



The Effects of Raising Strategy-awareness on EFL Learners' Reading Achievement and Reading Self-efficacy in Different Educational Settings

Vista Bakhtiari
Yazd University

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to explore the impact of the cognitive reading strategy instruction on learners' reading self-efficacy and their reading achievement. In order to fulfill this purpose, from 120 participants, 90 intermediate EFL learners as an experimental group were chosen from three different educational settings namely, Yazd University, Yazd Science and Art University and Farzanegan Pre-University School and a control group of 30 learners also participated in this study. Another attempt was also made to study the effect of different educational settings on the raising awareness of EFL learners' reading strategies, their sense of self-efficacy and their reading achievement. To do so, some treatments on strategy awareness were defined and intervened. Data were collected by two piloted measuring instruments. The first one was a 20-item questionnaire which measured learners' reading self-efficacy and the other one was a reading proficiency test which measured the effectiveness of employing reading strategies on their reading performances. The results illustrated that the learners in the experimental groups showed statistically significant gains on reading achievement and sense of self-efficacy as compared with the control group. In addition, the results indicated that among the three educational settings, Yazd University and Farzanegan Pre-University had a significant effect on the reading comprehension and reading self-efficacy of the learners. The implications of the study for reading instructions among EFL learners across different educational contexts have been discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Reading is considered as one of the most important skills for second language learners to master in academic contexts (Grabe, 1991). Reading is an active and interactive cognitive process in which readers guess, predict and find information given in the written form. Cognitive reading strategy refers to those mental activities which lead language learners into using their language and world knowledge in order to accomplish a task (Oxford, 1990). Recently Iranian EFL context, especially the English course of all High School and Pre-University, has outlined the major importance of reading comprehension. While in learning a reading skill, the role of learners' belief about their capabilities is crucial, as this belief is the foundation for all other academic areas.

Over the last 15 years, some affective factors were the focus of research such as one's attitude and motivation toward reading, and one's reading self-efficacy along with the cognitive skills (Guthrie, Pernceovich, Tonks & Wigfield, 2004). These factors are very essential in determining whether the learners are able to accomplish the task. The learners' efficacy beliefs about their success in reading comprehension would impact their comprehension levels (Peyman, 2008). According to Pajares (2000), self-efficacy is the learners' judgments of their

academic competence, which has a great effect on the achievement and the performance of learners.

Some studies (e.g., Iravani & Atighia-ee, 2013; Khosravi, 2000; Motallebzadeh & Mamdoohi, 2011; Salataci & Akyel, 2002) highlighted the positive impact of reading strategy instruction on both reading comprehension of learners and also on their awareness of reading strategy use. Moreover, some other studies (Ghonsooly & Elahi, 2011; Naseri & Zaferanieh, 2012) focused on the positive significant correlation between reading self-efficacy and reading strategy use, and also illustrated that those high self-efficacious learners are more successful in using reading strategies than low self-efficacious ones.

However, Wang (2004) declared that a few studies were done on the area of self-efficacy and strategy use. As far as the review of related literature is concerned, so many studies (Kasser & Ryan, 1996; Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000) have been conducted on the areas of motivation (i.e. intrinsic and extrinsic), but a limited amount of research has examined the efficacy belief of learners in Iranian context specifically in Pre-University. However there is a great focus on the pivotal effect of reading strategy use on the better reading performances, the instructions of reading strategies were less emphasized by Iranian educational system (Fotovatian & Shokrpour, 2007).

Unfortunately, few intervention programs instruct explicitly cognitive reading strategy to develop reading comprehension. Furthermore, the effect of the cognitive reading strategy instruction on reading self-efficacy has not been fully examined especially among different educational settings in Iranian English learners. However, some studies have been conducted in other countries on these cases.

