simulation is described as a contextualized framework, a method, and a collection of in-class activities (Levine, 2004), it would be inappropriate to claim that the global simulation writing tasks alone influenced the students' writing self-belief systems. The results should be interpreted in light of the integrated influence of this global simulation curriculum's distinct features; including
its writing tasks, classroom integration, writing assessment procedures, and incorporation of technology. Different global simulation curricula may yield different results. Generally, this study suggests that the Intermediate French students' overall self-efficacy beliefs to write in French developed over the course of the semester. A variety of influences may have contributed to this development. Supporting the claims of Spiliotopoulos & Carey (2005), this global simulation curriculum may have established a collective identity among the language learners which led to learner empowerment. The enhanced collective identity created through consistent discussion board interactions, global simulation course integration, and in-class discussion of events and happenings in the immeuble led the language learners to develop a collective efficacy, or shared sense of efficacy across learners in the same learning context. Writing with the purpose of communicating with a community of learners as opposed to a teacher-only audience (Cohen & Riel, 1989), the students communicated important information fundamental to the immeuble community. Through collaborative discussion board postings, students were able to vicariously observe the writing capabilities of their peers, thus promoting vicarious comparisons, a source of self-efficacy beliefs according to Bandura (1986, 1997). Furthermore, this global simulation curriculum included consistent writing practice in a variety of genres, aspects of writing curricula claimed to enhance writing self-beliefs (McConochie, 2000).

The results also revealed that this global simulation curriculum enhanced students' writing self-efficacy in creativity, organization, grammar, content, and expression. The development of students' perceptions of their ability to write creatively and to appropriately communicate content was likely due to a variety of sources. Primarily, the creative nature of the writing assignments that attempted to "hook students" (Campbell, 1998) provided students with choice within the curriculum that allowed them to draw on their interests. Choice within writing assignments is claimed to motivate students, promote exploration, persistence and engagement, and enhance students' self-efficacy beliefs (Walker, 2003). The creative writing context compelled students to both make choices and to be responsible for their character's integrity and identity. Throughout the global simulation experience, students were required to progressively develop the complexity of the character's beliefs, values, and actions. This responsibility allowed students to claim control over their writing and supported Spaulding's (1995) claims that ownership opportunities in writing enhance students' engagement in writing tasks. Similarly, the global simulation environment may have provided students with the opportunity to explore a new, altered, or desired self and liberated them from their first language identity. By means of such artistic freedom to make creative discourse choices, the students may have felt more confident in their ability in their ability to write creatively and communicate content.

Students also perceived themselves as more capable to write with increased organization and grammatical accuracy after participation in this global simulation context. Consistent writing practice, teachers' feedback on first drafts, writing workshops, and the focus on process-oriented writing may have contributed to this increase. For the first draft of each writing assignment, the instructors highlighted students' grammatical errors as well as provided detailed feedback related to the compositions' organization and structure. In the second draft, grammatical errors that were not successfully revised were then corrected by the instructor. The consistent revision
and writing practice coupled with the teacher feedback likely influenced students’ self-efficacy beliefs in grammar and organization.

Students’ writing self-efficacy beliefs to write with enhanced expression also developed over the course of the semester. This development may have also been influenced by the grading procedure. Recall that the first draft of the writing assignment was allotted 30 points and graded solely on conjugations, agreement, and spelling. Through this assessment procedure, students’ first drafts were graded only on the errors within their control that could be easily verified with a dictionary or conjugation reference. As such, the students were encouraged to experiment and take risks with complex sentence structures and enhance their choice of vocabulary without penalty. Instructor comments on the first drafts also highlighted simple sentence structures and banal vocabulary choices and encouraged students to develop thoughts, enhance descriptions, and write their persona into the text. As a result, students may have experienced a sense of liberation from the simplicity of elementary-level FL writing and free to express themselves in a similar style to that of their first language.

