

Spring 2017

Reading Comprehension and Self Efficacy

Brittany Conway
Governors State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://opus.govst.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Conway, Brittany, "Reading Comprehension and Self Efficacy" (2017). *All Capstone Projects*. 283.
<http://opus.govst.edu/capstones/283>

For more information about the academic degree, extended learning, and certificate programs of Governors State University, go to
http://www.govst.edu/Academics/Degree_Programs_and_Certifications/

Visit the [Governors State Multicategorical Special Education Department](#)

This Project Summary is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Capstone Projects at OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. For more information, please contact opus@govst.edu.

Acknowledgments

I would like to first thank Dr. Boudreau for his guidance and support over the past year. I would also like to thank my parents for always being there for me throughout my education and encouraging me along my journey. I want thank my brother, Mike, and sister, Courtney, for always lending me a helping hand and being my comic relief. I would also like to thank my boyfriend, Scott, for always being understanding during this challenging semester and constantly encouraging me and supporting me. Lastly, I would like to thank my fellow GSU classmate, Stacy, for being an amazing and supportive friend over the past two years as we completed our Master's Degree together.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vi
Abstract	2
Chapter I: Introduction	3
Problem Statement	5
Purpose of Study	5
Questions of the Study	5
Assumptions and Limitations	6
Significance of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	7
Chapter Summary	8
Chapter II: Review of Literature	9
Special Education Legislation	9
Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka	9
Mills vs. District of Columbia Board of Education	10
Hendrick Hudson Central School District Board of Education vs. Rowley	11
Section 504 Rehab Act of 1973	12
Education for all Handicapped Children Act	12
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990)	13
Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004)	13

Learning Disability	14
Reading Disability	15
Five Pillars of Reading	16
Reading Comprehension	16
Features of Reading that Affect Reading Comprehension	17
Self-Efficacy	19
Effect of Self-Efficacy on Academic Achievement	20
Effect of Self-Efficacy on Reading Comprehension	21
Chapter Summary	24
Chapter III: Methodology	26
Participants	26
Instrumentation	26
Map Assessment	27
Reader Self-Perception Scale	27
Procedures	28
Data Collection	29
MAP Assessment	29
Reader Self-Perception Scale	29
Data Analysis	30
Chapter Summary	30
Chapter IV: Results	31

Descriptives	31
Relationships	32
Chapter Summary	33
Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusion	35
Discussion	35
Conclusion	36
Educational Implications	36
Recommendations for Further Research	37
Summary	38
References	40
Appendix A: Parent/Guardian Informed Consent Form	44
Appendix B: CITI Certification	46

List of Tables

Table 1: Prevalence of children aged 3-21 served under IDEA by disability type (2013-2014)	3
Table 2: Reader Self Perception Scale Example Statements	32
Table 3: MAP and Self-Efficacy Descriptives by Group	33

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Parent/Guardian Informed Consent Form	44
Appendix B: CITI Certification	46

READING COMPREHENSION AND SELF EFFICACY

Brittany Conway

Prepared in Partial Fulfillment of the
Masters of Arts Degree in Multicategorical Special Education
Governors State University

2017

Abstract

This study investigated whether or not there is a correlation between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores at Smith High School. There were 24 students that participated in this study. Eight of those students were in special education and have an identified reading disability, eight were students in general education, and eight were in honors level reading. There were two instruments used in the study. One instrument used in the study was the MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) Assessment (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017), which was used to measure reading comprehension. The Reader Self-Perception Scale (Henk & Melnick, 1995) was used to assess overall self-efficacy in addition to four sub categories of self-efficacy including (a) progress, (b) observational comparison, (c) social feedback, and (d) psychological states. A moderate correlation was found between reading comprehension and general perception. A moderate correlation was also found between reading comprehension and the social feedback sub-scale. Only one sub-scale, observational comparison (OC) was found to be highly correlated with reading MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) scores.

Key Terms: Reading Comprehension, Self-Efficacy, Correlation

Chapter 1

Introduction

According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, any student, age 3 through 22, is eligible for special education services if they have a disability which adversely impacts their education and falls into one of the 14 categories of disability (Yell, 2016). The 14 categories of disability and their associated number of children served are displayed in Table 1:

Table 1

Prevalence of children aged 3-21 served under IDEA by disability type (2013-2014)

IDEA Disability Type	Percentage of children served
Autism	8.3
Deaf-blindness	>1
Developmental delay	6.3
Emotional disturbance	5.5
Hearing impairment	1.2
Intellectual disability	6.6
Multiple disabilities	2.0
Orthopedic impairment	0.9
Other health impairment	12.6
Specific learning disability	35.0
Speech or language impairment	20.6
Traumatic brain injury	0.4
Visual impairment	0.4

Note. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs,

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Retrieved, from

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/state-level-data-files/index.html>.

One of those categories is specific learning disability (Yell, 2016). A student with a learning disability experiences significant difficulty in one or more of the following areas: (a) listening,

(b) speaking, (c) reading, (d) writing, (e) reading, or (f) mathematics (Hallahan, Kauffman & Pullen, 2009).

There are a couple of different ways that a student can be identified as having a specific learning disability in the area of reading (Caldwell, Jennings, & Learner, 2010). One way to determine if a student has a reading disability is to assess if there is a difference in the students expected reading level for their grade and their actual reading level (Caldwell et al., 2010). Another way to identify the presence of a reading disability is to assess if there is a discrepancy between a student's intelligence test scores and standardized reading test scores (Caldwell et al., 2010). It is determined that a student has a reading disability if there is a large gap in the student's reading potential and reading achievement scores (Caldwell et al., 2010).

According to Cervetti and Hiebert (2015), in 2000, the National Reading Panel (NRP) identified five essential components of reading that they referred to as the five pillars of reading. The five pillars include (a) phonemic awareness, (b) phonics, (c) fluency, (d) vocabulary, and (e) comprehension (Cervetti & Hiebert, 2015). One of the five pillars, reading comprehension, refers to a student's ability to construct meaning from what they read (Hallahan et al., 2009). Reading comprehension includes both literal comprehension and higher-level comprehension (Caldwell et al., 2010).

Self-efficacy is a term that was made popular by Albert Bandura in the 1970s (Liao, 2015). Self-efficacy refers to a person's belief about their ability to perform a task (Liao, 2015). According to Liao (2015), "Bandura (1977) suggested that efficacy beliefs for tasks could determine activity choice, as well as willingness to persist and persevere in a task" (p. 8). The research is mixed as to whether self-efficacy is a predictor of reading comprehension ability (Liao, 2015).

Problem Statement

Caldwell et al. (2010) state that “seventy-four percent of children who are unsuccessful at reading in third grade are still unsuccessful in ninth grade” (p. 5). There are multiple reasons as to why it is important to research and identify possible factors, such as self-efficacy, that might be contributing to prolonged reading problems (Caldwell et al., 2010). The first reason why we must identify possible factors contributing to prolonged reading problems is that “low level readers are particularly at risk in content area subjects such as science, social studies, and health” (Caldwell et al., 2010, p. 18). Students fall behind in these subjects because they cannot comprehend the textbook content. Another reason why we must identify possible factors contributing to prolonged reading problems is that in today’s advanced technological world, an individual’s potential for employment often depends on whether they are an efficient reader or not (Caldwell et al., 2010).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores. Bandura (1977) believed that self-efficacy and motivation were directly related. In turn, a student with high self-efficacy would be likely to put forth more effort in order to become a better reader.

