

ANALYZING STUDENTS' AGENCY IN FINNISH AND SPANISH UNIVERSITY COURSES: EXAMINATION OF MEASUREMENT INVARIANCE

Dr. Satish A Hiremath, Principal

Kotturswamy College of Teacher Education, BALLARI

ABSTRACT

This study gives cross-national findings on student agency evaluation and reports on the measurement invariance of the Agency of University Students Scale in data comprising of Finnish and Spanish university students ($n = 645$). In order to compare covariance structures and correlation analyses, multigroup confirmatory factor analysis validated the metric invariance for ten components. This confirmatory factor analysis can be used, for instance, to investigate the impact of background factors on agency among groups. Six components showed at least partial scalar invariance, enabling mean value comparisons across Finnish and Spanish pupils. Variations were observed in the experiences of the relational and personal agency resources. The usefulness of the AUS Scale for extensive international research of student agency is included in the analysis.

Key words: Student leadership Advanced learning International research University Students' Measurement Invariance Agency Scale

I. INTRODUCTION

Agency has been set as a critical goal for formal education because of its key role for individuals in influencing their lives and contributing to societal change (Brown and Westaway, 2011; Jeffery, 2011; OECD, 2022). The relevance of agency has been acknowledged for lifelong learning (Su, 2011), problem solving (Damsa et al., 2010), creative action (Etelapelto et al., 2013), transforming work practices (Collin et al., 2018; Hokkila et al., 2017) and constructing meaningful careers and personal well-being (Etelapelto et al., 2013; O'Meara et al., 2014). However, systematic attention to university students'

agency in educational practices is scant (e.g. Case, 2015; Su, 2011). This is partly due to a noticeable dearth of conceptual models, measurement instruments and practical tools that would address the multidimensionality inherent in the construct of agency and illuminate students' perceptions of their individual as well as relational and participatory resources for agency in various educational contexts and cultures. Moreover, large-scale studies in the field are scarce, calling for quantitative, theory-based, valid measurement instrument development to respond to this knowledge gap.

The development of tools capturing professional agency in the work life context (e.g. Pyhältö et al., 2015; Vahvasantanen et al., 2019) has, thus far, received more focus than the assessment of student agency in educational settings. A rare exception to the latter context is a scale by Soini et al. (2015), narrowing down a measurement on pre-service teachers' sense of professional agency in teaching practice with an emphasis on facilitating and managing learning in the classroom. The present instrument, the Agency of University Students Scale (AUS; Jaaskela et al., 2017, Jaaskela et al., 2020), with a multidimensional structure, was developed for use in higher education courses across disciplines. The AUS, with its original 11-factor model, was validated in a sample of Finnish university students ($n = 270$), showing sound psychometric properties (Jaaskela et al., 2020). Before this study, however, its applicability had not been tested outside the Finnish context.

Our objective is to elucidate the use and utility of the AUS Scale (Jaaskela et al., 2017, Jaaskela et al., 2020) in cross-national research to gain broader insight into university

students' agency experiences in different educational contexts and fields. The ultimate aim is to contribute to the development of internationally applicable agency-supportive practices in higher education. In the present study, we pursued this objective by examining the measurement invariance of the AUS Scale in the higher education contexts of Finland and Spain. To conduct meaningful and valid cross-national research on students' agency, careful examination of the scale's measurement invariance at several levels is first needed. Thus, we set out to examine the following research questions: To what extent does the factorial invariance of the AUS Scale hold between student agency data collected in Finland and Spain? In addition, are there potential mean-level differences in the data regarding factors meeting the invariance criteria?

1.1. Conceptualisation of agency on the AUS Scale

Previous literature has highlighted various foci in the conceptualisation of agency, which we will briefly outline below. To gain a comprehensive understanding of student agency in higher education, student agency was reconceptualised as a multidimensional whole. Our view of agency encompasses a student's perspective interwoven with resources experienced by the student within a course's context. We draw on our multidimensional construct analysis (Jaaskela et al., 2017, Jaaskela et al., 2020), based on which we define student agency as having access to and being empowered to act through personal resources (Self-Efficacy and Competence Beliefs), relational resources (Teacher Support, Trust for Teacher and Equal Treatment) and participatory resources (six constructs capturing, e.g. opportunity to influence, interest and wish to participate and becoming empowered in peer interaction). These agentic resources allow a student to engage in purposeful, intentional and meaningful action and learning in study contexts. Aligning with Su (2011), we view that, in addition to cognition and action, person-centred aspects of agency highlighting affective experiences in learning are relevant

to understanding student agency. Thus, we pay attention to affective aspects of agency, which have been scarcely dealt with in the current literature. Furthermore, according to recent positions (e.g. Etelapelto et al., 2013; Goller, 2017) rejecting a permanent capabilities perspective, we highlight agency as a dynamic construct that develops and is transformed in interaction with the environment.