The present study is intended to investigate the effect of cognitive reading strategy instruction and reading self-efficacy on reading achievement and reading self-efficacy of intermediate EFL learners in three various educational settings namely, Yazd University, Pre University and Yazd Science and Art University, and further attempt is also made to study the effect of three different educational settings on the raising awareness of EFL learners' cognitive reading strategies, their sense of self-efficacy and their reading achievement.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

From 120 participants of the study, 30 freshmen were from Yazd Science and Art University majoring in English Translation, 30 freshmen were from Yazd University majoring in English Literature and the last group consisted of 30 participants from Farzanegan Pre-University School in Yazd and 30 freshmen were from Yazd University majoring in English Literature were considered as a control group because the treatment to all three experimental groups was the same, one control group was just chosen. All participants were English students whose native language is Persian.

Instruments

The Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT), Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (RSEQ) and Intermediate Select Readings Test (ISRT) were three measuring instruments in this study. Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was given to all the participants in order to homogenize the participants of the study in terms of their general English proficiency level. The total time allocated to completion of the test is 20 minutes. Those participants whose scores were above 28 out of 60 were considered as intermediate in terms of their language proficiency.

Learners' reading self-efficacy was evaluated based on reviewing the relevant scales of available reading self-efficacy questionnaires by Marie (1988); Gahungu (2009); Dohrman-Swain(1998) ; Hortwiz, (1985) ; Jinks and Morgan (1999). The questionnaire went through the validation process by conducting a pilot study. The developed Persian questionnaire was given to 20 learners in each three educational settings (i.e. Yazd Science and Art University, Yazd University and Farzanegan Pre-University School). Totally 60 participants, who were not involved in the actual study, participated in the pilot study. Some refinements were considered necessary. This was accomplished by modifying or omitting those items which were erroneous. These changes were implemented and validated (See appendix A)

Consequently, 20 items were left for testing reading self-efficacy. The participants were required to answer this questionnaire in order to express their belief about their capabilities in reading tasks on a five-point base Likert-scale (i.e., (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) no idea, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree). A time-limitation of 10 minutes was considered to complete this test. The possible range of scores is 1-100. The Cronbach alpha which turned out to be 0.84 in pretest reading self-efficacy and 0.90 in posttest was within the preferable range of reliability.

Eight reading texts with some multiple choice questions were selected from a recently published course book on reading named "Intermediate Select Readings Test" by Lee and Gudersen (2011). Each pre and posttest reading test contains four passages with 20 multiple choice questions, which were selected randomly in the form of odd and even from the above-mentioned book.

The time allotted for reading the passage and answering the questions was approximately 20-25 minutes. The correct answer to each item received one point. Scoring of the items was done through coding the correct and incorrect answers (1) and (0), respectively. The result of Cronbach alpha α was 0.71 for the pretest. For the posttest, the result of Cronbach alpha α was 0.75, which was within the acceptable range of reliability.

Procedures

The Oxford Quick Placement Test was given in one session to measure the proficiency level of the learners, and those subjects who were intermediate in English proficiency level were selected. In the next session, a reading comprehension test and reading self-efficacy questionnaires were given to the all experimental and control groups.

All participants in each three experimental groups were taught cognitive reading strategies which were adopted from Noorizadeh (2003). These strategies are such as finding main idea, unstated details, pronoun referents, and unknown words, answering stated details (scanning), implied details (inference) and the tone and purpose of the passage. In each three experimental groups, every session was allocated only to teach two of these reading strategies. However, the control group was not given any treatment.

After the treatment, both reading self-efficacy questionnaire and reading comprehension test were given to evaluate the success of treatment by measuring learner's performance in both a control group and three experimental groups.

RESULTS

To provide a more comprehensive view of the sample in the three experimental groups and a control group, descriptive statistics including Mean, Standard Deviation of pre and posttest scores for three groups are presented below. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 16) was manipulated in analyzing.

Table 1 shows, the mean scores and standard deviation of pre-RSEQ for each group such as Yazd University, Pre-University and Science and Art University are (M=71.47, SD=7.480), (M=71.42, SD=11.129), and (M=71.56, SD=8.706), respectively.

Table 1. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Pretest Scores of RSEQ in Three

Groups

Pretest of RSEQ	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Yazd University	34	71.47	7.480
Science and Art University	18	71.56	8.706
Pre-University	26	71.42	11.129

Note. RSEQ= Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire.

