

A Study on the Relationship between Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Comprehension in English Reading*

Jaewoo Shim, Heechul Lee & Seunghee Jin**
(Chonbuk National University)

Shim, Jaewoo, Lee, Heechul & Jin, Seunghee. (2016). A Study on the Relationship between Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Comprehension in English Reading. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 24(4), 129-149. The purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and comprehension in English reading. A total of 219 Korean EFL middle school students completed the questionnaires on reading self-efficacy beliefs. To measure students' reading comprehension, English scores of a province-run-achievement test were used. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading comprehension. The dependent variable was reading comprehension, and the independent variable was reading self-efficacy beliefs with the subfactors of Initiative, Effort, Performance, and Persistence. The result of the study showed that two variables of Effort and Performance were significant to predict the variance in reading proficiency ($b=0.241$ and $b=0.248$, $p<0.05$, respectively). In addition, R^2 was 0.343 ($p<0.01$). This means that 34.3.1% of variance of reading proficiency was accounted for by the linear combination of reading self-efficacy beliefs. These results imply that there is a strong relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading proficiency. Pedagogical implications based on the findings are discussed.

Key Words: Reading Self-Efficacy beliefs, Reading Comprehension, Multiple Regression Analysis

* This research was supported by the research funds of Chonbuk National University in 2016.

** The first author is Shim, Jaewoo, the corresponding author, Lee, Heechul, and the third author, Jin, Seunghee.

1. Introduction

Reading is an essential skill for learners in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, and a number of foreign language reading specialists regard reading as an interactive and complex process affected by linguistic and cognitive factors on the one hand, and affective and motivational factors on the other (Carrell, Devine, & Eskey, 1988; Grabe, 1991). Similarly, the interactive approaches to reading processes assumed the following occurrences: (1) the automatic application of lower-level skills; (2) the interaction of text and background knowledge; and (3) the impact of social, contextual, and political variables (Hudson, 2007).

In this regard, reading comprehension should be addressed in multifaceted contexts with a consideration of a variety of variables or factors. Koda (2005) posited that researchers should consider the following variables in order to clarify successful reading comprehension: decoding, vocabulary knowledge, syntactic processing, text-structure knowledge, prior knowledge, and reading strategies. In the same vein, EFL reading instructors and researchers from both Korea and other countries have put considerable emphasis on linguistic and cognitive factors (e.g. words, grammatical knowledge, discourse organization, reading models, metacognitive awareness) as well as social and cultural variables (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). In other words, reading researchers often focused on the cognitive aspects of reading, making efforts to develop interventions to increase specific reading skills (Wigfield, 1997).

However, knowledge about reading skills or strategies does not surely enable students to be engaged in reading performance and achieve reading goals. According to Bandura (1997), a child may understand the skills required to be a successful reader, but without sufficient motivation the skills may never be put to use. Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks, and Perencevich (2004) stated that since reading is an effortful activity that often requires choice, motivation is vital to reading engagement.

Many researchers studying on reading motivation suggest that students' competence and efficacy beliefs, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and purposes for achievement importantly affect their decisions about which activities to do, how long to do them, and how much effort to put into them (Bandura, 1997;

Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Motivated readers thus will engage more in reading and will have a positive attitude toward reading (Athey, 1982; Greaney & Hegarty, 1987; Mathewson 1994, as cited in Baker & Wigfield, 1999). Thus, investigating students' motivation might provide insights into why a number of learners are going through difficulties with regard to reading proficiency (Wigfield, 1997; Wigfield et al., 2004).

Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) conceptualized 11 different dimensions of reading motivation, and Wigfield (1997) created a theoretical taxonomy with three categories: reading self-efficacy, the belief that one can be successful at reading; challenge, the willingness to take on difficult reading material; work avoidance, the desire to avoid reading activities. Also, Baker and Wigfield (1999) argued that when students lack a sense of efficacy, they tend to avoid challenging reading activities.