In developing the above-described multidimensional conceptualisation of student agency, we drew from earlier literature where agency is conceptualised as intentional and purposeful action, or a dynamic capability or capacity for action implying will, autonomy, freedom and choice (Biesta and Tedder, 2007; Edwards and D'Arcy, 2004; Emirbayer and Mische, 1998; Oolbakkink-Marchand et al., 2017; Schoon and Heckhausen, 2019). The construct of agency has been elaborated on in scientific fields, such as psychologically oriented research (e.g. Bandura, 2001, 2006; Deci and Ryan, 2004; Eccles and Wigfield, 2002), the social sciences (e.g. Archer, 2003; Giddens, 1984) and the educational sciences (e.g. Lipponen and Kumpulainen, 2011; Nieminen et al., 2021; Su, 2011). We argue that a synthesis of these offers a more comprehensive understanding of agency in a higher education context where capabilities for action are empowered by various types of resources, that is contextual and relational affordances intertwined with self-efficacy, competence beliefs and interests.

Drawing from accounts of the social-cognitive sciences, agency is related to self-processes, self-reflection and beliefs about one's own capabilities (e.g. Bandura, 2001, 2006; Deci and Ryan, 2004; Schunk and Zimmerman, 2012), which act as mediating factors from thoughts to intentional action. Therefore, we included self-efficacy beliefs as one aspect of personal resources on the AUS Scale. Self-efficacy beliefs involve individuals' subjective judgements about their capabilities to perform the tasks needed to achieve their goals (Bandura, 2006; Schunk and Zimmerman, 2012). Strong self-efficacy beliefs alone will not, however, lead to purposeful performance if a person perceives a lack of knowledge and

skills to succeed (Schunk, 2012). Hence, attention should also be paid to individuals' competence beliefs, which refer to the self-evaluation of one's knowledge, skills and strategies against the demands of the task (Schunk and Zimmerman, 2012).

Our conceptualisation of participatory resources as a critical dimension of student agency derives from the literature/theoretical approaches of the social sciences, especially sociological tradition and educational sciences. This literature focuses on the actualisation of agency in multilevel interactions between the individual(s) and the environment and pays attention to the constraints and opportunities for making choices and initiatives for agentic action, including opportunities for influencing learning and instruction practices and experiencing interest and value in active participation and collaboration with peers. Within the sociological traditions, the core of agency lies in individuals' possibilities for autonomous (self-defined, meaningful and intentional) action under the constraints of structural, contextual factors (e.g. Giddens, 1984; see also Leien et al., 2020). These factors are known to be maintained through norms, practices and power relations in any institutionalised action (Berger and Luckmann, 1994). Consequently, agency is manifested to the extent that individuals can actively participate, make choices and influence events that affect their lives (e.g. Berger and Luckmann, 1994).

In educational settings, the facilitation of students' autonomy can mean involving them in decision making concerning the pedagogical process and offering opportunities for active learning and personal growth (Bechter et al., 2019; Elen et al., 2007; Harju and Åkerblom, 2017, Lea et al., 2003). Agency is also critically supported by volitional goal-oriented action fuelled by intrinsic interest (e.g. the desire to understand; Deci and Ryan, 2004; Wehmeyer et al., 2009) and the utility value perceived in attaining goals (Wigfield et al., 2012). Accordingly, a student's will to engage in agentic participation in a course depends on perceiving the value of how the course is germane to their personal goals (Schunk and

DiBenedetto, 2016). Furthermore, it has been noted (Matusov et al., 2016) that opportunities to practice agency in learning environments are likely to be bound to normative notions of agency, such as expectations of certain kinds of optimal or purposeful learning and teaching in the prevalent educational discourse. Theories of learning emphasise the critical role of learners' participatory action, such as active knowledge construction in dialogue with others (e.g. commenting, presenting views), taking responsibility for epistemic and regulative actions and utilising peer support in communal learning situations (e.g. Dams, a et al., 2010; Edwards, 2005; Greeno, 2006; Martin, 2004; Reeve and Tseng, 2011; van Boxtel et al., 2000). Participation that allows students to purposefully calibrate their personal learning needs and aims and act as co-creators of knowledge and practices has been seen to manifest and nourish agency (see Salmela-Aro, 2017; authorial agency, Nieminen et al., 2021). In the development of the AUS, it was deemed important to include students' self-assessment of their participation in instructional dialogue and collaboration with peers, because exclusive reliance on observed behaviour would not give insight into how empowered the students perceive themselves in the participatory structures of their courses (see e.g. Billet, 2008; Etelapelto et al., 2005; Hokk et al., 2017). Accordingly, we make the claim that attention should be paid first to students' active engagement in participatory action, second, to students' experience of ease of participation (i.e. having space to contribute to learning dialogue; see Lipponen and Kumpulainen, 2011), and third, to the extent to which they feel empowered by interactions with others (e.g. having opportunities for receiving and providing support; cf. others as resources, Edwards, 2005).

In addition to personal and participatory resources, an increasing amount of research has drawn attention to relational resources of agency. Dialogic spaces for agency are not automatically afforded in learning situations (Etelapelto et al., 2005; Lipponen and Kumpulainen, 2011), and relational support,

particularly the experience of emotional security and trust, must be intentionally fostered and facilitated (Harris et al., 2018). Sociocultural views note the power to act and take stances depends not only on an individual's will but also on contextual affordances, such as reciprocal and dialogic relationships between the teacher and students (Etelapelto and Lahti, 2008; Greeno, 2006; Lipponen and Kumpulainen, 2011). Agency is also linked with learners' power relationships and experiences of equality (Etelapelto et al., 2005).