As measured by students’ first and last composition grades, the instructors also perceived a development in students’ text quality in the areas of composition organization, content, and creativity. Despite the increase in self-efficacy in grammar and expression, however, the students’ actual grammar and expression grades did not significantly increase from the first to the last composition. As previously noted, the first composition topic required that students write a “self” portrait in the present tense, incorporating adjectives and comparative structures whereas the final composition was significantly more complex, requiring the mastery of the three past tenses. As the appropriate use of the past tenses is commonly regarded as a challenging feat for French language learners, it is understandable that the grade in grammar may not have increased significantly. In the final composition, students may have placed a great focus on the mastery of tense usage and, in turn, placed less emphasis on complex sentence structure. Despite an overall increased sense of competence to write with increased expression, the grammatical difficulty of the final composition topic may have impeded students’ exploration of complex structures. The repetition of a similar self-portrait assignment at the end of the semester may have yielded different results.

However, because the students did perceive themselves as more capable of writing with increased expression and style, these characteristics may have likewise enhanced the participants’ writing self-concept. The students’ overall perception of themselves as French writers may have evolved as their writing developed from basic writing tasks to more complex writing structures. As such, the writing tasks may have encouraged students to develop their overall sense of self as FL writers. The significant increase in participants’ writing self-concept beliefs was a surprising and atypical development. Because self-concept is closely linked with an individual’s overall sense of self and identity, changes in such beliefs are uncommon.

In addition to writing self-concept, the participants’ writing anxiety also significantly decreased. The social comparisons experienced through discussion board participation likely had an influence on both students’ writing anxiety and writing self-efficacy. Participants’ feelings of stress and uneasiness associated with writing in French may have been allayed through comparisons with peers at similar writing levels. Similarly, writing from the perspective of
created personas as opposed to their real selves, students may have experienced less anxiety about expressing and sharing thoughts, feelings, and beliefs. The progressive character development through consistent writing practice may have also assisted in alleviating student writing anxiety. Although each writing task varied, the subject (the character) and the context (the immeuble) remained constant. Such consistency permitted students to inhabit and develop their contextual role and avoid “starting from scratch” with each writing task.

Despite the significant change in writing self-efficacy, writing self-concept, and writing anxiety, students’ self-efficacy for self-regulation and perceived value of writing did not increase significantly after global simulation. Students’ self-efficacy for self-regulation may not have been enhanced due to the creative nature of the global simulation writing tasks. The creative process of expression required for the writing assignments may not have necessitated the use of varied writing strategy and organization techniques. Similarly, class time was not devoted to the instruction of writing self-regulation approaches. Instructors who use global simulation may wish to teach lessons on the necessary strategies to become more successful FL writers.

Pajares (2002) suggests that teachers should identify students’ self-beliefs about their own self-regulatory strategies and then develop appropriate interventions to challenge and alter their perceptions. Through the use of writing self-regulatory surveys, instructors may become aware of the writing strategies of their students while students may simultaneously develop an awareness and consecutive evaluation of their writing strategies.

Results also revealed that students’ perceived value of writing did not increase significantly after global simulation. As the process of writing is challenging even for professional writers, it was not surprising to learn that intermediate-level French students’ perception of the interest and enjoyment involved in writing did not increase significantly after global simulation. On close examination of the perceived value of writing instrument, however, it became evident that the majority of items were associated with “learning about French writing” and only two items were associated with students’ interest and enjoyment in the writing process. Because bi-monthly writing workshops were not uniform and were conducted by varied instructors, the process of “learning about French writing” may have been different among sections. As such, caution is advised when interpreting these results.

The highly reliable writing self-efficacy scale developed by the investigators, however, provides the profession with an effective measure from which researchers and instructors may gain valuable information about the writing self-efficacy beliefs of language learners (See Appendix C). Knowledge of students’ writing self-efficacy beliefs could help FL instructors determine the specific areas from which students’ perceptions of inadequacy stem and, in turn, develop teaching practices that might develop writing self-efficacy beliefs within a global simulation or more traditional course format.

In conclusion, in response to Levine’s (2004) request for empirical research evaluating the efficacy of global simulation, it is hoped that this study may be both a point of departure and impetus for further quantitative and qualitative studies on the influence of global simulation on language learners. Whereas the profession has valuable presentations and guidelines for global simulation course design, further empirical research is still essential to assist FL instructors and coordinators in the curricular decision making process and to help refine existing
global simulation curricula. Numerous acknowledged advantages of global simulation still merit empirical investigation. This study revealed that this global simulation curriculum positively influenced intermediate-level students’ writing self-beliefs; namely their writing self-concept, writing anxiety, and writing self-efficacy in a variety of domains, through the development of a collective community and the creation of contextualized assignments. Such results could potentially expand Levine’s (2004) definition of global simulation as “simultaneously an approach, a set of classroom techniques, and the conceptual framework for a syllabus” (p. 27) with the potential to promote experimentation, creativity, and liberation from one’s first language identity.
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Appendix A. Memoir Chapters

L'IMMEUBLE – COMPOSITIONS

La Mairie du XVIIIème arrondissement a organisé un concours littéraire dont le sujet est la vie de quartier à Montmartre. L'heureux gagnant du concours verra son loyer payé à vie par la municipalité. Votre personnage ne peut pas laisser passer cette chance!