In table 2, regarding the pre-ISRT, the mean scores and standard deviations for Yazd University are (M=11.29, SD=2.456), for Pre-University are (M=12.54, SD=2.083) and for Science and Art University are (M=11.56, SD=1.688).

Table 2. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Pretest Scores of ISRT in Three

Groups

Pretest of ISRT	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Yazd University	34	11.29	2.456
Science and Art University	18	11.56	1.688
Pre-University	26	12.54	2.083

Note. ISRT= Intermediate Select Readings Test.

Table 3 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of post-ISRT for Yazd University are (M=13.97, SD=2.342), for Pre-University are (M= 15.35, SD=2.116) and for Science and Art University are (M=13.89, SD=1.568).

Table 3. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Post-ISRT in Three Groups

Posttest of ISRT	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Yazd University	34	13.97	2.342
Science and Art University	18	13.89	1.568
Pre-University	26	15.35	2.116

Regarding the mean scores in terms of post-RSEQ , as Table 4 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for Yazd University are (M=77.15,SD=8.334), for Pre-University are (M= 84.08, SD=7.647) and for Science and Art University are (M=79.99, SD=9.089).

Table 4. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Post-RSEQ in Three Groups

Posttest of RSEQ	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Yazd University	34	77.15	8.334
Science and Art University	18	79.99	9.089
Pre-University	26	84.08	7.647

There is an increase in the mean scores of the three groups in their posttests of RSEQ and ISRT compared to the ones obtained in their pretests as illustrated in Tables 1 and 2.

In order to ensure the normality of the distribution of the three groups on the data, the pre-tests were subjected to the application of One-Sample Kolomogorov-Smirnov (K-S). The results of K-S test, presented in Table 5, show that P values are greater than .05 level of significance, thus, indicating that the data is normally distributed; hence, this assumption of parametric tests was met.

Table 5. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normal Distribution

	Pre-ISRT	Pre-RSEQ
N	78	78
Normal Parameters ^a Mean	11.77	71.47
Std. Deviation	2.221	8.996
Most Extreme Absolute Differences	.100	.107
Positive	.100	.107
Negative	-.093	-.058
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	.880	.949
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.421	.329

A mixed between-within subjects ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there is any pre-existing difference between these three groups in terms of their reading achievement and reading self-efficacy; therefore, the results of Levene's tests were not significant at $p > .05$ indicating that the difference between variance is zero in each pretest.

Table 6. Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variances in Pre-RSEQ and Pre-ISRT

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Pre-ISRT	1.111	2	75	.334
Pre-RSEQ	1.727	2	75	.185

The first research question explored the relationship between reading comprehension and reading instruction, a paired-samples t-test was performed.

A comparison made between the mean scores of pre and post-ISR which reveals that there is a difference in the mean score of post-ISRT (M= 14.41, SD=2.189) compared to the pre-ISRT (M=11.77, SD=2.221).

Table 7. Mean Scores of the Pre- and Post-ISRT

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-ISRT	11.77	78	2.221	.251
	Post-ISRT	14.41	78	2.189	.248

Table 7 shows that whether the difference between the mean scores of the participants in pre- and post-ISRT is significant. The detailed description of the results of this analysis is presented in Table 8.

There was a statistically significant increase in post-ISRT (M=14.41, SD= 2.189) compared to the pre-ISRT (M= 11.77, SD= 2.221), $t(77)=9.22, p<.0005$. The increase of the mean scores in ISRT was 2.64 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 3.21 to 2.07. The eta squared statistic (0.52) indicated a large effect size.

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-ISRT–post-ISRT	-2.641	2.528	.286	-3.211	-2.071	-9.228	77	.000

For investigating the second question, another paired-samples t-test was run to evaluate the impact of the intervention on reading efficacy scores of the learners before and after the treatment. As Table 9 shows there is a difference in the mean score of post-RSEQ (M= 79.99, SD=8.733) compared to the pre-RSEQ (M=71.47, SD=8.996).