II. METHOD

2.1. Context of the study

Both universities involved in this study (one in Finland and one in Spain) are multidisciplinary public research institutions offering training from the bachelor's to the doctoral level. They have a similar number of students (around 15,000 and 16,000 students in the Finnish and Spanish universities, respectively). In their pedagogical orientation, they follow the Bologna process recommendations, which have linkages to student agency, for example in increasing students' capacity for studying (see European Commission, n.d.; European Students' Union, 2018). The educational strategy of the Finnish university underscores students' growth for academic expertise and societal impact. In turn, the Spanish university strives for a commitment to values such as solidarity and integrity. These strategic guidelines do not provide a direct mandate for modes of pedagogical practices, such as how to assess and support student agency. At the teaching practice level, there is no uniform pedagogy being implemented in either university. The teachers at both universities have wide autonomy concerning the decisions on teaching methods they choose to use in their courses. Both universities annually provide support for teacher development, such as by promoting student-centred practices. In addition, both are traditional on-campus/in-presence universities with notable technology presence with blended forms in teaching and learning, usually including an institutional

learning platform for specific tasks or uploading resources.

2.2. Participants and data collection

A total of 645 university students (270 at the Finnish university and 375 at the Spanish university) completed the Agency of University Students (AUS) Scale questionnaire near the end of their courses before receiving grades. Table 1 shows the sample

Table 1 Description of respondents by country.

	Finland (n = 270)	Spain (n = 375)
Participants' mean age	22.66 years (SD = 4.63, range = 18-55; missing data for two persons)	22.45 years (SD = 6.24, range = 17-81; missing data for eight persons)
Median number of credits at the university	68.52 (SD = 82.45, range = 0-459; missing data for 34 persons)	84.00 (SD = 79.00, range = 0-600; missing data for 55 persons)
Gender	167 women; 103 men; missing data for one person	212 women; 155 men; missing data for eight persons
Type of programme	Master's degree programme courses	Master's degree programme courses
Number of courses in the data	10	22
Median number of respondents in the courses	11 (SD = 26.7, range = 4-79)	12 (SD = 14.1, range = 4-60)
Level of the study courses	Basic level (n = 5) Intermediate level (n = 4) Advanced level (n = 1)	Basic level (n = 9) Intermediate level (n = 8) Advanced level (n = 5)
Discipline the courses represent	Economics (n = 1) Education (n = 2) Humanities (n = 2) Natural sciences (n = 3) Psychology (n = 1) General studies (n = 1)	Computer engineering (n = 1) Economics (n = 2) Education (n = 4) Humanities (n = 2) Natural sciences (n = 7) Psychology (n = 2) Law (n = 2) General studies (n = 2)

characteristics of both countries.

Data were collected using an online survey before COVID-19 in both countries. Data were collected first in Finland (Jaaskela et al., 2020). Subsequently, to obtain comparable sets of data, we selected courses in the Spanish university that best corresponded to the Finnish data profile in terms of discipline, subject, content and level. For example, from the degree programme in physics, we chose a basic course on mechanics for first-year students in both countries. Diverse forms of instruction were used in the courses at both sites, involving a mixture of lecturing and student activation through individual and group tasks.

The AUS questionnaire was translated from Finnish to the Spanish university's two official languages using official translators. Next, a group of Spanish researchers, teachers and students (native speakers, bilingual speakers) tested and evaluated the comprehensibility of the translated instructions and items. Then Spanish team members and Finnish researchers discussed the semantic equivalence of the terms used. This meant several modification rounds, so the translation maintained the original meanings. Finally, the questionnaires were back-translated to Finnish and compared to the initial Finnish version.

All participants responded voluntarily and anonymously to the questionnaire as part of their respective courses. Students whose questionnaire data were used in the analyses gave written consent. The students were informed that only group-level analyses would be reported. National ethical requirements and principles drawn up at the European level (ALLEA – All European Academies, 2017) concerning ethical conduct and research integrity were followed in both countries. Our research included only a minimum risk for participants. According to the standard for both countries' institutional review board approvals, a statement by the ethical boards of the universities was not required.

2.3. Measure

The AUS Scale (Jaaskelainen et al., 2017, Jaaskelainen et al., 2020) was used to measure students' perceived resources of agency in their courses. The AUS was validated earlier in the Finnish university context, with data supporting a 10-factor model (Jaaskelainen et al., 2017). In the same national context, the scale was refined with a new dataset ($n = 270$) and revalidated with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), resulting in an 11-factor model (set a priori, residuals allowed to correlate) with acceptable fit indexes: $\chi^2(1,529; n = 270) = 2, 527.96$, RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.07 (Jaaskelainen et al., 2020).