The mayor of the 18th arrondissement organized a literary contest and the subject is life in the Montmartre district. The winner of the contest will have is rent paid for life by the district. Your character cannot let this chance get away!

La vie dans l'immeuble représente une source d'inspiration intarissable. Aussi, au cours de ces quelques mois, votre personnage va-t-il consigner dans son manuscrit prometteur tous ces petits détails qui font du 7, rue du Tertre un endroit unique. Toutes les 2 semaines, il soumettra un chapitre à son éditeur qui lui rendra le premier jet truffé d'annotations utiles. Et comme tout bon écrivain qu'il est, votre personnage ne donnera de titre qu'une fois son chef-d'oeuvre terminé et relié dans son portfolio.

Life in the building represents a source of inspiration. Also, through the course of a few months, your character is going to include all of the little details in his/her manuscript that makes 7, Place du Tertre a unique place. Every 2 weeks, your character will turn in a chapter to his editor that will provide some helpful revisions and suggestions. And as all good writers are, your character will give a title to his/her chef-d’oeuvre when it is complete and placed in his/her portfolio.

Chapitre I - Présentation

Présentez-vous à vos voisins en faisant un autoportrait détaillé et lucide. Soyez créatif et surtout précis(e) dans votre portrait. Essayez d’oublier vos références américaines et plongez-vous dans le monde francophone. Décrivez aussi Montmartre, le quartier où vous habitez.
1. Votre devoir doit être rédigé à la première personne du singulier (je) et au présent.
2. Utilisez au moins 2 verbes pronominaux et 2 verbes irréguliers.
3. Allez sur les liens en relation avec Montmartre pour décrire votre quartier.

Chapter 1 - Presentation

Present yourself to your neighbors in a detailed and clear autoportrait (autobiography). Be creative and precise in your description. Try to forget your American references and immerse yourself in the francophone world. Describe Montmartre also, the quarter where you live.
1. Your work should be written in the first person singular and in the present tense
2. Use at least 2 pronominal verbs et 2 irregular verbs
3. Go to the websites related to Montmartre to describe your neighborhood.

Chapitre II - Dis-moi comment est ton appartement et je te dirai qui tu es ...

Décrivez l’appartement de votre voisin de palier. Expliquez comment l’intérieur est à l’image de son locataire. Profitez-en pour faire la comparaison avec votre propre appartement.

1. Faites attention à la forme et à la place des adjectifs
2. Utilisez 2 comparatifs et un superlatif.

Chapter II- Tell what your apartment is like and I will tell you who you are...

Describe the apartment of one of your neighbors. Explain how the interior of the apartment matches well his/her personality. Take advantage of this opportunity to compare his/her apartment with your own.

1. Pay attention to the form and placement of the adjectives
2. Use 2 comparative phrases and 1 superlative phrase.

Chapitre III - Mais, je vous connais...

Samedi dernier, vous vous trouviez sur les marches qui mènent au Sacré-Cœur. Soudain, qui avez-vous vu passer à côté de vous? Votre voisin, _____________. Vous avez profité de ce heureux hasard pour l’accoster et lui poser toutes les questions que vous aviez toujours voulu lui poser.

1. Ecrivez ce devoir sous la forme d’un dialogue.
2. Le dialogue doit être précédé d’une introduction dans laquelle vous rappellerez dans quel contexte la rencontre a eu lieu et vous expliquerez pourquoi vous étiez heureux de cette rencontre
4. Utilisez [qui / ce qui / que / dont / où] une fois chacun
Chapter III- But, don’t I know you...

Last Saturday, you find yourself on the stairs that lead to the Sacré-Coeur. Suddenly, who passed by you? Your neighbor________________________. You take advantage of this opportunity to accost him/her and ask him/her all of the questions that had always wanted to ask.