Table 9.Mean Scores of the Pre- and Post- RSEQ

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Pre-RSEQ	71.47	78	8.996	1.019
Post-RSEQ	79.99	78	8.733	.989

As Table 10 shows, there is a statistically significant increase in RSEQ scores in posttest (M= 79.99, SD= 8.733) compared to the pretest of RSEQ (M=71.47, SD= 8.996), $t(77)=9.33, p<.0005$. The increase of the mean scores in RSEQ was 8.52 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 10.330 to 6.696. The eta squared statistic (0.53) indicated a large effect size.

Table 10. Paired Samples T- Tests Comparing the Performance of the Groups in the Pre- and Post- RSEQ

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-RSEQ–post-RSEQ	-8.513	8.058	.912	-10.330	-6.696	-9.330	77	.000

In order to explore the third question about the impact of three educational settings on reading self-efficacy and reading achievement of the participants across two time periods in pretest and posttest, a mixed between-within subjects ANOVA was run.

As Table 11 shows there is a significant interaction effect between the two intervals (i.e. pre and posttests of RSEQ and ISRT)and the three educational settings, Wilks Lambda=.82,F(6,146)=2.41,p=.03, partial eta squared=.09 and the effect size was moderate.

Table 11. A Between- Subjects ANOVA of the Group Performance and the Three Educational Settings

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Test*group Wilks' Lambda	.828	2.412	6.000	146.000	.030	.090

Since there was a main effect for the test scores in pre and posttests, a one-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to see where this difference lies.

Table 12 shows there is a statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level in the scores of post-ISRT: $F(2,75)=3.83, p=0.02$ and post-RSEQ: $F(2,75)=5.19, P=0.008$ in the three educational settings. However, there was no statistically significant difference in the results of pre-ISRT: $F(2, 75) = 2.51, p=0.08$ and pre-RSEQ: $F(2, 75) = 0.001, p=0.99$.

Table 12. A One-Way Between-Group ANOVA of Pre and Posttest of ISRT and RSEQ

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pre-ISRT	Between Groups	23.881	2	11.941	2.516	.088
	Within Groups	355.965	75	4.746		
	Total	379.846	77			
Post-ISRT	Between Groups	34.239	2	17.119	3.837	.026
	Within Groups	334.633	75	4.462		
	Total	368.872	77			
Pre-RSEQ	Between Groups	.188	2	.094	.001	.999
	Within Groups	6231.261	75	83.083		
	Total	6231.449	77			
Post-RSEQ	Between Groups	714.432	2	357.216	5.194	.008
	Within Groups	5158.555	75	68.781		
	Total	5872.987	77			

A Post-hoc test was run to see where the difference exactly lies among the three educational settings. Post-hoc comparisons using the Turkey HSD test indicates that the mean scores of the post-ISRT for Yazd University group ($M=13.97$, $SD= 2.34$) and Pre-University group ($M= 15.35$, $SD= 2.11$) are significantly different from each other. However, Science and Art University group ($M=13.89$, $SD= 1.56$) did not differ significantly from either Yazd University group ($M=13.97$, $SD= 2.34$) and Pre-University group ($M= 15.35$, $SD= 2.11$).

The mean scores of the post-RSEQ for Yazd University group ($M=77.15$, $SD=8.334$) and Pre-University group ($M= 84.08$, $SD=7.647$) are significantly different from each other. Science and Art University group ($M=79.99$, $SD=9.089$) did not differ significantly from either Yazd University group ($M=77.15$, $SD=8.334$) and Pre-University group ($M= 84.08$, $SD=7.647$).