The most recent version of the AUS (Appendix C) comprises 58 items forming 11 latent factors (Jaaskelainen et al., 2020). Each factor includes three to seven items rated using a five-point Likert scale (1 = fully disagree, 2 = partly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = partly agree and 5 = fully agree). The factors measure students' personal, relational and participatory resources, providing opportunities for practicing agency in the courses. Two factors – Self-efficacy and Competence beliefs – pertain to personal resources. The former measures students' overall confidence as a learner in completing the course (Bandura, 2006), and the latter focuses on beliefs concerning understanding course content (e.g. Schunk and Zimmerman, 2012). Three factors – Trust for the teacher,

Teacher support and Equal treatment – pertain to relational resources between the teacher and students in the course. These factors stem from research emphasising students' experiences of trust and emotional support as well as power relationships in agency construction (e.g. Etelapelto and Lahti, 2008; Harris et al., 2018), especially reflected as an individual's experiences and interpretations of the relationships and opportunities afforded through the teacher's orchestrative action (Lipponen and Kumpulainen, 2011). Six factors concern participatory resources. From these, Participation activity encompasses a student's self-assessment of one's active involvement in the interactive learning situations offered in the course (e.g. Reeve and Tseng, 2011). The other five factors capture a student's experience with affordances for agency (e.g. Berger and Luckmann, 1994; Deci and Ryan, 2004; Edwards, 2005): Opportunities to influence (e.g. students' viewpoints were taken into account), Opportunities to make choices (e.g. choosing contents in line with one's learning goals; different options to complete the course), Ease of participation (e.g. the possibility of expressing views without ridicule), Peer support (e.g. experiencing other students as resources for learning) and Interest and utility value (e.g. desire to learn to understand; perceiving the value of the course in attaining one's learning goals).

2.4. Data analysis strategy

A multigroup CFA was conducted to examine the factorial invariance of the measurement (French and Finch, 2008; Putnick and Bornstein, 2016) and, correspondingly, whether the AUS Scale functions similarly in Finnish and Spanish data. The four test levels to compare a scale's measurement structure include the following: 1) configural, 2) metric, 3) scalar and 4) strict invariances. First, the configural invariance between groups (here, countries) was tested to find out whether the overall factor structure was similar across groups; that is, the theoretical (latent) factors could be measured by the same items. Configural invariance requires that the items load statistically significantly on the same

factors in both countries. If configural invariance does not hold, this means that some items are not associated with the latent factor and should be removed from the factor.

Second, we tested metric invariance, which indicated whether factor loadings could be set as equal between countries. If the metric invariance holds, it suggests that a latent factor has the same meaning across the groups; that is, analyses based on individual differences are comparable between groups. In that case, we can compare covariances, correlations, regression coefficients and path coefficients between groups. However, this does not justify comparisons of group means. At this stage, intercepts are estimated at the item level separately for both groups. Therefore, the means of latent factors are zero.

Testing measurement invariance may result in the finding that the factor loadings and intercepts of the observed variables can only be partially set as equal between country-specific groups. In this case, a sufficient level of invariance should be evaluated. In the AUS Scale, the number of items per factor varies from three to seven. Following guidelines presented in Putnick and Borstein (2016) and El-Den et al. (2020), we set a criterion that more than half of the items – at least a minimum of three items in a factor – should be invariant to consider the factor partially invariant.

Analyses were conducted using Mplus (Version 8.0; Muthén and Muthén, 1998–2017). All models were estimated using the full information maximum likelihood method with robust standard error and scaled chi-square test value (MLR estimator in Mplus). The model invariances were tested using the Satorra–Bentler scaled chi-square difference test (Satorra, 2000). In the case of a statistically significant difference in test values, modification indices were used to identify the measurement structure inconsistency between countries.

Measurement invariance was tested separately for each factor to gain knowledge of possible differences in factor loadings, intercepts and

error variances, and to most efficiently identify items on the factors for which the invariance does not hold (Shi et al., 2109). Testing the measurement invariance at the level of the whole instrument would not have achieved this goal, as preliminary testing revealed many large modification indices, suggesting that the model did not identify distinctions between factors. At the first step, the multigroup model was estimated without any constraints (configural invariance). Second, factor loadings were fixed to be equal between countries (metric invariance). Third, factor loadings and intercepts of observed variables were fixed to be equal between countries (scalar invariance). Fourth, factor loadings, intercepts and residual variances of observed variables were fixed to be equal between countries (strict invariance). Model fits were evaluated using the chi-square test, RMSEA, CFI, TLI and SRMR. For a good-fitting model, chi-square test values are non-significant, CFI and TLI are near 0.95 and RMSEA and SRMR are below 0.06 and 0.08, respectively (Hu and Bentler, 2009). Based on the test results of separate factors, items and factors of good fit were incorporated into the final model, and the goodness of fit of the entire AUS model was evaluated. Finally, those factors that met scalar invariance, mean differences between countries were examined using Cohen's *d* (translating to mean the difference divided by the pooled standard deviation).

III. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive statistics for the AUS Scale in country-specific groups

Fig. 1 which is constructed based on the mean values and standard deviations of all 58 items of the original AUS Scale, visualises that each item has variation and mean values are positioned approximately in the middle of the scale without any floor or ceiling effects. Mean values varied between 2.43 and 4.83 in the Finnish data and between 2.47 and 4.70 in the Spanish data (a total range from a minimum of one to a maximum of five). The standard deviation was near 1.0 for most items and varied between 0.7 and 1.35.




Fig. 1. Means and standard deviations of 58 items for the Finnish and Spanish data.

3.2. Baseline model for the AUS Scale in Spanish data

To examine whether the original 11-factor model developed with the Finnish data also fit the Spanish data, we estimated the confirmatory factor model of the Spanish data against the Finnish factor structure. The model fit the data well (RMSEA = 0.055 [95% CI is 0.053, 0.058] and SRMR = 0.075). Configural invariance was, however, only met for 10 factors. Standardised factor loadings for items (Appendix A) were statistically significant, except for items 48, 57, 21 and 54 in the Spanish data; these items represent the factor of Peer support (four out of five items) in the validated Finnish AUS Scale (J' aaskel " a " et al., 2017, Ja" askela " et al., 2020). Furthermore, standardised factor loadings for four items (5, 10, 52 and 27) were statistically significant, though they were lower than 0.30. For further analyses, in which the AUS factors were tested separately, we excluded all five items (48, 57, 21, 54 and 42), tapping the factor of Peer support and continued analyses using the 10-factor model as the base model. Therefore, a few items with statistically significant but relatively lower loadings were included in the analyses.

3.3. Invariance testing for the AUS factors

Table 2 displays a summary of the invariance testing for the 10-factor AUS model in the Finnish and Spanish data. The extended version of the results concerning the factor-specific invariance tests, estimating configural, metric, scalar and strict invariances, and critical item-level considerations are presented in the supplementary file, Appendix B. Table 2 shows that when the factors were tested separately, configural invariance held for all 10 factors. Metric invariance was also fully met

for eight out of ten factors, and for the remaining two factors, it was possible to establish partial metric invariance. Next, we elaborate on the results concerning the estimation of the model for each factor separately.

3.3.1. Competence beliefs

Evidence was found only for partial scalar invariance (see Appendix B, Table 2.1). Concerning four of the seven intercepts (for items 5, 10, 35 and 37), support was found for setting equivalent intercepts across the two countries. These items capture students' selfevaluation of the extent to which they perceive that they have sufficient background knowledge to learn new things in the course (Appendix C). Testing strict invariance did not provide support for setting item residuals equivalent across the two countries. All residual variances were statistically significantly larger in the Spanish data than in the Finnish data.

3.3.2. Self-efficacy

It was possible to establish strict invariance, except for item 19, for which there was no support for setting the intercept to be equal across countries (see Appendix B, Table 2.2). In conclusion, concerning the four items of this factor, measurement invariance was supported for capturing a student's general belief in successfully completing this course.

3.3.3. Teacher support

Partial scalar invariance was met (see Appendix B, Table 2.3). Support was found for setting four of the five intercepts (items 11, 16, 20 and 33) so they are equal across countries. Scalar invariance could thereby be shown for items capturing emotional support students reported receiving from the course's teacher (Appendix C). Support was not found for setting the residual variances of the observed variables equal across countries. Except item 11, the residual variances of items were statistically significantly larger in Spain than in Finland.

Table 2 Summary of the invariance testing for the ten AUS factors.

Invariance levels	Configural invariance ^a	Metric invariance ^b	Scalar invariance ^c	Strict invariance ^d
Factor in the AUS scale				
1 Competence beliefs (7 items)	Yes	Yes	Partial 4/7	No
2 Self-efficacy (3 items)	Yes	Yes	Partial 4/5	No
3 Teacher support (3 items)	Yes	Yes	Partial 4/5	No
4 Equal treatment (3 items)	Yes	Yes	No	No
5 Trust for teacher (2 items)	Yes	Yes	No	No
6 Interest and utility value (7 items)	Yes	Yes	Partial 5/7	No
7 Opportunities to make choices (3 items)	Yes	Yes	No	No
8 Participation activity (3 items)	Yes	Yes	Partial 3/5	Partial 4/5
9 Opportunities to influence (7 items)	Yes	Yes	Partial 5/7	Partial 4/7
10 Rate of participation (4 items)	Yes	Partial 3/4	No	No

3.3.4. Equal treatment

Only metric invariance was met (see Appendix B, Table 2.4). Scalar and strict invariance did not hold; support was not found for setting either item intercepts (items 18, 39 and 32) or residual variances of observed variables so they are equal across countries. Factor variance was statistically significantly larger in Spain than in Finland, and all the residual variances of the items were statistically significantly larger in Spain than in Finland.

3.3.5. Trust for teacher

Support was found for setting intercepts to be equal across countries. Hence, the scalar invariance was met. However, support was not found for setting residual variances of observed variables so they are equal across countries (see Appendix B, Table 2.5). Four residual variances were statistically significantly larger in the Spanish data than in the Finnish data.