1. Write the chapter in the form of a dialogue
2. The dialogue should be preceded by an introduction in which you describe the context in which the meeting took place and you explain why you are happy about this meeting
3. You should use inversion at least 3 times and yes/no questions only 2 times
4. Use the relative pronouns (qui/ ce qui/ que /don’t/ où) at least one time each

Chapter IV—a memorable meal

In order to get to know each other better, all of the tenants go to the famous restaurant “La Mère Catherine.” Everything was established to make this a very memorable meal- animated discussions about nutrition, the “I know it all” attitudes, etc. To top it all off, Lou announced that she was selected to participate in the television show “Le Bachelor”. How sweet! The problem is that she only ate one plate of vegetables. You suspect that she is on a very strict diet to be “the most beautiful” on the show. But, what is she thinking! This flighty girl needs someone to give her some advice. After the meal, each of you try to knock some sense into her.
APPENDIX

1. First, talk about the restaurant and its décor.
2. Next, talk about what you ate and how it was.
3. Finally, in the form of a dialogue, recreate the discussion that you had face to face with Lou
4. You should formulate at least 5 words of advice, varying the structures. Propose some menus as well as some precise activities (place, price, timetables) that you will have researched in the links posted on BlackBoard

Chapitre V - Lou est amoureuse

Bonne nouvelle: Jean-Pierre aka le Bachelor est tombé sous le charme de Lou. Elle a enfin trouvé son Prince Charmant. Il ne reste plus qu’à ajouter la célèbre phrase “Ils se marièrent et eurent beaucoup d’enfants” à la fin de ce chapitre. Malheureusement, une histoire d’amour orchestrée par une chaîne de télévision n’a rien de très romantique...Vous vous en remettez à votre imagination pour réécrire cette histoire d’amour. Dans quelles circonstances plus heureuses, Jean-Pierre et Lou auraient-ils pu se rencontrer?

1. Vous devez respecter les règles du conte (e.g. “il était une fois…”)
3. Articulez votre récit avec des expressions temporelles.

Chapter V- Lou is in love

Good news- Jean-Pierre aka le Bachelor has fallen in love with Lou and all of her charms. She has finally found her Prince Charming. All that is left to say is “They will marry and how lots of children” at the end of the chapter. Unfortunately, a love story orchestrated by a TV station is not all romantic. With imagination, recreate this love story.

1. You should respect the rules of fairy tales (once upon a time…)
2. Your story should take place in the past tense (Use the passé composé and the imperfect)
3. Use temporal expressions when telling your story

Chapitre VI - Meurtre au 7, Place du Tertre

Pendant que Lou voit la vie en rose et file le parfait amour avec son Jean-Pierre sur une plage ensoleillée de la Méditerranée, l’immeuble est sens dessus-dessous depuis que le concierge, M. Piplette, a été retrouvé mort dans le local à poubelles. A un pied, il portait une chaussure
rouge à talon. A l’autre, une basket. Dans sa main crispée se trouvait un morceau de papier sur lequel figurait: "capitaine flam". Dans l’immeuble, les rumeurs vont bon train. Chacun a sa propre version des faits. Et vous, à votre avis, que s’est-il passé?

1. Racontez dans quelles circonstances vous avez appris la triste nouvelle
2. Le récit doit être au passé
3. Utilisez les 3 temps du passé; venir de; depuis et pendant
4. N’oubliez pas de tenter d’expliquer le papier...

Chapter VI- Murder at 7, Place du Tertre

While Lou is living “la vie en rose” with her true love Jean-Pierre on a sunny beach in the Mediterranean, the building has been turned upside down since the concierge, M. Piplette, was found dead in the local dumpster. On one foot, he was wearing a red high-heeled shoe and on the other, a sneaker. In his hand, a piece of paper was found with the words sketched ‘capitaine flam.” In the building, the rumors are running wild. Each tenant has his/her won version of the events. And you, in your opinion, what happened?

1. Tell how and in what circumstances you learned the sad news
2. The story must be told in the past tense.
3. Use three past tenses (imperfect- passé composé – pluperfect) and the expressions “venir de, depuis, and pendant)
4. Don’t forget to attempt to explain the piece of paper...