Questions of the Study

The focus of this study was to compare the self-efficacy of high school students to their reading comprehension scores. Is there a correlation between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores at Smith High School? To what extent are these two variables positively or negatively correlated?

Assumptions and Limitations

There is an assumption that not all students who participated in the study filled out the self-efficacy instrument in an honest manner. Also, there is an assumption that students could have rushed through the reading comprehension instrument, and therefore, scores might not accurately represent their true reading comprehension level.

Significance of the Study

A positive correlation between self-efficacy and reading comprehension scores would indicate that there is need for more emotional support in the area of self-efficacy. Because reading problems have been shown to extend from the elementary to the secondary level, it will be important to emotionally support students with reading disabilities and reading difficulties from a young age all the way until they finish high school.

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be discussed throughout the study:

Reading Comprehension. Reading comprehension refers to the ability to gain meaning from what one has read (Hallahan, Kauffman & Pullen, 2009). Hallahan et al. (2009) state that “reading too slowly or in a halting manner interferes with a person’s ability to comprehend text” (p. 197). According to Caldwell et al., 2010, “The many levels of comprehension include drawing on background experiences, literal comprehension, higher-level-comprehension, and the ability to study and learn from text” (p. 17). The two types of reading comprehension include narrative comprehension, which refers to stories and novels, and expository comprehension, which refers to informational material such as science books (Caldwell et al., 2010).

Reading Fluency. According to Hallahan, Kauffman and Pullen (2009), “Reading fluency refers to the ability to read effortlessly and smoothly” (p. 197). Students need to be able to read words quickly and fluently otherwise reading becomes too much work and, therefore, an unenjoyable task (Caldwell et al., 2010). The study will discuss reading fluency in chapter 2 as a factor that impacts reading comprehension.

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a belief that helps determine how much effort an individual will put forth during an activity, how long they will stick it out when confronting obstacles, and quick they are to bounce back from difficult or unfamiliar situations (Varney, 2010). According to Henk and Melnick (1995), “Bandura defines self-efficacy as a person’s judgements of her or his ability to perform an activity, and the effect this perception has on the on-going and future conduct of the activity” (p. 471). The study will measure self-efficacy using the Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS) (Henk & Melnick, 1995).

Specific Learning Disability. Specific learning disability is one of the 14 categories of IDEA in which a student can qualify for special education services if their education is adversely impacted by the disability (Yell, 2016). Learning disability is a general term that represents a group of different disorders (Hallahan et al., 2009). A student with a learning disability experiences significant difficulty in one or more of the following areas: (a) listening, (b) speaking, (c) reading, (d) writing, (e) reading, or (f) mathematics (Hallahan et al., 2009).

Chapter Summary

Students who are diagnosed as having a reading disability at a young age often find that they still experience reading difficulties once they reach high school (Caldwell et al., 2010). It is possible that factors such as self-efficacy are contributing to the reading comprehension problems plaguing students with reading disabilities. Is there a correlation between reading comprehension scores and self-efficacy amongst students with reading disabilities?

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

This chapter begins by reviewing legislation that strongly impacted special education. LaNear and Frattura (2007) discuss important cases such as *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka* and *Mills vs. District of Columbia Board of Education*, while (Kehoe, 1994) highlights important aspects of *Hendrick Hudson Central School District Board of Education vs. Rowley*. Section 504 Rehab Act of 1973 as well as The Education for All Handicapped Children Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 and 2004 are also discussed (Jones, 2015; LaNear & Frattura, 2007; Madaus & Shaw, 2006; Weber, 2010). Import aspects of reading comprehension and self-efficacy are also discussed along with research related to both topics.

Special Education Legislation

Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka. According to LaNear and Frattura (2007), “Though it was decided within the context of racial inequality, *Brown* is often referenced as the beginning legal point for equal educational opportunities for all students, including those with disabilities” (p. 92). LaNear and Frattura (2007) note that this case is often considered to be the most noteworthy case in United States educational history. In this case, the Supreme Court was asked to decide the constitutionality of segregation in public schools (LaNear & Frattura, 2007). The Court ended up reversing *Plessy vs. Ferguson*, which stated that schools should be separate but equal (LaNear & Frattura, 2007). LaNear and Frattura (2007) explain that states were ordered to work to achieve desegregation at a ‘deliberates speed’. They also note that “When states attempted to implement desegregation plans, other factors such as housing patterns continued to frustrate the true integration of schools. Even under court-ordered desegregation plans, schools often remained segregated” (p. 93). According to Gabriel (2016), “Immediately after *Brown*, the

Georgia legislature enacted legislation to defund any local school system that desegregated” (p. 636). Gabril (2016) also notes that “Vouchers were to be provided to parents who sent their children to private schools that arose in a desegregated school system” (p. 636). LaNear and Frattura (2007) explain that there is irony in the Brown case because it ended up creating categories of separation for African American students and students with disabilities that it intended to get rid of.

Mills vs. District of Columbia Board of Education. According to LaNear and Frattura (2007), “Mills, addressed the exclusion of ‘exceptional children (mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, physically ‘handicapped’, hyperactive and other children with behavioral problems)’ from Washington, D.C. public schools. They explain that this was a class action law suit that was based on the grounds that due process rights and equal protection rights were being violated. This case was eventually settled between the plaintiffs and the Board of Education. They state that “As part of the settlement, the Board of Education agreed to provide the plaintiff children with a ‘publicly supported education suited to their (plaintiff’s) needs” (p. 95). They explain that the Board did not end up following through with the settlement. LaNear and Frattura (2007), elaborate on this stating that “The Board objected to providing ‘exceptional children’ with publicly supported education, asserting that it would be unfair to the ‘normal children’ because they were already receiving an education that would be hampered by the shift in funds” (p. 95). The Court found this excuse to be absurd and referenced the Brown case to justify their rationale (LaNear & Frattura, 2007). The Court concluded that “The Board of Education was ‘required by the Constitution of the United States, the District of Columbia Code, and their own regulations to provide a publicly supported education for these “exceptional children”’” (p. 95). This case is widely considered to be a milestone in special education law (LaNear & Frattura, 2007).