3.3.6. Interest and utility value

Partial scalar invariance was met (see Appendix B, Table 2.6). Support was found for setting five of the seven intercepts (for items 1, 2, 34, 47 and 52) to be equal between countries. In the items in which support was documented for scalar invariance, students were asked to rate their general interest and utility value regarding the course, whereas items that did not meet scalar invariance (items 13 and 50) may have been ambiguous by asking the respondents to provide ratings on intrinsic motives vs. extrinsic motives for learning (see Appendix C). Support was not found for setting the residual variances of the observed variables equally across countries. Four residual variances were statistically significantly larger in Spain than in Finland.

3.3.7. Opportunities for influence

Partial scalar invariance was met (see Appendix B, Table 2.9). There was support for

five out of seven intercepts (items 3, 8, 9, 51 and 60) to be set as equal across countries. These items, for which scalar invariance could be established, assess student-perceived opportunities to influence the course in general (items 3, 8 and 9), goals set for the course (item 51) and assessment methods (item 60; Appendix C). Strict invariance was established for other items except for 3, 9 and 51, where residual variances were statistically significantly larger in Spain than in Finland.




Fig. 2. Means and standard deviations of the six AUS factors for the Finnish and Spanish data.

IV. DISCUSSION

The complex nature of the construct of agency generates a critical need to develop psychometrically sound measurement instruments to assess student agency. In the present study, relevant theoretical aspects of the construct are considered and operationalised to provide a multidimensional understanding of student-perceived agency in various higher educational contexts. To our knowledge, no cross-nationally validated scales are widely available yet for student agency assessment in higher education. Nor is there the comparative empirical documentation of student agency based on large-scale study designs. Thus, this study presents a novel contribution to the field, specifically regarding cross-national research, by analysing and documenting the level of measurement invariance of the multidimensional AUS Scale (J' aaskel ... a et al., 2020) in data (n = 645) collected in Finland and Spain. The findings of these analyses and preliminary comparisons of

the AUS mean values between the two countries are reported and discussed.

The results of the measurement invariance analyses of the AUS Scale suggested that after excluding one factor (Peer support), support was received for configural and metric invariance. An identical factorial structure with 10 factors could be confirmed for the Spanish and Finnish data. Metric invariance was fully met for eight factors and partially met for two factors. This allowed further analyses of invariance testing and analyses based on individual differences between groups. Furthermore, six factors met at least partial scalar invariance, which made it possible to compare the countries' mean values on these dimensions.

From the original 11 factors, one – Peer support – produced non-significant factor loadings in Spanish data. Consequently, revisions may be needed to maintain peer relationships in the construction of agency (e.g. Edwards, 2005) and to capture its core components. The literature has paid ample attention to 'co-agency', 'relational agency', 'shared epistemic agency' and 'participatory qualities of interaction' and emphasised interdependence in solving challenging problems in studies and work (Damsa et al., 2010; Edwards, 2005; Glaveanu, ~ 2015; Stenalt, 2021). The literature also underscores reciprocal action, including individuals' own contribution to the collaboration and support received from others (e.g. Edwards, 2005). The operationalisation of peer support as a resource should acknowledge at least the following perspectives: students' experiences of their own potential to put effort into collaborating with others and their perception of other students as resources for one's own learning. The future development of the measurement model would benefit from adding items capturing students' perception of their investment and action in collaboration (see Klemenčič, 2015; Stenalt, 2021).

Findings from analyses testing metric invariance suggested factor loadings in eight of the 10 factors met full invariance across Finnish and Spanish data. Furthermore,

evidence for partial metric invariance was observed for the factors of Participation activity and Ease of participation. These factors included three items that could be set as equal between countries. Hence, the latent factors represent theoretically coherent content. In conclusion, the 10 factors of the AUS Scale were comparable in capturing individual variations in the intended dimension of agency, enabling the comparison of covariance structures between Finnish and Spanish data. This will make possible the future examination of associations between pedagogical practices (e.g. forms of learning and instructional methods) and agency factors. Moreover, an examination is possible concerning an array of background factors' effects (e.g. study success, age, gender and social and familial factors; see, e.g. Klemenčič, 2015) on agency across countries.

Perhaps higher competence beliefs (i.e. the student's sense of having sufficient knowledge to understand contents and learn new things) among Finnish students may be due to potentially higher competition for Finnish university admissions and relatively high competence in certain fields. It can also be linked with mandatory requirements for teacher pedagogical studies at the Finnish university, which contribute to teachers' abilities to adapt their instruction to students' competences.

The differences in student-perceived teacher–student relations may reflect divergences in school culture and educational practices in these countries and national cultural values. For example, relatively informal communication practices and low hierarchies between teachers and students – typical for Finnish schools and universities – may contribute to Finnish students' experiences of higher trust in teacher–student relations. Power distance is considered a national cultural value in Hofstede's (2001, 2010) cultural dimensions. Finland scores lower than Spain in this value, suggesting decentralised power, equal rights and direct, participative communication. A hierarchical order and power centralisation prevail in Spain. The two

countries belong to different cultural clusters derived from religion, language and the geographic continuum (Ronen and Shenkar, 2013) – Latin Europe and Nordic – which may play a role in these disparities.