Among the three categories mentioned above, self-efficacy is considered to be the most important construct to affect reading motivation (Baker & Wigfield, 1999). According to Bandura (1993) and Pajares (1996), self-efficacy is defined as a person's faith that he or she can complete a specific task successfully, and is closely related to initial task engagement, persistence, and achievement. They also mentioned that more efficacious students tend to select challenging tasks, make more efforts, and be more patient when encountering difficulties.

In addition, self-efficacy beliefs are a better indicator of success than one's actual abilities, skills, or knowledge because of the significant role which self-efficacy plays in facilitating behaviors (Bandura, 1997; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 1995). Multon, Brown, and Lent's (1991) meta-analysis of research demonstrated a positive relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and academic achievements.

These self-efficacy beliefs are context-specific, or linked to particular domains such as reading. Reading self-efficacy beliefs have a close relationship with reading performance (Pajares, 2003). They refer to learners' perceptions of their reading abilities to perform various reading tasks, and may impact learners' overall orientation toward the reading comprehension process and achievements (Henk & Melnick, 1995). Also, one explanation for student's different reading performance may be associated with the different levels of reading self-efficacy beliefs (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997).

Much L1 reading research indicated that reading self-efficacy beliefs had a strongly positive correlation with reading proficiency (Barkely, 2006; Shell, Murphy, & Bruning 1989). In contrast, there has been little research on reading self-efficacy in Korean EFL context. In addition, although a variety of studies on affective factors such as motivation, attitude, and interest were conducted in foreign language achievement (e.g., Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; MacIntyre, 1995; Saito & Samimy, 1996), there still remains a relatively limited amount of research examining the effect of self-efficacy beliefs on reading comprehension of foreign language students. Furthermore, very few studies have been conducted on the relationship of multiple subfactors of reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading comprehension in EFL settings and none have been conducted with the same variables as this study.

Therefore, the purpose of the present study was not only to examine if there is a relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading comprehension, but also to investigate which subconstructs of reading self-efficacy beliefs are statistically significant predictors to account for the variance of dependent variable of reading comprehension.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Reading Comprehension

Cognitive theory regards comprehension as an active constructive process that applies to listening or reading (Maeng, 2010). The comprehension process develops through the stages of perceptual analysis, parsing, and utilization of the meaning of text (Anderson, 2005). With regard to reading, according to Hudson (2007), the ability to read is a wonderful human capacity. In the process of reading, human creates meaning on their own. Also, reading process itself is motivated by the readers' particular purpose and is enhanced by increasing comprehension of the texts.

Compared to reading, reading comprehension is a process of extracting and constructing meaning simultaneously by engaging in and interacting with written language (Snow, 2002). According to Stahl and Elfrieda (2005), reading

comprehension is composed of three interactive processes: decoding, constructing a text base, and developing a situational model. More specifically, a reader decodes sound-symbol correspondences to identify written words leading to propositions or idea units. Then, he or she sets up a coherent representation of a text involving relationships between ideas. Concurrently, a reader integrates the text base with their schema and prior experiences to construct a situational model. Lastly, this mental model allows a reader to make a higher level of inferences and react personally.

With regard to the second and foreign language reading, reading involves the interaction between first and second language (Hudson, 2007). Therefore, several L2 reading researchers have adopted reading models and theories from L1 reading studies to identify L2 reading capability. They referred to reading as a series of complex cognitive processes which require the use of both top-down and bottom-up processing (Anderson, 2005; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Stanovich, 2000).

The top-down model focuses on meaning or the content of the text. From the perspective of top-down model, reading is regarded as a hypothesis-testing activity: readers first build hypotheses and then test the hypotheses during reading process. (Segalowitz, Poulsen & Komodoa, 1991). On the other hand, the bottom-up approach puts more emphasis on a decoding process. It means that readers analyze text in small parts and construct meaning from these small units. That is, the information is processed from letters to words to meaning (Stanovich, 2000). In general, good readers of L1 and L2 integrate both bottom-up strategies and top-down strategies to address the difficulties in reading comprehension and eventually develop their reading proficiency.