Hendrick Hudson Central School District Board of Education vs. Rowley. At the center of this case was a deaf child named Amy Rowley living in New York (Kehoe, 1994). Amy received special education and related services when her local committee on special education determined that she needed the services in order to benefit educationally (Kehoe, 1994). Amy's parents agreed with the school that she would trial kindergarten in a general education classroom with an FM hearing aid. When it came time to plan for first grade, Amy's parents wanted her to have an full-time sign language interpreter (Kehoe, 1994). An interpreter was trialed in kindergarten for a short period and the interpreter and the school felt that Amy did not need those services (Kehoe, 1994). Amy's parents then went to due process to advocate that she needed a full-time interpreter (Kehoe, 1994). The hearing officer sided with the district and found that Amy did not need an interpreter to achieve academic and social success (Kehoe, 1994). Amy's parents then brought the case to the District Court (Kehoe, 1994). According to Kehoe (1994), "The district court concluded that Amy was not receiving a free appropriate public education as guaranteed in the act, which the court defined as "an opportunity to achieve [her] potential commensurate with the opportunity provided to other children"" (p. 19). Kehoe (1994) notes that the case was then brought to the Supreme Court where they found that "The district court's interpretation of the act and the second circuit's affirmation of that decision faulty" (p. 19). Kehoe (1994) also mentions that the reaching of this conclusion "drew on the legislative history leading up to the passage of the act and what it viewed as the plain language of the act in defining "free appropriate public education."" (p. 19). According to Kehoe (1994), understanding the decision and how the court reached it is important for all school administrators who have students with disabilities in their schools. Kehoe (1994) explains, "The Court was clearly interpreting the act to mean that students with disabilities, while entitled to

receive a "free appropriate public education," are not entitled, sometimes at great expense, to programs and services that go far beyond the "benefit" standard" (p. 19).

Section 504 Rehab Act of 1973. Section 504 is a provision of The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (LaNear & Frattura, 2007). According to LaNear and Frattura (2007), It stated that:

No otherwise qualified individual with a disability in the United States ... shall, solely by reason of her or his disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (p. 100)

Since just about every school in America receives some type of federal funding, section 504 greatly impacted public education (LaNear & Frattura, 2007). Section 504 defines disability as "A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of an individual, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment" (Weber, 2010, p. 5). Weber (2010) explains that the Supreme Court noted that although the language sounds broad is should be read narrowly. According to Weber (2010):

The Court held that to be substantially limited in the major life activity of performing manual tasks, an individual must be prevented or severely restricted "from doing activities that are of central importance to most people's daily lives," and that the impairment's impact must be "permanent or long term" (p. 6).

According to Weber (2010), "Other courts followed the Supreme Court's example and adopted their own restrictive readings of the definitional provisions" (p. 6).

Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This act was passed by congress in 1975 (Jones, 2015). Jones (2015) states that:

This law was written to assure that all children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education emphasizing special education and related services designed to meet their needs to assure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents are protected to provide education for children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities. (p. 17)

According to Jones (2015), “Prior to this, students with disabilities were often denied services, excluded from the school system and interaction with their peers, misdiagnosed or undiagnosed, and did not receive adequate resources through the American public school system” (p. 17). This act would eventually be amended several times and is known today as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Jones, 2015).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990). According to Jones (2015), the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was amended in 1990 and renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. It now included “transition services from high school to adult life, to include children with autism and traumatic brain injuries, to define services and technology available, to clarify the requirements of providing the least restrictive environment, and to remove language now considered inappropriate” (p. 19). LaNear and Frattura (2007) explain that IDEA 1990 got rid of the terms handicapped and disabled and instead used people first language. IDEA also added autism and traumatic brain injury as qualifiers for disabilities eligible to receive services (LaNear & Frattura, 2007).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act is an amendment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 (LaNear & Frattura, 2007). According to LaNear and Frattura

(2007), some of these amendments include, “an emphasized need to reduce ‘irrelevant and unnecessary’ paperwork; a concern for resolving parent/school disputes in ‘positive and constructive’ ways; and the ability for some IEP team members to be absent from IEP meetings under certain circumstances” (p 103). Madaus and Shaw (2006) explain that the most notable changes are related to assessment and transition planning. According to Madaus and Shaw (2006), “The area of assessment is a critical area because students with LD are required to submit documentation to a postsecondary institution if they wish to access protections and services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973” (p. 276).

Learning Disability

Hallahan, Kauffman, and Pullen (2009) state that “Learning disabilities is a general term that refers to a heterogeneous group of disorders manifested by significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, or mathematical abilities” (p. 188). An individual with a learning disability might also exhibit problems with self-regulation, social perception, and social interaction (Hallahan et al., 2009). However, they note that while these problems might exist with a learning disability, they do not indicate the presence of a learning disability.

The traditional approach to identifying a learning disability is through the IQ-achievement discrepancy (Hallahan et al., 2009). According to Hallahan et al. (2009), The IQ-achievement discrepancy is “A comparison between scores on standardized intelligence and achievement tests” (p. 188). This approach has been criticized by authorities who believe IQ is not a strong predictor of reading ability (Hallahan et al., 2009). Response to-intervention is another method of identifying students with a learning disability (Hallahan et al., 2009). According to Hallahan et al. (2009), “RTI is a way of determining the presence of a learning

disability based on a multi-tiered model of prevention” (p. 190). They note that there is no universally accepted model of RTI (response-to-intervention).

Reading Disability

According to Costa, Edwards, and Hooper (2016), “Reading is a complex task that is comprised of several subskills such as fluency, phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension” (p. 18). They continue by stating that “Any disruption of these processes will produce a specific reading disability or a phonological subtype of a reading disability” (p. 18). Individuals with a reading disability typically experience challenges when trying to decode words, which affects both fluency and comprehension (Costa et al., 2016). Various cognitive abilities have also been shown to affect reading (Costa et al., 2016). They explain that executive functions such as attention regulation and verbal working memory have been shown to affect reading skills. Costa et al. (2016) state that “Reading Disabilities affect 5% to nearly 18% of the population. Furthermore, Reading Disabilities have been estimated to comprise approximately 80% of all learning disabilities” (p. 18).

Caldwell, Jennings, and Learner (2010) explain that a reading disability is sometimes measured by the difference between a student’s expected reading level and their actual reading level. They note that one method to identify whether or not a reading disability is present is by using intelligence test scores. This method involves comparing the students actual reading performance as measured by standardized tests with the student’s potential for reading achievement, which is measure by an intelligence test (Caldwell et al., 2010). Caldwell, et al. (2010) explain that a significant discrepancy indicates a reading disability is present.

Five Pillars of Reading

According to Cervetti and Hiebert (2015), in 2000, the National Reading Panel (NRP) identified five essential components of reading that they referred to as the five pillars of reading. The five pillars include (a) phonemic awareness, (b) phonics, (c) fluency, (d) vocabulary, and (e) comprehension (Cervetti & Hiebert, 2015). Hallahan, Kauffman, and Pullen (2009) define phonemic awareness as, “The ability to understand that words are made up of sound, or phonemes” (p. 196). Caldwell et al., 2010 describe phonics as the letter and sound patterns within a language. They go on to describe fluency as the ability to read quickly and fluently (Caldwell et al., 2010). Reading comprehension refers to a student’s ability to construct meaning from what they read (Hallahan et al., 2009). Reading comprehension includes both literal comprehension and higher-level comprehension (Caldwell et al., 2010).