Table 13. Multiple Comparisons of the Three Educational Settings

Dependent Variable		(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Post-ISRT	Tukey HSD	Yazd University	Pre-University	-1.376*	.550	.038	-2.69	-.06
			Science and Art University	.082	.616	.990	-1.39	1.55
		Pre-University	Yazd University	1.376*	.550	.038	.06	2.69
			Science and Art University	1.457	.648	.069	-.09	3.01
		Science and Art University	Yazd University	-.082	.616	.990	-1.55	1.39
			Pre-University	-1.457	.648	.069	-3.01	.09
Post-RSEQ	Tukey HSD	Yazd University	Pre-University	-6.930*	2.161	.006	-12.10	-1.76
			Science and Art University	-2.297	2.417	.610	-8.08	3.48
		Pre-University	Yazd University	6.930*	2.161	.006	1.76	12.10
			Science and Art University	4.632	2.543	.169	-1.45	10.71
		Science and Art University	Yazd University	2.297	2.417	.610	-3.48	8.08
			Pre-University	-4.632	2.543	.169	-10.71	1.45

CONCLUSION

Applying the results obtained from analyzing the data, the research questions addressed in the current study will be responded to in this section which is organized as follows:

1. Does EFL reading instruction have an effect on intermediate EFL learners' reading comprehension?

This study indicated that cognitive reading strategy instruction improves the performances of learners in their learning of reading comprehension. The above-mentioned result of the present study is consistent with the findings of Motallebzadeh and Mamdoohi (2011) that highlighted the significant effect of cognitive reading strategy on reading comprehension of the learners. The authors declared that cognitive reading strategies (i.e., skimming, scanning, inferences and key words) are the effective strategies in raising learners' scores on the reading component, and also suggested that the instructors should persuade the less skilled learner to observe the skilled learner's strategies and practice more. In addition, the teachers should create an environment in which the learners can practice strategies more. The same result of significant effect of cognitive strategy instruction on the reading component is

also manifested in the study of Salataci and Akyel (2002) who pinpointed the same result of the present study. Similarly, Iravani and Atghia-ee (2013) found that skimming and scanning reading skills as cognitive strategies helped the learners to have better reading performances compared to the control group which did not received these treatments. In the same vein, Khosravi (2000) highlighted the significant effect of both scanning and skimming as two cognitive reading strategies on learners' reading comprehension, all these findings, which pinpointed the significant effect of skimming and scanning reading strategies on learners' better reading performances, are in aligned with the findings of the present study.

On the other hand, Karami and Hashemian (2012) investigated the impact of metacognitive and cognitive reading strategies instruction on the reading comprehension of the learners. It was realized that as far as the cognitive strategy use is concerned, both groups (i.e., adult and young) were alike in their performance after cognitive reading instruction which is not in accord with the findings of the present study, since in current study, after receiving cognitive strategy instruction, the performances of the participants were not the same as their performances in their pretest and also their reading comprehension improved after the treatment.

Regarding the impact of language learning strategies on reading comprehension performance, Alsamadani's (2009) study demonstrated that there is not a linear relationship between the use of reading strategies and reading comprehension level. There are some other factors that should be focused such as vocabulary knowledge, purpose of the study and motivation for the reading. As in this study we focused on the reading self-efficacy.

2. Does EFL reading instruction have an effect on intermediate EFL learners' reading self-efficacy?

By comparing the scores of the learners in pretest and posttest of reading self-efficacy, we can claim that cognitive reading strategy instruction has a significant effect on the learners' belief about their reading ability which can confirm this claim that cognitive reading strategy instruction has a significant effect on their reading self-efficacy. This result is in line with the finding of a study by Aghaei and Pillage (2011) in which the effect of instructing cognitive and metacognitive strategies on 120 EFL University learners' reading comprehension and their self-efficacy was measured. The study claimed the beneficial effect of these reading strategies' instruction on the learners' reading strategy comprehension and their reading self-efficacy. However, present study investigated only the role of cognitive reading strategy, but got the same result of the improvement in the performance of the learners in both reading comprehension and reading self-efficacy.

Similarly other studies were conducted by McMurray (2006), NokhbehRousta and Ghazi MirSaeed (2012), which investigated the effect of the metacognitive strategy on the reading self-efficacy and reading comprehension. The result revealed that metacognitive reading instruction has a positive effect on reading self-efficacy and reading achievement of the participants. Despite the fact that the strategy used in these studies (i.e. metacognitive) is different from the one used in the present study (i.e. cognitive), the beneficial effect of reading instruction on reading comprehension is pinpointed in these three studies. In addition, the positive impact of reading instruction on reading self-efficacy is highlighted in both studies.