Current research on reading demonstrates that several key variables impede students' reading comprehension (National Reading Panel, 2000). For example, working memory, vocabulary, prior knowledge, word recognition, and reading strategies are cognitive factors that foster reading comprehension. Also, affective variables such as motivation to read, reading interest and attitude, and reading self-efficacy beliefs influence reading comprehension (Wigfield & Guthrie, 2000). Despite the extensive literature on how to improve reading comprehension for students, there is no consensus of which variables affect their reading proficiency or the relative significance of these factors (Sanford, 2015).

2.2 Reading Self-Efficacy Beliefs

Since the social cognitivist Alber Bandura's (1977) article entitled "Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change" was published, researchers from many fields have employed self-efficacy to predict and explain human functioning (Pajares, 2003). As a key construct of social cognitive theory, self-efficacy has received increasing attention in the field of academic motivation and achievement (Bandura, 1986; Linnenbrink, & Pintrich, 2002; Schunk, & Pajares, 2004).

Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as the strength of expectations individuals maintain about their competence to successfully perform a behavior which will lead to a particular outcome. He also argued that individual's level of self-efficacy influences the initiation of activity, the effort to be expended, and the persistence to be sustained in the face of obstacles and unpleasant experiences.

There are four main sources of information that help individuals create a sense of self-efficacy related to a particular task and a specific domain; performance accomplishments or learners' past performances, vicarious experiences or experiences with others' performances, verbal persuasion or persuasion-positive or negative-from significant others, and physiological states or physiological and emotional changes that alert learner to possible failure or success (Bandura, 1986).

In addition to one's capability to facilitate the basic cognitive elements described above in Bandura's social cognitive theory, motivational factors also play an important role in explaining reading performance. Unsuccessful readers and successful readers can be distinguished not only in their cognitive competence but also in their level of reading motivation. Proficient readers are more likely to have higher self-competence beliefs about their reading performance (Tunmer & Chapman, 2002; Shell, Colvin & Bruning, 1995). Reading self-efficacy is defined as students' 'judgement of their abilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of reading performances' (Bandura, 1994 as cited in Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003, p. 120).

Reading researchers acknowledged that affective factors, including self-efficacy beliefs, positively influence students' academic achievement and

behavior (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Those researchers found that students who make positive associations with reading tend to read more often, for a longer periods of time, and with a greater intensity. Simultaneously, students who have negative thought about reading are likely to suffer from low achievement (Henk and Melnick, 1995).

2.3 Previous Research on Reading Comprehension and Reading Self-Efficacy Beliefs

There are some research examining the effect of self-efficacy beliefs in the field of language, but only little can be found in particular reading domain. Nevertheless, there are some studies addressing the relationship between reading self-efficacy and reading proficiency.

Shell, Murphy and Bruning (1989) examined if there was a relationship between self-efficacy, outcome expectancy and achievement in reading and writing with the participants of undergraduate students. The study used a multiple regression analysis and its result showed that about 32% of the variance of reading achievement was accounted for by the constructs of reading self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectation beliefs. In addition, Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) conducted research to investigate the relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading amount and breadth by sampling 105 students in Grades 4 and 5. The result indicated that there was a strong correlation between reading self-efficacy and reading amount and breadth. Swalander and Taube (2007) also found that verbal self-concept including self-efficacy beliefs had the strongest effect on reading achievement.

Schunk (1991) also demonstrated through studies with L1 remedial students that learners' sense of efficacy is closely connected to their academic performance, and that instructing students both on how to be more efficacious and to believe they are more efficacious improves learners' achievement in subjects such as math and reading. The results from this study suggested that when students believe that they are capable and efficacious for reading, they are more liable to engage in reading. In addition, Zimmerman (1995) argued that highly efficacious students tend to have a higher rate of performance, to persist at the task, and to exert more efforts. Also, Mills, Pajares, and Herron (2006)

revealed a significant relationship between FFL reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading proficiency through an evaluation of 95 college students of French as a Foreign Language

Judging from these previous studies mentioned above, we see that reading self-efficacy beliefs are currently considered a strong indicator of reading achievement and a significant mediating construct in relation to other motivational variables. Therefore, highly efficacious readers tend to exert more energy, persevere longer and remain resilient when confronting adversity throughout the reading process (Burrows, 2012).