Reading Comprehension

According to Caldwell, Jennings, and Learner (2010), “Comprehension is the essence of the reading act” (p. 17). They note that there are many levels of comprehension. Those levels include drawing on background experiences, literal comprehension, higher-level comprehension, and the ability to study and learn from text (Caldwell, Jennings, & Learner 2010). They note that readers require background knowledge in order to effectively comprehend material. Caldwell et al. (2010) state that “The background that students already have enables them to build bridges to new reading experiences and connect what they read to what they know” (p. 18). They also discuss different levels of comprehension that are strongly related. These levels include (a) literal comprehension, (b) higher-level comprehension, (c) inference, and (d) critical thinking. Literal comprehension refers to the ability to understand what is directly stated in the text (Caldwell et al., 2010). Higher level comprehension refers to, “Formulating the central thought of a passage.

The main thought constructed is a little different for each of us” (Jennings et al., 2010, p. 18). They define inference as, “The implied information we draw from a text” (p. 18). Jennings et al. (2010) notes that critical thinking is also a part of higher-level comprehension. They discuss that critical thinking refers to the ability to evaluate information within a text while considering individual thinking and experiences.

Caldwell et al. (2010) discuss two different types of comprehension, which include narrative comprehension and informational comprehension. Narrative comprehension refers to comprehension related to stories or novels (Caldwell et al., 2010). Informational comprehension refers to comprehension of materials that contains information (Caldwell et al., 2010). Examples of material that require informational comprehension include science and social studies textbooks (Caldwell et al., 2010).

Features of Reading that Affect Reading Comprehension

According to research, various aspects of reading, reader characteristics, and reading strategies affect reading comprehension. There is a vast amount of evidence that suggests that reading fluency strongly impacts reading comprehension at the elementary level (Liao, 2015). However, when students reach middle school fluency is no longer seen as a significant factor that impacts comprehension (Liao, 2015). Rather, other factors should be considered (Liao, 2015). The findings from a study completed by Liao (2015) indicate that amongst eighth grade students, silent reading fluency significantly predicts reading comprehension, oral reading fluency does not significantly contribute to reading comprehension, language status is a significant predictor of reading comprehension, and lastly, for English learner students, reading involvement may significantly increase reading comprehension scores. According to Casteel, Isom, and Jordan (2000), recent research also supports the teaching of cognitive strategies in order to improve

reading comprehension skills. She notes that proficient readers combine multiple strategies to improve their understanding of a text (Casteel et al., 2000).

One reader characteristic that might be linked to reading comprehension is motivation (Liao, 2015). Liao (2015) explains:

Students' reading comprehension may be affected by motivation through different pathways. It has been hypothesized that students who are more curious or interested in reading tend to exhibit higher amounts of reading engagement, pointing to the influence of intrinsic motivation. (p. 7)

Another possible pathway could suggest that students with higher self-efficacy are willing to put forth more effort trying to figure out the meaning of a text (Liao, 2015). This would likely result in higher reading comprehension (Liao, 2015). Liao (2015) also notes finding from a study stating that "the relationship between intrinsic reading motivation in third grade, and reading comprehension in sixth grade were significant" (p. 10).

A study completed by Tobing (2013) examined the relationship amongst the reading strategies, self-efficacy, reading comprehension of high school students in Indonesia. The regression analysis results from the study demonstrated that the overall use of reading strategies was significantly related to reading comprehension and slightly predicted reading comprehension ability (Tobing, 2013). According to Barkley (2005), "Teaching a variety of reading comprehension strategies can lead to an increased learning of the strategies, to specific transfer of learning, to increased retention and understanding of new passages, and, in some cases, to general improvements in comprehension" (p. 28). Barkley (2005) also notes that the instructional environment is directly related to students' development of reading comprehension skills.

Barkley (2005) described The National Reading Panel's scientifically based-reading research and identified areas important to reading comprehension. Three of these areas included prior knowledge, self-monitoring, and using graphic organizers (Barkley, 2005). A student's prior knowledge influences reading comprehension because the more knowledge that a student has about a text, the more likely they are to understand and remember what they read (Barkley, 2005). Self-monitoring allows students the ability to know when they do and do not understand what they are reading (Barkley, 2005). Using graphic organizers allows students to understand the relationships between different concepts and information (Barkley, 2005). The results of a study completed by Solheim (2011) also indicated that word reading ability, listening comprehension, and the ability for nonverbal reasoning all predicted reading comprehension scores. However, reading strategies do not always help to improve reading comprehension for all students (Barkley, 2005). Barkley (2005) discussed a 1993 study that found that students who struggle with reading strategies lose interest in them over time and, therefore, do not properly utilize them.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a motivational construct developed by Bandura in social cognitive theory (Tobing, 2013). It refers to an individual's belief about their performance of a particular task (Tobing, 2013). According to Tobing (2013), "Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as "people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (p. 3). Tobing (2013) expands on Bandura's definition adding that self-efficacy addresses what people think they can do regardless of their actual skills. Barkley (2006) notes that efficacy belief is one of the factors that Bandura and other social cognitivists believe to be critical for academic performance.

Self-efficacy has its roots in social learning theory, which was developed by Albert Bandura (Gibson, 2004). According to Gibson (2004), “Bandura believed that humans can learn through observation without the need for imitation; learning could be either direct or indirect (vicarious) in that one could learn through observing others' behaviors and the consequences of those behaviors” (p. 195). Gibson (2004) explains that in 1986, Bandura relabeled social learning theory as social cognitive theory because he felt that it was more comprehensive. Tams (2008) defines social learning as “cognitions by which people attend to, or reflect upon, cues from their social environment in order to strengthen the confidence in their abilities at work (i.e. self-efficacy)” (p. 197).

According to Bandura (1997), “Perceived self-efficacy is a belief in one’s personal capabilities” (p. 4). Bandura (1993) notes that perceived self-efficacy influences four major processes including (a) cognitive, (b) motivational, (c) affective, and (d) selection processes. According to Bandura (1993), “Students’ beliefs in their efficacy to regulate their own learning and to master academic activities determine their aspirations, level of motivation, and academic accomplishment” (p. 117). Tams (2008) states that “A considerable body of research demonstrates that social learning interventions can serve as effective means for raising people’s self-efficacy” (p. 199).

Effect of Self-Efficacy on Academic Achievement

Psychologists have examined theories of the positive impact of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation on academic achievement (Liao, 2015). According to Tobing (2013), self-efficacy is an important motivational factor related to learning task completion because activities that students choose are often chosen as a result of self-efficacy beliefs (i.e., they believe they are capable). In contrast, students will avoid partaking in activities that they feel they are not capable

of. Also, according to Tobing (2013), “Students with strong self-efficacy will spend more vigorous and persistent efforts even when facing difficult tasks, whereas those with low self-efficacy will slacken their efforts and give up given the same situation” (p. 3).

According to Barkley (2005), research suggests that students with high levels of self-efficacy are more willing to participate, they work harder and longer, and have fewer negative emotional reactions when they struggle in comparison to students with low levels of self-efficacy. In order to increase self-efficacy in struggling students, teachers can model for those students helping them to acquire the skills and efficacy beliefs that are necessary in order to complete a given task (Barkley, 2005). Once students begin to accomplish a given task consistently, their efficacy beliefs are likely to increase (Barkley, 2005).