Four factors out of 10 – Equal treatment, Opportunities to make choices, Participation activity and Ease of participation – did not meet scalar invariance at item intercepts. Additionally, non-invariance at single-item intercepts was found in the remaining six factors that partially met scalar invariance. These findings offer valuable information for developing AUS Scale items (see supplementary file, Appendix B). For example, the current items in the AUS Scale concerning students' perceptions of equal treatment are partly formulated as general statements without linking them directly to the teacher's treatment of students in the course. This may have caused varying interpretations of items' meaning among respondents. Furthermore, the finding of non-invariance concerning the item intercepts in the Opportunities to make choices factor suggests that some item meanings are not universally shared and may not reflect the typical course practices to which students are accustomed. Generally, Spanish students responded differently (i.e. lower ratings than Finnish students) on items that included emotional stances regarding participation (e.g. daring to challenge matters presented in the course, item 22) or concerning emotional aspects of teacher–student relations (e.g. teachers' friendly attitude towards students, item 4). In some cases, the difference may be linked to different cultural connotations of terms and translation difficulties and replacing words expressing emotion with more neutral wording (e.g. replacing the adjective friendly with positive in item 4), which could enhance the invariance of item intercepts.

The AUS scale items were initially operationalised based on the conceptualisations drawn from theoretical literature. We conceptualized student agency as a multidimensional whole including several dimensions in the domains of personal, relational and participatory resources. Success in development of a valid measurement

instrument is dependent on the extent to which one succeed in creating items for the supposed latent factors that would be valid across different groups. If the factor structure differs or is not comparable between the groups, it suggests that respondents differ on how they understand the items and respond to them. In the development of the AUS Scale, the factor of Peer support is an example of a challenge which surfaced in the invariance analyses with data from students from different countries. This does not, however, mean that the aspect of peer relationships would be irrelevant for agency. Instead, it means that we have not yet succeeded in capturing representative items that coherently would constitute the (higher order) latent factor. As acknowledged in the research (e.g. Ginevra et al., 2015; Virtanen et al., 2018), it is difficult to accomplish full measurement invariance between groups across countries on multi-item self-report surveys measuring latent constructs that are not directly observable. The reasons respondents respond differently to questions might relate, for example to instrument translation, the data collection situation, cultural differences in students' response styles, familiarity with question formats and responses' social desirability (Davidov et al., 2014; Wetzel et al., 2013).

4.1. Limitations

This study used a relatively small sample of Finnish and Spanish university students, which may have affected the results when examining a model as complex as the AUS Scale (i.e. having several factors). Respondents in both countries are from one university. Correspondingly, the empirical findings should be treated with caution when considering them in a broader national context.

Although effort was exerted to choose students from courses representing the same disciplines, subjects and stages of their studies and highly similar information was provided to respondents on the study's aims, data collection procedures and instructions, the data collection situations varied in the countries. Data collection in the Finnish university's courses was implemented in classroom

situations within the presence of the researcher, who could motivate students to participate and from whom the students could request clarification. In Spain, the key researcher also organised the data collection, but data collection in some courses was implemented through self-paced online responses within the given time frame.

Moreover, the AUS Scale was constructed to capture students' self-evaluations of a multidimensional set of resources fostering agency. These include resources embedded in the study contexts, such as opportunities and support for participation, relational resources available and activated by students, themselves, and notably, students' competence beliefs, their interests and values in social interactions and relationships with their peers and teachers in their studies. Other researchers have indicated it is also relevant to explicitly pay attention to and examine the relationships between resources and affordances of agency and the individual's will (e.g. volition and subsequent investment) to engage in agentic action (see, e.g. Klemenčič, 2015; Stenalt, 2021). In our piloting work, we supplemented the AUS Scale with a scale capturing students' perceptions of the extent to which the pedagogical structure and practices of the courses they attend include student-centred, activating formats and opportunities for enquiry-based learning. In further development of the AUS Scale, we will enrich its coverage by including items capturing aspects linked with transformative agency (see Lund and Vestøl, 2020), such as students' opportunities and will to engage in creative collaboration, solving of open problems and addressing complex challenges and their assessment of the extent to which these experiences have been meaningful in advancing their learning and have empowered their reflexive awareness and capabilities to engage in agentic action. According to Lund and Vestøl (2020), transformative agency departs from conventional notions of agency; it stems from encounters with and examinations of conflicts or contradictions in the collective activity and develops in the joint activity of envisioning new possibilities.

Future research could, thus, enrich understanding of the field by including also indicators of transformative agency in association with relational agency (see Edwards, 2005), where one's thoughts and actions are aligned with others' in interpreting problems of practice.