3. Research Design

3.1 Participants

219 students of 3rd in a middle school in Jeonju, Korea are the subjects of this study. They have been learning English as a compulsory school subject for seven years since elementary school. They are intermediate-to-high level students in English reading proficiency on the ground of their English scores of the province-run achievement tests supervised by Jeollabukdo Educational Office. 113 students (51.8%) were male and 106 students (48.2%) were female. They took four hours of English lesson per week for 45 minutes per class.

3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 Survey for Reading Self-Efficacy Beliefs

Data for the current research was collected using a questionnaire that consisted of items aimed to measure reading self-efficacy beliefs. Since a standardized survey for reading self-efficacy beliefs has not existed, this study adopted Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS) by Henk & Melnick (1995) and Jung's work (2010) which was designed based on General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) by Sherer et al (1982).

The survey for reading self-efficacy beliefs used in this study consisted of 24 items with the Likert scales of 5, including four constructs of reading

self-efficacy beliefs: 6 items for willingness to expend effort in initiating the behavior; 'Initiative' (e.g., "When I begin to read, I can understand most of a reading passage"); 6 items for willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior, 'Effort' (e.g., "I keep trying to understand a reading passage until I can understand it even though it is complicated to comprehend"); 6 items for the expected efficacy to reading performance, 'Performance' (e.g., "I am confident about my comprehending while reading a text"); and 6 items for persistence in the face of adversity, 'Persistence' (e.g., "I can overcome difficulties however hard it is to understand").

This study confirmed the validity and reliability of all this reading self-efficacy survey items using a confirmatory factor analysis through the AMOS 23 program, and obtained the final items. Based on the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, several items were excluded from the subscales of reading self-efficacy beliefs because of their low factor loadings or large modification indices. A total of 17 items out of 24 of survey of reading self-efficacy beliefs remained in the model of reading self-efficacy beliefs as shown in the Table 1.

Table 1. Classification of Reading Self-Efficacy Beliefs Items

	Content	Number of Item	Item Number
Sub-categories of Reading Self-Efficacy Beliefs	Initiative	6	1,7,9,20,21,16
	Effort	3	11,18,22
	Performance	5	3,4,8,10,14
	Persistence	3	13,23,24
	Total	17	

The model of reading self-efficacy beliefs fitted data well. The χ^2 was significant in the model (reading self-efficacy model, χ^2 (df = 113) = 255.672, $p < 0.01$). Other fit indices showed good fits for the model. Comparative Fit index was high (CFI = 0.927 and 0.928 respectively) as was Incremental Fit Index (IFI = 0.928). The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation also suggested a good fit to the data (RMSEA = 0.076). Non-normal Fit Index and Normed Fit Index confirmed these good fits (NNFI = 0.902, NFI = 0.880).

To assess the internal consistency of the subscales, scale (construct) reliability

was calculated for each subscale. All values of scale reliabilities were high enough (> 0.7). Wang and Wang (2012) have recommended scale reliability should be above 0.7 (0.6~0.7 acceptable). The model met this recommendation as a reliable scale.

3.2.2 Reading Comprehension Test

In order to measure students' reading performance, this study used the results of a province-run achievement test as a validated reading test which was supervised by Jeollabuk Educational office. In general, the province-run achievement test of English subject consisted of two sections: listening and reading. The listening and reading test have 10 and 16 test items, respectively. Thus, the maximum score of the reading achievement test for this study is 16 points. This study employed only the scores of reading test for the purpose of this study. Table 2 demonstrates the contents of the reading test.