It is the opinion of Barkley (2005) that the most common and overused method for increasing student self-efficacy beliefs is verbal persuasion. In many traditional classrooms, teachers are quick to reward student’s efforts with verbal praise (Barkley, 2005). According to Barkley (2005), “Small and meaningful amounts of verbal praise are important; however, when verbal praise become rote in the classroom, students quickly lose interest and the individual doling out the praise may even lose credibility” (p. 18). Dweck (2007) was also critical of certain types of praise. According to Dweck (2007), there are two different types of praise which include praise for intelligence and praise for effort. Intelligence praise does not provide motivation, rather, it creates a fixed mind set (Dweck, 2007). In contrast, praise for effort leads to motivation (Dweck, 2007).

Effect of Self-Efficacy on Reading Comprehension

According to Nes Ferrara (2005), “Self-efficacy for reading refers to individuals’ assessments of how well they think they can accomplish a particular reading task and is

influenced by how well they have performed on similar tasks, including any accompanying feedback and encouragement received” (p. 216). Nes Ferrara (2005) notes that reading self-efficacy is an important aspect of making the transition from an okay to an excellent reader (Nes Ferrara, 2005). According to Chapman and Tunmer (1995), research indicates that young children in first grade and even kindergarten can and do make self-concept-related differentiations both across and within the domains of reading.

In a reading classroom, the teachers primary goal is to help their students become better readers (Barkley, 2005). In order to help students become better readers, the teacher needs to make sure that they are manipulating the efficacy beliefs that students have about reading (Barkley, 2005). Barkley argues that there are numerous methods to foster high efficacy beliefs about reading in students. These methods include classroom environment and experience modifications, reading strategies instruction, and self-regulation. Each has its strengths and weaknesses, but when used appropriately, each can be applicable in the school setting (Barkley, 2005). Barkley (2006) conducted a study investigating self-efficacy and reading comprehension. According to Barkley (2006), “Quantitative data were used in this study to test hypotheses related to the relationships between teacher and student efficacy beliefs and relationships between student efficacy beliefs and student standardized achievement test scores” (p. 197). Achievement was measure using the reading comprehension subtest on the Stanford Achievement Test. The participants included both teachers and students from a middle school in suburban Alabama. The teacher and student participants were grouped together based on both grade level and the academic team that they were place on at the beginning of the school year by the school administration. The instrumentation included both a student and teacher survey which was comprised of a four point Lykert-type scale. Barkley (2006) concluded that students' self-

efficacy beliefs about using prior knowledge, self-monitoring, and graphic organizers were statistically significantly correlated with reading comprehension scores on the Stanford Achievement Test.

Within the domain of reading, efficacy beliefs can fluctuate based on the difficulty of the task at hand (Piercey, 2013). Some students may be confident in their ability to recognize words within a passage but have difficulty with comprehension of the same passage (Piercey, 2013). In order to foster reading comprehension, the teacher should understand the effect of efficacy beliefs on comprehension relate learning tasks (Barkley. 2005). There are many different methods for fostering high efficacy beliefs about reading including modifying the classroom environment and classroom experience, reading strategies instruction, and self-regulation (Barkley, 2005). Nes Ferrera (2005) also discussed a study that examined reading self-efficacy and found that young students who received training to help with their reading self-efficacy and strategy use were also better readers.

The research literature is mixed regarding whether self-efficacy is casually related to reading comprehension. Some studies indicate that they are not related. The results of a study focusing on eighth grade students completed by Liao (2015) suggests that self-efficacy is not a substantial predictor of reading comprehension scores. Liao (2015) notes that these findings are similar to that of a 2007 study in which reading self-efficacy was not significantly related to comprehension, whereas factors such as reading interest and choice were significantly related to comprehension. Liao (2015) suggests that one explanation for the non-significant contribution of self-efficacy to reading comprehension may be a result of the finding that students with learning disabilities tend to overrate their academic competence. Liao (2015) notes that this, in turn, is likely the result of teachers motivating their students by praising them and downplaying the

academic areas they tend to struggle. Thus, students' beliefs about their academic abilities (i.e., their self-efficacy) may be based on praise and as a result, the students with learning disabilities might not accurately predict their comprehension skills (Liao, 2015).

On the other hand, some studies indicate that self-efficacy and reading comprehension are related. Burrows (2012) conducted a quasi-experimental, longitudinal study that examined the role that extensive reading and reading strategies play in reading self-efficacy. His results from the latent growth curve model depicted that gains in reading self-efficacy were positively related to gains in reading comprehension (Burrows, 2012). The results of Tobing's (2013) study on the relationship amongst reading strategies and self-efficacy with reading comprehension also revealed that self-efficacy was significantly related to reading comprehension and contributed 20% to the prediction of reading comprehension (Tobing, 2013). Barkley (2006) also found that there are significant correlations between student efficacy beliefs and reading comprehension achievement. He notes that teachers, parents, and students should be made aware of the term self-efficacy because it may be an important predictors of academic achievement (Barkley, 2006). Research has indicated that there are reading intervention programs, such as the Poetry Academy, that improve reading comprehension and as a direct result, increase self-efficacy (Wilfong, 2008).

Summary

Special education as it is known today would not be what it is without legislation such as Mills vs. District of Columbia Board of Education and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004. After reviewing the literature on self-efficacy and reading comprehension, the research overall suggests that self-efficacy and reading comprehension are casually positively correlated (Barkley, 2006; Burrows, 2012; Chapman and Tunmer, 1995; Nes

Ferrara, 2005; Tobing, 2013). According to the research literature, in addition to reading comprehension, self-efficacy also effects academic achievement in general (Barkley, 2005; Dweck, 2007; Tobing, 2013;). The research also suggests that aspects of reading such as fluency (Liao, 2015) effect reading comprehension. Reader characteristics such as motivation (Liao, 2015) and prior knowledge (Barkley, 2005) also have been shown to effect reading comprehension. The research also indicates that the use of reading strategies (Barkley, 2005; Tobing, 2013) can affect reading comprehension.

Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores. The study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational design, with self-efficacy as the identified predictor and reading comprehension as the identified criterion (Mills & Gay, 2016). The Reader Self-Perception Scale (Henk & Melnick, 1995) was used to assess the students' self-efficacy in the area of reading. RIT scores from the MAP Assessment (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017) were used to assess reading comprehension.

Participants

The participants in this study are from a high school located in a suburb of Chicago. The school has approximately 1,553 students. Approximately (a) 55% of the students are White, (b) 20% are African-American, (c) 11% are Hispanic, and (d) 10% are Asian. Thirty percent of the students are considered low income and receive free and reduced lunch. About 14% of the student population receives special education services. Only 1% of the population is considered English Language Learners. The study includes 24 freshman students. Of those 24 students, eight are special education students with an identified reading disability as stated in their Individualized Education Plan (IEP), 8 are general education students, and 8 are honors students. Since the sample was from three specific classrooms that represented a range of high school students with varying reading abilities, the sampling method is considered purposive (Gay & Mills, 2016).