4.2. Implications for practice and future research

The development of valid and reliable measurement instruments to assess student agency across educational contexts is critical for estimating the level of agency among higher education students at the institution or discipline level and for developing practices for fostering agency tailored to these contexts. The possibility of making group comparisons of students' agency perceptions is a key interest of stakeholders in the development of quality assurance and higher education equality. This study provides knowledge of the measurement invariance of the AUS Scale between university students in Finland and Spain and invites additional cross-national research. The knowledge gained supports benchmarking processes and sharing good practices for promoting students' agency between universities and for comparisons between countries. Large-scale studies collecting data from a range of countries are at their initial stages of obtaining evidence of the validity of the AUS Scale and developing the instrument. Additionally, the development of a short version of the AUS Scale for international collaboration would be valuable, requiring the careful consideration and identification of redundant items based on invariance testing. However, it could increase the questionnaire's usability without decreasing the scale's validity (e.g. Virtanen et al., 2018). One interesting direction of future research is the utilisation of a person-oriented approach to examine the latent profiles of student agency across countries (e.g. J'askel'ä et al., 2020).

Similar to Klemenčič (2015), we acknowledge the importance of examining student agency in a temporal fashion and targeting students' reflexivity. In our ongoing

work, we have taken several steps in that direction. We have further developed the AUS Scale by including open-ended questions asking students to reflect on potential sources of change in their agency during their studies. In addition, we have piloted and will develop a practical tool (utilising learning analytics techniques) that provides diagnostic feedback to students. We aim to promote students' self-reflection of agency from various perspectives, capturing their interpretation of their agency as agentic orientation, investment and action. We also are launching a three-year follow-up of students in which we examine the temporal construction of higher education students' agency during their studies utilising several time points and methods such as scales, small group discussions, interviews tapping resources of agency and prompts inquiring about engagement in agentic action (suggested, e.g. by Stenalt, 2021).

V CONCLUSION

This study is a unique contribution to the development of a cross-national measurement tool for assessing university student agency as a multidimensional construct. It deepens our understanding of the critical elements of the AUS Scale in country-specific contexts. The findings confirmed metric invariance for the 10-factor model (excluding the factor of Peer support from the initial scale) and, from these, scalar invariance for the six-factor model of the AUS Scale and provided support for the use of the AUS Scale in comparative studies on student agency. Comparisons of the six factors' mean values revealed some differences in student agency experiences concerning personal and relational resources of agency between Finnish and Spanish students. Overall, the AUS Scale was shown to have the potential for large-scale studies of student agency across countries and to be a promising tool for development work supporting agency in higher education institutions.

REFERENCES

1. ALLEA - All European Academies. (2017). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity

- (Revised ed). Berlin: ALLEA – All European Academies. <https://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf>.
2. Ayllon, S., Alsina, A., & Colomer, J. (2019). Teachers' involvement and students' self-efficacy: Keys to achievement in higher education. *PLoS ONE*, 14(5), Article e0216865. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216865>
3. Beauducel, A., & Wittmann, W. W. (2005). Simulation study on fit indexes in CFA based on data with slightly distorted simple structure. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 12(1), 41–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1201_3
4. centered learning intervention with high school teachers. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101553> Translated by Berger, P., Luckmann, T., & Raiskila. Helsinki, V. (1994). *Todellisuudensosiaalinen rakentuminen : tiedonsosiologinentutkimus [The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, 1966]*. Gaudeamus. Translated by
5. Billett, S. (2008). Learning throughout working life: A relational interdependence between personal and social agency. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2007.00394.x>
6. Brown, K., & Westaway, E. (2011). Agency, capacity, and resilience to environmental change: Lessons from human development, well-being, and disasters. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 36, 321–342. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-052610-092905>

7. Case, J. M. (2015). A social realist perspective on student learning in higher education: the morphogenesis of agency. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 34 (5), 841–852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1011095>
8. Damsa, C. I., Kirschner, P., Andriessen, J. E. B., Erkens, G., & Sins, P. H. M. (2010). Shared epistemic agency: An empirical study of an emergent construct. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(2), 143–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508401003708381>
9. Elen, J., Clarebout, G., Leonard, R., & Lowyck, J. (2007). Student-centred and teacher-centred learning environments: What students think. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(1), 105–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510601102339>
10. Etelapelto, A., & Lahti, J. (2008). The resources and obstacles of creative collaboration in a long-term learning community. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 3(3), 226–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2008.09.003>
11. Etelapelto, A., Littleton, K., Lahti, J., & Wirtanen, S. (2005). Students' accounts of their participation in an intensive long-term learning community. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43(3), 183–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2006.06.011>
12. European Commission, n.d. The Bologna process and the European higher education area. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/highereducation/bologna-process-and-european-higher-education-area_en
13. European Students' Union. (2018). Student-centred learning. Bologna with Student Eyes 2018 (pp. 1–9). ESU. <https://www.esu-online.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/11.-Student-Centred-Learning.pdf>
14. Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., Vermue, C., Deinum, J.-F., & van Rooij, E. (2021). First-year academic achievement: the role of academic self-efficacy, self-regulated learning and beyond classroom engagement. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(7), 1115–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1845606>
15. Ginevra, C. M., Nota, L., Soresi, S., Shogren, K. A., Wehmeyer, M. L., & Little, T. D. (2015). A cross-cultural comparison of the self-determination construct in Italian and American adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(4), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2013.808159>