Table 2. Question Types of Province-Run Reading Test

Item Number	Question Types
1	Understanding the purpose of the text
2	Understanding details
3	Inferring the next story
4	Understanding the main idea
5	Inferring titles
6	Identifying a referent
7	Understanding details
8	Inferring the main character's emotional status
9	Choosing correct options
10	Understanding the topic
11	Filling in the blank
12	Filling in the blank
13	Identifying the mismatched sentence
14	Inserting a sentence
15	Reordering sentences/paragraphs
16	Summarizing the text

3.3 Data analysis

3.3.1 Data Collection

The data was collected in a regular English class by one of the researchers in the middle of the second semester in 2015. The researcher informed participants of the purpose of the study, and asked them to complete an informed consent. Students were provided with a brief explanation on how to complete the reading self-efficacy questionnaire, and were asked to check the number best describing their perceived ability about reading performance. Then, students were asked to answer the questionnaire to measure their reading self-efficacy beliefs. The researcher gave the students approximately 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire. A total of 219 questionnaires were collected.

3.3.2 Data Analysis

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading proficiency. A multiple regression was selected because it allows the researcher to examine how much variance of the dependent variable (i.e. reading achievement score) was explained by the linear combination of independent variables (i.e. reading self-efficacy beliefs). The SPSS 20 program was employed to run the multiple regression analysis.

4. Results

A multiple regression analysis was used to test how much variance in reading comprehension proficiency was explained by reading self-efficacy beliefs. Table 3 demonstrates descriptive statistics for each variable of reading self-efficacy beliefs. The findings indicate that on average, the subjects scored 19.15 out of the highest possible score of 30 on Initiative, 10.29 out of 15 on Effort, 15.22 out of 25 on Performance, 10.04 out of 15 on Persistence. In terms of the dependent variable, Reading, the average was 18.19 out of 26. Among independent variables, Initiative had the largest variation with the standard

deviation of 4.55, while Persistence showed the smallest variation with the standard deviation of 2.00.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Maximum Score	N
Reading	8.12	4.57	16	219
Initiative	19.15	4.55	30	219
Effort	10.29	2.48	15	219
Performance	15.22	3.98	25	219
Persistence	10.04	2.00	15	219

As shown in Table 4, correlation among the independent variables and their correlations with the dependent variables were checked. It was found that independent variables were highly correlated in general, ranging from the highest correlation of 0.85 between Initiative and Performance to the lowest correlation of 0.66 between Persistence and Effort. However, as noted in the column of tolerance in Table 7, the high correlations among independent variables turned out to be not a problem in the multiple regression analysis, indicating all independent variables had tolerance value more than 0.10. In other words, no variance in an independent variable was explained less than 0.90% by the linear combinations of other independent variables.

Table 4. Correlations among Variables

	Initiative	Effort	Performance	Persistence	Reading
Initiative	1				
Effort	.80	1			
Performance	.85	.76	1		
Persistence	.75	.66	.69	1	
Reading	.53	.54	.55	.48	1

Table 5 shows the model summary of multiple regression analysis. It showed that the four reading self-efficacy variables explained 34.3% of the variance of reading proficiency with the value of R-square 0.343 ($p < .001$)

Table 5. Model Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Durbin-Watson	
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		Sig. F Change
1	.586 ^a	.343	.331	3.740	.343	27.938	4	214	.001	2.300

Table 6 exhibits the results of the test for analysis of variance that was used to measure the significance of the model. The model was statistically significant ($p < .001$) as in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1563.436	4	390.859	27.938	.001
	Residual	2993.889	214	13.990		
	Total	4557.324	218			

Table 7 shows the coefficients of regression model. Both Effort and Initiative were statistically significant variables with the p-value of 0.014 and 0.024 respectively at $p < 0.05$. With regard to the standardized coefficients, Performance was the most predictive variable (Beta=0.248, $p < 0.024$), followed by Effort (Beta=0.241, $p < 0.014$). Such a result confirms that reading proficiency would increase by 0.248 and 0.241 each on average when the amount of Performance and Effort increase, respectively.