Instrumentation

MAP Assessment (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017) RIT score data was used to

assess reading comprehension. Participants were given the Reader Self-Perception Scale (Henk & Melnick, 1995) to assess self-efficacy in the area of reading. General perception was assessed as well as four subscales which include (a) progress, (b) observational comparison, (c) social feedback, and (d) physiological states.

MAP Assessment

The primary data collected on reading comprehension was from the MAP Assessment (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017). Reading RIT scores were collected for each participant to measure reading comprehension. According to the Northwest Evaluation Association (2017), “The RIT (Rasch Unit) scale is a stable, equal-interval scale. Scores over time can be compared to tell how much growth a student has made” (p. 2).

Reader Self-Perception Scale

Self-efficacy was assessed using the Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS) (Henk & Melnick, 1995). The RSPS (Henk & Melnick, 1995) produces scores for general perception as well as four subscales: (a) progress, (b) observational comparison, (c) social feedback, and (d) physiological states. Students were instructed to read the 33 statements listed and circle whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with those statements. Each statement is coded to inform the person scoring the RSPS (Henk & Melnick, 1995) which subscale the statement belongs to. Example statements are shown in the following table.

Table 2

Reader Self Perception Scale Example Statements

Subscale	Statement
PR	When I read, I need less help than I used to.
OC	I read better than other kids in my class.
SF	My classmates think that I read pretty well.
PS	Reading makes me feel happy inside

Note. GP= General Perception; PR= Progress; OC= Observational Comparison; SF=Social Feedback; PS=Psychological States.

The items are in a Likert Scale format. The student then receives a raw score for general perception as well as for each subscale. According to Henk and Melnick (1995), “Reader Self-Perception Scale accounts adequately for concerns related to focus, norming, theoretical grounding, and practicality” (p. 476). They note that norming for this instrument was extensive.

Procedures

The study includes 10 participants. All participants have an identified reading disability as stated in their IEP. Data was only collected from the students whose parents/guardians gave the researcher permission (Appendix A).

Data Collection

The data collected from both the MAP Assessment and RSPS is quantitative. All freshman students took the MAP Assessment at the beginning of the school year so participant

data from the reading assessment was collected prior to the administration of the RSPS. The RSPS was administered to the participants during the participants' English class period.

MAP Assessment

The MAP Assessment is used to measure student growth in various subject areas throughout the school year. The MAP is typically given three times per school year. Once at the beginning of the year, once during the middle of the year, and once at the end of the year. Results from the MAP Assessment are shown as a RIT score. A RIT (Rasch Unit) scale is an equal interval scale. RIT scores have the same meaning regardless of age or grade level. A RIT score reflects a student's knowledge, skills and ability for a given subject area. For the purposes of the study, only the RIT score in the area of reading was collected to measure reading comprehension.

Reader Self-Perception Scale

The RSPS (Henk & Melnick, 1995) was relatively quick to administer. The researcher first explained the directions to each student and encouraged them to be honest and take their time. Each student then independently read the 33 statements and circled whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. When the student was finished, they raised their hand and the researcher collected the instrument to score. The scoring sheet included a scoring key, the five different scales: (a) general perception, (b) progress, (c) observational comparison, (d) social feedback, (e) psychological states and their associated questions, and a score interpretation table. According to Henk and Melnick (1995), self-efficacy for general perception as well as the sub-scales were either scored as high, average, or low based on the numerical raw score obtained for each category.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using Pearson's r . Pearson's r was used to evaluate the linear relationship between the reading comprehension and self-efficacy. Means and standard deviations were also calculated within special education, general education, and honors for each variable of reading comprehension and self-efficacy.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores. 24 students participated in this study. There were two instruments used in the study. One instrument used in the study is the MAP Assessment (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017) which was used to measure reading comprehension. The Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS) (Henk & Melnick, 1995) was used to assess (a) general perception, (b) progress, (c) observational comparison, (d) social feedback, and (e) psychological states. The reader self-perception scale was administered during students' English class. Once the data was collected, the data from both instruments for each student was entered into a table. The data was analyzed using Pearson's r to evaluate if there was any correlation amongst the different variables.

Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a correlation between the self-efficacy of 24 high school students and their reading comprehension scores. Three different groups were used in this study, with eight students per group. The groups included (a) students with IEP's, (b) students in general education, and (c) students in honors classes. The study used a quantitative approach with a correlational design, with self-efficacy as the identified predictor and reading comprehension as the identified criterion (Gay & Mills, 2016). Students' MAP reading comprehension scores were compared to five areas of self-efficacy: (a) general perception, (b) progress, (c) observational comparison, (d) social feedback, and (e) psychological states. General perception refers to the student's overall self-efficacy (Henk & Melnick, 1995). Henk and Melnick (1995) define progress as "how one's perception of present reading performance compares with past performance" (p. 472). They describe observational comparison as "dealing with how a child perceives her or his reading performance to compare with the performance of classmates" (p. 472). They explain that social feedback includes "direct or indirect input about reading from teachers, classmates, and people in the child's family" (p. 472). The last sub-scale, physiological states, "refers to internal feelings that the child experiences during reading" (p. 472).

Descriptives

Table three displays the means and standard deviations for each of the three groups: (a) special education, (b) general education, and (c) honors. The mean for each MAP score increased by almost exactly ten points for each group. Average general perception (GP) scores and observational comparison (OC) scores were shown to increase with each group as well. Average

general perception (GP) scores increased by 9.38 points from special education to general education and 13.26 points from general education to honors. Average observational comparison (OC) scores increased by 5.66 points from special education to general education and 1.63 points from general education to honors. The largest standard deviations were found within general perception (GP). Standard deviations ranged from 15.26 to 17.38.

Table 3

MAP and Self-Efficacy Descriptives by Group

Group	Reading Comp.		Self-Efficacy			
	MAP M(SD)	GP M(SD)	PR M(SD)	OC M(SD)	SF M(SD)	PS M(SD)
SE	218.75(7.21)	107.25(17.38)	36.63(5.01)	15.13(4.79)	25.88(7.81)	26.2(6.26)
GE	228.38(3.29)	116.63(15.26)	36.63(4.13)	21.12(4.02)	21.13(4.73)	23.5(5.76)
Honors	238.63(8.07)	130.25(17.08)	39.63(5.07)	22.75(4.27)	34.63(6.09)	29.4(5.71)

Note. Mean(Standard Deviation); *n*= 24. SE= Special Education; GE= General Education; GP= General Perception; PR= Progress; OC= Observational Comparison; SF= Social Feedback; PS=Psychological States.

Relationships

Table 4 displays the Pearson *r* values and the associated effect size (*r*²), which depicts the common variance. According to Mills and Gay (2016), Pearson *r* is “a measure of correlation appropriate when both variables are expressed as continuous data. It takes into account every score and produces a coefficient between -1.00 and +1.00” (p. 678). Gay and Mills (2016) define common variance as “the variation in one variable that is attributed to its tendency to vary with

another variable” (p. 674). The Pearson r was calculated in the following table depicting the results.