Some studies confirmed the links or the correlations between language learning strategy use and self-efficacy such as Ghonsooly and Elahi (2011); Naseri and Zaferanieh (2012). These studies reported that learners' sense of efficacy beliefs would be effected by their uses of language learning strategies. In other words, high efficacious learners employed more strategies and resulted in a better learning outcome. It is declared that when learners have enough knowledge of language strategy use, their belief about their reading abilities would be

increased. Accordingly, those learners with high self-efficacy show more motivation and engagement in the classroom and result into better achievement.

3. Do three educational settings have a significant impact on EFL learners' reading self-efficacy and their reading achievement?

In Pre-University, all the learners tried hard to be accepted in competitive National Entrance Exam (Konkur), to fulfill this purpose, most of the instructors focused on presenting so many reading materials and practicing reading strategies that could help them to answer the comprehension questions properly. Another reason is that, konkur exam is a paper and pencil test and also all the items are in a multiple-choice form and they are mostly based on reading and other skills such as listening, speaking and writing are neglected. The reasons of the increasing posttest-ISRT of Pre-University learners are in line with Hajhashemi and Wong (2012), which declared that Pre-University students have one English book which is mostly reading-oriented and the main focus is on enhancing the reading abilities of the learners. However, Pre-University instructors should be trained to know how to teach the learners reading strategies and they should be aware of the significant role of reading strategies use in learners' reading comprehension.

Similarly, Marzaban, 2008; Kamyab, 2008; Rahimi, Riazi, and Saif, 2008; Zare and Mobarakeh, 2011 claimed in their studies that the main trend of Iran's educational system is toward the reading skill and other three skills were disregarded because in most of the Iranian academic situations it seems to be ineffective and impractical to teach oral or listening language teaching in the classroom. In fact, all the final exams in High school and Pre-University are in a form of paper and pencil. This leads the attention toward more reading and comprehension skills than other three skills. Moreover, Hosseini and Jahangard (2007) asserted that students' listening and speaking skills are less emphasized in the Iranian EFL textbooks and are not being tested in the final exams during the three years of senior high school and one year of pre-university education; however, more attention is given to the comprehension skills and practices. Moreover, Iranian educational policies also put more emphasis on the reading skill of the learners.

According to the reading-based courses of Pre-University learners and also the reading-oriented materials such as novel, critical materials, short stories and so forth for the learners majoring English Literature in Yazd University, less attention was concentrated on the teaching of other skills such as listening, speaking and writing. Because they are mostly dealing with reading-oriented tasks, it is supposed that these learners are setting a goal when reading texts in a way that they follow some reading strategies. Since one of the sources of cultivating self-efficacy is goal-setting, that is a learning experience that can create an opportunity for the learners to foster their efficacy beliefs. As a result, the sense of efficacy of these learners would be improved. Consequently, those efficacious learners are more goal-oriented. Similarly, Page-Voth and Graham (1999) found that those participants who set a goal in their writing were significantly more efficacious about writing as compared to students who did not develop goals. Specific goals will boost performance by specifying the required effort for being successful. Having specific goals promote self-efficacy in the learners.

It appeared that majority of the learners in Yazd University and Pre-University have reading strategy use experience, so they make use of their reading experiences in their academic assignment. In turn, they can realize that their previous performances and experience in reading tasks have helped them to get better achievement on reading tasks and also this academic experience fosters their efficacy beliefs. This is due to the fact that as one of the ways of enhancing efficacy beliefs is mastery experience. This mastery experiences have played a pivotal role in learners' achievement. While the learners in these settings are more successful

in their reading performance, they will receive positive verbal message or social persuasion from their instructors which is another factor to enhance self-efficacy.