Table 7. Coefficients of Regression Model

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
	Initiative	.039	.127	.039	.310	.757	.192
	Effort	.445	.179	.241	2.486	.014*	.328
	Performance	.285	.126	.248	2.266	.024*	.257
	Persistence	.272	.196	.119	1.393	.165	.420

a. Predictors (Constant): Initiative, Effort, Performance, and Persistence

b. Dependent variable: reading

4. Discussions and Conclusion

The results of this study showed that out of four variables of reading self-efficacy beliefs, two variables of Effort and Performance were significantly found to predict the variance in reading proficiency ($b=0.241$ and $b=0.248$, $p<0.05$, respectively). This means that the magnitude of Performance proved to have the strongest predictive importance in reading achievement scores, followed by Effort. The other two variables of Initiative and Persistence showed no statistical significance.

In addition, the findings from the model summary demonstrated that R^2 was 0.343 ($p<0.05$). This means that 34.3% of variance of the dependent variable or reading proficiency was accounted for by the linear combination of the independent variables or reading self-efficacy beliefs. This result identified reading self-efficacy beliefs as a significant determinant in reading proficiency.

These results of the current study are consistent with those of previous research on the relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading proficiency. Zimmerman (1995) articulated that students with a high sense of perceived efficacy will have a higher rate of performance, be more likely to persist at the task, and expend more efforts. Also, Mills, Pajares, and Herron (2006) showed that an evaluation of 95 college students of French as a Foreign Language revealed a significant relationship between FFL reading self-efficacy beliefs and reading proficiency. Furthermore, Barkley (2006) undertook an investigation to determine if self-efficacy beliefs could predict reading comprehension performance as assessed in a comprehension sub-test score of a standardized test. The result showed that there existed a positive correlation between students' reading self-efficacy beliefs and comprehension abilities.

From these significant findings, it can be drawn that the higher reading self-efficacy beliefs students have, the higher level of reading proficiency they have. In this regard, Bandura (1997) noted that self-efficacy influences how people think of themselves: their motivation, affective state and actions are determined by what they think they are capable of rather than by what they actually are. Thus, behavioral outcomes are more truly predicted by what people believe they can achieve, and self-efficacy expectations determine what people do with the knowledge and skills they possess (Bandura, 1997, p. 24). From this

perspective, it can be concluded that it is the construct of reading self-efficacy beliefs that explains why different people with similar levels of knowledge and skill often show significantly different reading performance.

Given the empirical result that there is a strong relationship between reading motivation and reading self-efficacy beliefs, it is necessary to identify the ways to help students strengthen their self-efficacy about reading and ultimately lead to improvements in reading comprehension. As shown in the result of this study, Performance and Effort among four subfactors of reading self-efficacy beliefs are powerful predictor of reading proficiency. However, Initiative and Persistence turned out to be statistically non-significant. It suggests that regardless of reading proficiency, the expectations to initiate reading may be high. Also, even high-leveled students in reading comprehension may not have confidence to overcome reading difficulties such as too unfamiliar words or topics. Therefore, teachers are required to help students have more confidence in their reading performance, and also to encourage them to make more efforts to complete the given reading tasks.

First of all, to enhance students' confidence in their reading performance, it is important for language teachers to promote opportunities and encouragement for students to become autonomous learners who are self-motivated and responsible for their own learning. That is, autonomous learners tend to show more positive attitude and abilities to be responsible for their own learning. In line with the above arguments, to foster learner autonomy, teachers should conduct students-centered cooperative reading approach rather than teacher-centered grammar translation reading instruction. This cooperative reading approach allows students to take responsibility for their reading performance and build confidence in their abilities.

Another way of enhancing reading self-efficacy beliefs is to encourage students to have more effortful attitude to complete a reading task. Unsuccessful readers are less likely to exert more effort and sustain it when they self-doubt on the completion of their given reading tasks. To develop students' effortful attitude, language teachers should give them appropriately persuasive verbal feedback when they do not know what to do with reading adversities. In other words, students who are self-efficacious and receive encouraging corrective feedback are apt to exert greater effort and try to complete the given task.