Table 4

Correlation coefficients for MAP vs. Self-Efficacy scale

	GP	PR	OC	SF	PS
MAP	0.49*	0.21	0.62**	0.46*	0.21
r^2	24%	44%	38%	21%	44%

Note. r^2 = effect size; $n = 24$. GP= General Perception; PR= Progress; OC= Observational Comparison; SF= Social Feedback; PS=Psychological States; * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$.

Only one sub-scale was found to be highly correlated with reading MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) scores. The data indicates a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC). This means that students' MAP scores are highly correlated with how they perceive their reading performance in comparison to the performance of their classmates. Within the construct of self-efficacy, their perception of how they compare to others in reading is shown to vary with the reading MAP score.

Summary

MAP assessment scores and scores from the Reader Self-Perception Scale were used to compare reading comprehension to self-efficacy in the area of reading. The Reader Self-Perception Scale evaluated general perception as well as four sub-scales including (a) progress, (b) observational comparison, (c) social feedback, and (d) psychological states. The results of this study show that the mean for each MAP score increases by almost exactly ten points for each group. Average general perception (GP) scores and observational comparison (OC) scores

were shown to increase with each group as well. This indicates that students in special education have a much lower average general perception score as well as observational comparison score in comparison to student in honors level reading. The data indicates a moderate correlation between reading comprehension and general self-efficacy. The data does indicate a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC) and a moderate correlation between MAP scores and social feedback (SF). This means that students' MAP scores are highly correlated with how they perceive their reading performance in comparison to the performance of their classmates. Within the construct of self-efficacy, their perception of how they compare to others in reading is shown to vary with the reading MAP score.

Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores. The study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational design. Three different groups were used in this study with eight students per group. The groups included (a) students with IEP's, (b) students in general education, and (c) students in honors classes. The Reader Self-Perception Scale was used to assess the students' self-efficacy in the area of reading and RIT scores from the MAP Assessment were used to assess reading comprehension. Results showed that students in special education have a much lower average general perception score as well as observational comparison score when compared to student in honors level reading. The data indicates a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC) scores, a sub-scale of self-efficacy.

Discussion

Barkley (2006) notes that efficacy belief is one of the factors that Bandura and other social cognitivists believe to be critical for academic performance. Data from this study are generally in agreement with previous concepts indicated by general perception (0.49), observational comparison (0.62), and social feedback (0.46) were related to academic reading performance. While students in special education have a much lower average general perception score in comparison to students in honors level reading, a moderate correlation was found between reading comprehension and general perception. A moderate correlation was also found between reading comprehension and the social feedback sub-scale. Only one sub-scale was found to be highly correlated with reading MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) scores. The

data indicates a strong relationship between MAP scores and the observational comparison (OC) subscale. This would also be consistent with Bandura's concept of self-efficacy. This means that students' MAP scores are highly correlated with how they perceive their reading performance in comparison to the performance of their classmates. According to Barkley (2005), research suggests that students with high levels of self-efficacy (a) are more willing to participate, (b) they work harder and longer, and (c) have fewer negative emotional reactions when they struggle in comparison to students with low levels of self-efficacy.

Conclusion

The study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational design, with self-efficacy as the identified predictor and reading comprehension as the identified criterion (Gay & Mills, 2016). Five areas of self-efficacy were examined: (a) general perception, (b) progress (c) observational comparison, (d) social feedback, and (e) physiological states. Even with a small number of participants, the data indicates a moderate correlation between reading comprehension and general self-efficacy. The data does indicate a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC) and a moderate correlation between MAP scores and social feedback (SF). This means that within the construct of self-efficacy, students' perception of how they compare to others in reading is strongly related to their MAP reading scores.

Educational Implications

In order to help students become better readers, the teacher needs to make sure that they are manipulating the efficacy beliefs that students have about reading (Barkley, 2005). The data indicated that there is a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC). Therefore, we need to manipulate efficacy beliefs that students have in regards to comparing themselves to other students in the class. Barkley argues that there are numerous

methods to foster high efficacy beliefs about reading in students. These methods include classroom environment and experience modifications, reading strategies instruction, and self-regulation. Each has its strengths and weaknesses, but when used appropriately, each can be applicable in the school setting (Barkley, 2005). Nes Ferrara (2005) notes that reading self-efficacy is an important aspect of making the transition from an average to an excellent reader (Nes Ferrara, 2005).

It is the opinion of Barkley (2005) that the most common and overused method for increasing student self-efficacy beliefs is verbal persuasion. In many traditional classrooms, teachers are quick to reward student's efforts with verbal praise (Barkley, 2005). According to Barkley (2005), "Small and meaningful amounts of verbal praise are important; however, when verbal praise become rote in the classroom, students quickly lose interest and the individual doling out the praise may even lose credibility" (p. 18). Teachers need to be careful to not overuse verbal praise to increase students' self-efficacy. Teachers should focus on providing praise to all students, including honors. Since the data indicates that there is a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC), praise should be equal among special education, general education, and honors students. This way, special education students will not wonder why their peers are not receiving praise and they are. Also, students need to evaluate their own personal growth without comparing their reading skills to their peers. Struggling readers typically have more room to grow than excellent readers.

Recommendations for Further Research

One limitation of this study was the number of participants. Further research would benefit from using a larger number of participants. This study was completed at a high school with a high percentage of low-income students. Further research could help to determine if the

type of population that the participants were from impacted their self-efficacy. It would be interesting to investigate if there is a relationship between self-efficacy scores and reading scores in a low-income population school compared to a high-income population school. Lastly, further research would benefit from identifying whether or not the classroom setting affects students' self-efficacy in reading. The eight students in special education that participated in this study were from a self-contained reading class. It would be interesting to investigate whether or not students in special education with similar MAP reading scores had similar or different self-efficacy scores.

Summary

Caldwell et al. (2010) state that “seventy-four percent of children who are unsuccessful at reading in third grade are still unsuccessful in ninth grade” (p. 5). There are multiple reasons why it is important to research and identify possible factors, such as self-efficacy, that might be contributing to prolonged reading problems (Caldwell et al., 2010). The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores. Bandura (1977) believed that self-efficacy and motivation were directly related.

This study investigated whether or not there is a correlation between the self-efficacy of high school students and their reading comprehension scores at Smith High School. The study also investigated the extent to which these two variables positively or negatively correlated. There were 24 students that participated in this study. Eight of those students were in special education and have an identified reading disability, eight were students in general education, and eight were in honors level reading. There were two instruments used in the study. One instrument used in the study is the MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) Assessment

(Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017) which was used to measure reading comprehension. The Reader Self-Perception Scale (Henk & Melnick, 1995) was used to assess (a) general perception, (b) progress, (c) observational comparison, (d) social feedback, and (e) psychological states. The results of this study show that the mean for each MAP score increased by almost exactly ten points for each group. Average general perception (GP) scores and observational comparison (OC) scores were shown to increase with each group as well. This indicates that students in special education have a much lower average general perception score as well as observational comparison score in comparison to student in honors level reading. The data indicates a moderate correlation between reading comprehension and general self-efficacy. The data does indicate a strong relationship between MAP scores and observational comparison (OC) and a moderate correlation between MAP scores and social feedback (SF). This means that students' MAP scores are highly correlated with how they perceive their reading performance in comparison to the performance of their classmates. Within the construct of self-efficacy, their perception of how they compare to others in reading is shown to vary with the reading MAP score.