It was manifested that the learners' performances in Yazd Science and Art University did not differ significantly from the performances of learners in both Yazd University and Pre-University in terms of reading achievement and reading self-efficacy. This can be due to the educational system which is applicable in Yazd Science and Art University. Since the learners are studying English translation, the type of instruction offered in this university is mostly based on the grammar translation method (GTM) which emphasized on the explicit instruction of grammatical rules and unknown vocabulary meanings, use of L1 as the medium of instruction, and also translation from the first language (Persian) to the second language (English) and vice versa, and less attention is on being familiar with reading strategy use. Accordingly, they transfer reading strategies from their native language into their second language which is not effective in assisting them to be successful in their reading comprehension. As a result, when they interpret their failure in their reading tasks, then their self-efficacy would be decreased in turn.

Appendix

Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (RSEQ)

Dear students please read the questions carefully and put a × for the answers.

Imagine that you read a reading text, to what extent are you sure that you can do every parts of the below questions perfectly?

Name :

age:

Sex:

	Very disagree	disagree	No idea	Agree	Very agree
1-I have an especial ability to progress in reading comprehension skills.					
2- I'm sure if I practice reading comprehension skills more, I'll get better grades in reading lessons.					
3- My classmates usually score better					

than me in reading skills.					
4- Although it is difficult to practice reading and understanding a text in a class, I can use some skills to answer most of the questions.					
5- I'm one of the best language learners in the reading comprehension class.					
6- In reading comprehension classes, whenever a teacher asks a question, however I'm not sure of my answers, I answer it voluntarily.					
7- I can concentrate on the text that I read.					
8- I'm sure that my level of proficiency in reading skills will improve soon.					

9- Compared to other language learners, I think my performance is better at understanding and summarizing texts.					
10- I can read a text fast and correctly.					
11- I can guess the meanings of new words while reading.					
12- I can read and understand the manual for home appliances and office equipment.					
13- I can read a text for fun and entertainment.					
14- I can understand the main idea of a text that I read.					
15- I can motivate myself to improve my reading comprehension skills.					

16- I can stay focused when I read a difficult text.					
17- I'm proficient in reading skills.					
18- I'm sure that I can use an English text to do things in a real situation, such as finding a place through the English manual.					
19- I can answer the questions related to the reading text correctly.					
20- I can do reading assignment on my own.					

REFERENCES

- Aghaei, R., &Pillaie, S. (2011). On the explicit instruction of cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies in reading performance and self-efficacy. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7 (5), 98-118.
- Alsamadani, H. A. (2009). The relationship between Saudi EFL college-level students' use of reading strategies and their EFL reading comprehension. *Curriculum and Instruction, Reading Arts and Language Arts Education*, p:173.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1994). *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87-99.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. New York, Longman.
- Cohen, A. D. (2007). Being a strategic language learner in CALL. *Applied Language Learning*, 17, 57-71.
- Dohrman-Swain, K. (1998). Participation in curriculum-based measurement with goal setting and teacher feedback: effects on reading achievement, goal knowledge, and reading self-efficacy. PhD dissertation, Department of Special Education, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Duffy, G. (1993). Rethinking strategy instruction: four teachers' development and their low achievers' understanding. *Elementary School Journal*, 93, 231 – 247.
- Ediger, M. (2001). Testing and evaluating student achievement in reading. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED455498)
- Fotovatian, S., & Shokrpour, N. (2007). Comparison of the efficiency of reading comprehension strategies on Iranian university students' comprehension. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 37(2), 47-63.
- Gahungu, O. N. (2009). *Strategy Use, Self-Efficacy, and Language Ability: Their Relationship*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Ghonsooly, B., & Elahi, M. (2011). Learners' Self-efficacy in reading and its relation to foreign language reading anxiety and reading achievement. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 53, p:217.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 375-406
- Hajhashemi, K and Wong, B. E. (2012). MI as a predictor of students' performance in reading competency English Language Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 240-251. Retrieved from <http://works.bepress.com/hajhashemi/2>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1985). Surveying student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course, *Foreign Language Annals*, 18(4), 333-340.
- Hosseini, S. M. H. (2007). ELT in higher education in Iran and India: A critical view. *Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow*, 7, 1-11
- Iravani, H., and Atghia-ee, F. (2013). The effects of skimming and scanning via a multimedia CD on the reading comprehension of Iranian female English Translation students. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, (9) 3.
- Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 9(2), 130-150.
- Jinks, J. & Morgan, V. (1999). Children's perceived academic self-efficacy: An inventory scale. *The Clearing House*, 72 (4), 224-230.