In conclusion, as studies on reading in a foreign language continue to grow, the multifaceted nature of motivation to read in a foreign language has become increasingly clear. Self-belief and its influence on reading performance is one dimension of this multi-layered construct (Mori, 2002; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). However, despite the significant role that self-efficacy beliefs play in enhancing reading proficiency in EFL context as proved in this study, there is little research investigating the influential variables to help students improve their reading proficiency from an affective and motivational perspective such as reading self-efficacy beliefs. Therefore, this study suggests that the goal of English teachers with regard to reading comprehension should be help students maintain appropriate level of self-efficacy beliefs about their performance and efforts on reading comprehension.

References

- Anderson, J. R. (2005). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. London: Macmillan.
- Bandura, A. (1997). "Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change." *Psychological Review* 84(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1993). "Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning." *Educational Psychologist* 28(2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Baker, L. & Wigfield, A. (1999). "Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement." *Reading Research Quarterly* 34(4), 452-477.
- Barkley, J. M. (2006). "Reading education: Is self-efficacy important?" *Reading Improvement* 43(4), 194.
- Burrows, L. (2012). *The effects of extensive reading and reading strategies on reading self-Efficacy*. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC.
- Carrell, P. L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to

- second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, 26(01), 1-11.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 375-406.
- Grabe, W. P., & Stoller, F. L. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Reading*. London: Routledge.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & VonSecker, C. (2000). Effects of integrated instruction on motivation and strategy use in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(2), 331.
- Henk, W. A., & Melnick, S. A. (1995). The reader self-perception scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 48(6), 470-482.
- Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching second language reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jung, M. R. (2010). *Effects of verb-centered sentence writing activities on Korean EFL students' writing and reading activities*. PhD dissertation, Kyowon National University.
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review*, 31(3), 313.
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs instudent engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 119-137.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 90-99.
- Maeng, U. K. (2010). "Reading strategy instruction and reading comprehension of middle school students." *Study of English Language and Literature*, 52(2), 95-121.
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 276-295.
- Mori, S. (2002). Redefining motivation to read in a foreign language. *Reading in a Foreign language*, 14(2), 91.

- Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(1), 30.
- National Reading Panel (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction, from: <http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/report.cfm>.
- O'malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 543-578.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*(2), 139-158.
- Pintrich, P., & Schunk, D. (1996). The role of expectancy and self-efficacy beliefs. *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research & Applications, 3*.
- Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(2), 239-249.
- Sanford, K. L. (2015). *Factors that affect the reading comprehension of secondary students with disabilities*. PhD dissertation, San Francisco University.
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3-4), 207-231.
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2004). Self-efficacy in education revisited. *Big Theories Revisited, 4*, 115.
- Segalowitz, N., Poulsen, C., & Komoda, M. (1991). Lower level components of reading skill in higher level bilinguals: Implications for reading instruction. *AILA Review, 8*(1), 15-30.
- Shell, D. F., Murphy, C. C., & Bruning, R. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(1), 91.
- Shell, D. F., Colvin, C., & Bruning, R. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, attribution, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade-level and achievement-level differences. *Journal of Educational*

Psychology, 87(3), 386.

- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51(2), 663-671.
- Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.
- Stanovich, K. E. (2000). *Progress in understanding reading: Scientific foundations and new frontiers*. Delaware: Guilford Press.
- Stahl, S. A., & Hiebert, E. H. (2005). The "word factors": A problem for reading comprehension assessment. *Children's Reading Comprehension and Assessment*, 161-186.
- Swalander, L., & Taube, K. (2007). Influences of family based prerequisites, reading attitude, and self-regulation on reading ability. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32(2), 206-230.
- Tremblay, P. F., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(4), 505-518.
- Tunmer, W. E., & Chapman, J. W. (2002). The relation of beginning readers' reported word identification strategies to reading achievement, reading-related skills, and academic self-perceptions. *Reading and Writing*, 15(3-4), 341-358.
- Wang, ., & Wang, X. (2012). *Structural equation modeling: Applications Using Mplus*. NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wigfield, A. (1997). Reading motivation: A domain-specific approach to motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(2), 59-68.
- Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 420.
- Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. *Handbook of Reading Research*, 3, 403-422.
- Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(6), 299-310.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-regulation involves more than metacognition: A social cognitive perspective. *Educational psychologist*, 30(4), 217-221.