Global Simulation topics created by Mélanie Péron
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Appendix B. Grading system

FIRST DRAFT  /30

Spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very few spelling errors.</td>
<td>Some avoidable spelling errors.</td>
<td>Many spelling errors.</td>
<td>Meaning blocked; text dominated by spelling errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conjugation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very few conjugation errors.</td>
<td>Some avoidable conjugation errors.</td>
<td>Many conjugation errors.</td>
<td>Meaning blocked; text dominated by conjugation errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very few agreement errors.</td>
<td>Some agreement errors.</td>
<td>Many agreement errors.</td>
<td>Meaning blocked; text dominated by agreement errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL DRAFT  /70

FORM

Grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent control of grammar and punctuation; very few errors.</td>
<td>Good control of grammar and punctuation; some avoidable errors.</td>
<td>Fair control of grammar and punctuation; many errors.</td>
<td>Excessive grammar and punctuation errors meaning may be blocked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-14</td>
<td>13-12</td>
<td>11-10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent and appropriate control and choice of vocabulary; variety and complexity of structures used as well as idiomatic expressions. Sentence lengths and patterns varied.</td>
<td>Good control and choice of structures; moderate variety and complexity. Sentence lengths and patterns show some variety.</td>
<td>Fair control and choice of structures; minimal variety and complexity. Sentence lengths and patterns are seldom varied.</td>
<td>Poor control and choice of structures; definite lack of variety. Sentence lengths and patterns are repetitious; tone is lifeless and shows no involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 15-14 | 13-12 | 11-10 | 9 |

CONTENT

Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant and appropriate response to task, content communicated well; appropriate length.</td>
<td>Generally good content, though topic may not be fully explored; appropriate length.</td>
<td>Adequate content, though repetitious and simplistic; not long enough.</td>
<td>Inadequate development of ideas and content; poor ability to communicate; brevity compromises message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 20-18 | 17 | 16-15 | 14 |

Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly creative and personalized and / or evidence of extensive research of cultural topic</td>
<td>Creative and/or evidence of sufficient research to complete cultural assignment</td>
<td>Fairly creative and personalized and/or minimal research of topic</td>
<td>Lack of creativity and personalization and/or insufficient research to complete assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10-9 | 8 | 7 | 6 |

Organization/clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Très Bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Moyen</th>
<th>Inacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing contains related ideas; writing follows logical plan with a clear sense of beginning and closure.</td>
<td>Writing usually follows a logical plan with some sense of beginning and closure.</td>
<td>Ideas are often unrelated; writing often strays from a logical plan with a weak sense of beginning or lack of closure.</td>
<td>Writing follows no logical plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10-9 | 8 | 7 | 6 |

Adapted from Columbus (OH) Public Schools’ Writing Rubric by the Ohio State University Foreign Language and Dr. Nicole Mills’ document
Appendix C. French Writing Self-Efficacy Items

Directions: Please use the following scale to answer the following statements. Circle the number that best describes how sure you are that you can perform each of the French writing skills below.

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
No chance Completely Certain

Content

1. Write in French about a variety of topics with significant precision and detail
2. Describe personal experiences fully when writing in French
3. Write a composition in French that is relevant and appropriate to the assignment
4. Write in several paragraphs in length on familiar topics
5. Write about topics related to your particular interests and opinions in French
6. Present arguments or points of view accurately and effectively when writing in French

Expression

1. Express yourself with sufficient and appropriate vocabulary when writing in French
2. Write in French in a way that does not resemble literal translation from your native language
3. Write in French with fluency and ease of expression
4. Write in French with a variety and complexity of structures
5. Make few vocabulary errors when writing in French
6. Write in French being sensitive to differences in formal and informal style
7. Vary sentence lengths and patterns when writing in French
8. Write in French using a wide range of vocabulary

Grammar

1. Make few conjugation errors when writing in French
2. Make few agreement errors when writing in French
3. Make few verb tense errors when writing in French
4. Make few errors in spelling when writing in French
5. Make few grammatical errors when writing in French
6. Write in French with a good control of a full range of grammatical structures
Organization

1. Write in French with an underlying logical organization
2. Write with a clear sense of beginning and closure
3. Accurately and effectively use transitions when writing in French
4. Write in French including appropriate introductions and conclusions

Creativity

1. Write in French with creativity.
2. Interest and engage the reader when writing in French