- Karami, S., & Hashemian, M. (2012). The relationship between (meta)cognitive strategies and reading comprehension in Iranian female L2 learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(4), 58-68.
- Kasser, T., and Ryan, R.M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 280-287.
- Khosravi, A. A. (2000). The effect of scanning and skimming on the rate of and reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. Masterthesis, Shiraz University, Iran.
- Lee, L. and Gundersen, E. (2011). *Intermediate Select Readings*. Oxford University Press.
- Marie, L. Ch. (1988). The influence of interest, vocabulary difficulty and print size on the situation-specific reading self-efficacy of high achieving and low achieving high school readers. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Mastropieri, M.A., & Scruggs, T.E. (1997). Best practices in promoting reading comprehension in students with learning disabilities: 1976-1996. *Remedial and Special Education*, 18, 197-213.
- McMurray, E. L. (2006). The Impact of metacognitive college reading course on students' comprehension, reading self-efficacy, and subsequent English course grades. Ph.D dissertation, Department of Teacher Education, Brigham Young University.
- Motallebzadeh, K., & Mamdoohi, N. (2011). Language Learning Strategies: A Key Factor to Improvement of TOEFL Candidates' Reading Comprehension Ability. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Naseri, M., and Zaferanieh, E. (2012). The relationship between reading self-efficacy beliefs, reading strategy use and reading comprehension level of Iranian EFL learners, *World Journal of Education*, 2(2).
- Nokhbehrousta, S., & Ghazi MirSaeed, S.J. (2012). The effect of teaching metacognitive reading strategies on reading self-efficacy of Iranian intermediate EFL students. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 2(11), 10-20.
- Noorizadeh, A. (2003). A study of the effects of direct teaching of TOEFL reading comprehension section test skills on the success of test takers in TOEFL examination (Unpublished M.A dissertation). English Language Department. Yazd University.
- Oettingen, G. (1997). Culture and future thought. *Culture & Psychology*, 3, 353-381. doi:10.1177/1354067X9733008
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford English Placement Test. (2001). *Oxford English Placement Test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). Language learning strategies and beyond: a look at strategies in the context of styles. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.). *Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner*. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 35-55.

- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78 (1), 12-25.
- Page-Voth, V., & Graham, S. (1999). Effects of goal setting and strategy use on the writing performance and self-efficacy of students with writing and learning problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 230-240.
- Pajares, F. (2000). Self-efficacy beliefs and current directions in self-efficacy research. Retrieved June, 2008 from <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/effpage.html>.
- Peyman, N. (2008). Developing foreign language reading self-efficacy scale and using self-efficacy interventions and concept map as a scaffolding tool to increase students' reading self-efficacy and comprehension. (Unpublished M.A dissertation) , English Department, Tarbiat Modares University.
- Rahimi, M., Riazi, A., & Saif, S. (2008). An investigation into the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2): 31-60.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya. (2002). Methodology in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190>
- Salataci, R., & Akyel, A. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. *Reading in a foreign language*, 14(1). 234-255.
- Sansone, C., and Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Wang, R. F. (2004). Action, verbal response and spatial reasoning. *Cognition*, 94, 185-192.
- 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).
- Zare, M; Mobarakeh, S. D. (2011). The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Use of Reading Strategies: The Case of Iranian Senior High School Students. *Studies in Literature and Language*. 3(3), 98-105.

Vista Bakhtiari is an English Teacher at Sama University, where she has been teaching EFL reading and researching. Her interests are EFL reading, motivation and research in ELT.

Email: azbo.csq@gmail.com