Appendix 1.

Reading Self-Efficacy Beliefs Questionnaire

1. 전혀 그렇지 않다, 2. 그렇지 않다, 3. 보통이다, 4. 그렇다, 5. 매우 그렇다

1	나는 영어 독해 학습이 시작되면 대부분의 내용을 잘 학습할 수 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
2	나는 영어 읽기 내용이 복잡하더라도 이해 할 때 까지 계속해서 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
3	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 시작하면 계획한 만큼은 꼭 끝을 내려고 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
4	나는 어렵다고 생각되는 내용이라도 읽고 이해할 수 있는 자신이 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
5	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 할 때 내가 세운 목표를 이룰 때 까지 끝까지 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
6	나는 별로 학습하고 싶지 않는 내용이라도 그것을 끝까지 읽는다.	1	2	3	4	5
7	나는 영어 독해를 잘 해야겠다고 일단 마음먹으면 즉시 시작한다.	1	2	3	4	5
8	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 할 때 대부분의 내용에서 자신감이 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
9	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 할 때 대체로 언제 어떻게 공부하면 효과적인지 잘 알고 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
10	내가 이용하는 영어 읽기 학습 방법은 대부분 효과가 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
11	내가 노력만 한다면 어려운 내용도 영어 독해를 잘할 수 있다고 믿는다.	1	2	3	4	5
12	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 할 때, 내가 어려움을 느끼는 이유를 대개는 알 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
13	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 할 때 아무리 어려운 상황에 생겨도 그런 상황을 잘 이겨낸다.	1	2	3	4	5
14	나는 새로운 영어 읽기 학습내용이 나오면 대개는 이해를 빠르게 하는 편이다.	1	2	3	4	5
15	나는 새로운 영어 읽기 내용을 배울 때 처음에 어려움을 느끼면 더욱 흥미가 생기는 편이다.	1	2	3	4	5
16	나는 복잡한 영어 읽기 학습 내용을 공부할 때면 대개 어떻게 공부를 해야 할지 스스로 정한다.	1	2	3	4	5
17	나는 공부할 때, 어려운 영어 독해 내용이 나오면 반드시 이해하고 넘어가고자 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
18	나는 영어 읽기 학습을 잘 할 수 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
19	나는 새로 배운 영어 읽기 학습 내용이 어렵다고 생각되면 이해할 때까지 노력을 계속한다.	1	2	3	4	5
20	나는 다른 사람의 도움 없이도 스스로 영어 읽기 학습을 시작할 수 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
21	나는 지금보다 앞으로 영어 읽기 성적을 더 올릴 수 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
22	나는 영어 읽기를 할 때 성적을 올리는 방법을 계속적으로 시도하려고 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
23	나는 영어 읽기 성적을 올리는 방법에 대해 잘 알고 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
24	내가 영어 읽기에서 나쁜 성적을 받더라도 나의 탓으로 돌리지 않는다.	1	2	3	4	5

Jaewoo Shim

Department of English Education, College of Education,
Chonbuk National University
664-1 Deokjin-dong Deokjin-gu
Jeonju, 561-756 Korea
Phone: 82-63-270-2729
Email: shimjw@jbnu.ac.kr

Heechul Lee

Department of English Education, College of Education,
Chonbuk National University
664-1 Deokjin-dong Deokjin-gu
Jeonju, 561-756 Korea
Phone: 82-63-270-2719
Email: hlee@jbnu.ac.kr

Seunghee Jin

Hosung Middle School
23 Baemasil-gil Deokjin-gu
Jeonju, 561-211 Korea
Phone: 82-63-253-6946
Email: wlstmdgml@hanmail.net

Received on September 27, 2016

Revised version received on October 5, 2016

Accepted on December 30, 2016