References

- Bandura, A. I. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*, 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Insights. Self-efficacy. *Harvard Mental Health Letter, 13*(9), 4-6.
- Barkley, J. M. (2005). Reading education: Is self-efficacy important? *Reading Improvement*. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University). 43(4), 194-210.
- Barkley, J. M. (2006). *Efficacy beliefs and reading comprehension: Relations between middle grades teachers' and students' efficacy beliefs, outcome expectancies, and students' reading comprehension performance*. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3173462)
- Burrows, L. (2012). *The effects of extensive reading and reading strategies on reading self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3509037)
- Caldwell, J., Jennings, J., & Lerner, J. (2010). *Reading Problems: Assessment and Teaching Strategies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Casteel, C. P., Isom, B. A., & Jordan, K. F. (2000). Creating confident and competent readers. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 36*(2), 67-74.
- Cervetti, G. N., & Hiebert, E. H. (2015). The Sixth Pillar of Reading Instruction. *Reading Teacher, 68*(7), 548-551.
- Chapman, J. W., & Tunmer, W. E. (1995). Development of young children's reading self-concepts: An examination of emerging subcomponents and their relationship with reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(1) 54-167.

- Costa, L. C., Edwards, C. N., & Hooper, S. R. (2016). Writing Disabilities and Reading Disabilities in Elementary School Students. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 39(1), 17-30.
- Dweck, C.C. (2007). The perils and promises of praise. *Educational Leadership*, 65(2), 34-39.
- ELA Common Core Standards. (2010). Retrieved, from http://www.isbe.net/COMMON_CORE/DEFAULT.HTM
- Gabriel, R. C. (2016). Public Defenders, Local Control, and Brown v. Board of Education. *Mercer Law Review*, 67(3), 625-649.
- Gay, L., & Mills, G. (2016). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gibson, S. K. (2004). Social learning (cognitive) theory and implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6(2), 193-210.
- Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., & Pullen, P. C. (2009). *Exceptional Learners: An Introduction to Special Education*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- 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) 470-462.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Retrieved, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/state-level-data-files/index.html>.
- Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Retrieved, from <https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2011/07/A-Parents-Guide-to-MAP-.pdf>
- Jones, S. K. (2015). Teaching Students with Disabilities. *Applications of Research in Music Education*, 34(1), 13-23.

- LaNear, J., & Frattura, E. (2007). Getting the stories straight: allowing different voices to tell an 'effective history' of special education law in the United States. *Education & The Law, 19*(2), 87-109.
- Liao, C. (2015). *Predicting reading comprehension of 8th grade struggling readers: Fluency, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California Riverside). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses Global. (Order No. 3721384)
- Madaus, J. W., & Shaw, S. F. (2006). The Impact of the IDEA 2004 on Transition to College for Students with Learning Disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 21*(4), 273-281.
- Nes Ferrara, S. L. (2005). Reading fluency and self-efficacy: A case study. *International Journal of Disability, Development & Education, 52*(3), 215-231.
- Piercey, R.R. (2013). *Reading self-efficacy in early adolescence: Which measure works best?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (Order No. 7921986)
- Solheim, O. J. (2011). The impact of reading self-efficacy and task value on reading comprehension scores in different item formats. *Reading Psychology, 32*(1), 1-27.
- Tams, S. (2008). Self-directed social learning: The role of individual differences. *The Journal of Management Development, 27*(2), 196-213.
- Tobing, I. R. A. (2013). *The relationship of reading strategies and self-efficacy with the reading comprehension of high school students in Indonesia*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses Global. (Order No. 356735)

- Varney, J. (2010). The role of dissertation self-efficacy in increasing dissertation completion: sources, effects, and viability of a new self-efficacy construct. *College Student Journal*, 44. Abstract retrieved from Academic Premiere database.
- Weber, M. C. (2010). A New Look at Section 504 and the ADA in Special Education Cases. *Texas Journal on Civil Liberties & Civil Rights*, 16(1), 1-27.
- Wilfong, L. (2008). Building fluency, word-recognition ability, and confidence in struggling readers: The poetry academy. *Reading Teacher*, 62(1) 4-13.

Appendix A

Parent/Guardian Informed Consent Form

Investigating if There is a Correlation Between the Self-Efficacy of Middle School Students and their Reading Comprehension Scores

Principal Researcher: Brittany Conway, Candidate in the Masters in Multicategorical Special Education Program

Purpose: Your son or daughter is invited to participate in the research project entitled, *Investigating if There is a Correlation Between the Self-Efficacy of Middle School Students and their Comprehension Scores*, which is being conducted at Governors State University under the direction of Dr. Phil Boudreau. The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there is a correlation between your son or daughter's self-efficacy and reading comprehension scores.

Description of Procedures: The research will take place at your child's school over the course of one week in January. Your son or daughter will first complete the Informal Reading Inventory to assess his or her reading comprehension. Two days later he or she will complete the Reader Self-Perception Scale in order to assess their self-efficacy in the area of reading.

Potential Risks: There is minimal risk to participating in this study, including loss of confidentiality.

Your son or daughter may become frustrated while completing the Informal Reading Inventory, but the researcher will provide positive reinforcement to help when your son or daughter appears to struggle.

Potential Benefits: Through completing the Informal Reading Inventory, your son or daughter's teacher will have an updated understanding of where their reading comprehension level is and can make adjustments to individualized instruction based off of what they learn from the reading comprehension score data collected by the researcher.

Confidentiality: The researcher will make it her priority to prevent anyone who is not directly involved in the study from knowing that your child took part in the study as well as your child's results from the study. Your son or daughter will be referred to as "Student A" on both the answer forms for the Informal Reading Inventory as well as the Reader Self-Perception Scale. The consent forms will be kept separate from the answer forms. Due to the fact that I am going to make it a top priority to protect your confidentiality, there is a low risk that confidentiality will be breached.

Voluntary Participation: You may refuse to include your son or daughter in the study under no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Participating in this study will in no way affect you son or daughter's school performance data or your relationship with his or her school and/or Governors State University. In addition, you may remove your son or daughter or daughter from the study at any point in time with no penalty.

Contact Information: If at any time you have questions related to this study, please contact me at [REDACTED]. You may also contact the Governors State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at irb@govst.edu with any questions concerning the study as well as your child’s rights as a research participant.

If there is anything that is unclear to you about this study, please contact me before you sign and return this form. Feel free to take as much time as you need to review and complete this form.

 Researcher Signature

By signing this consent form, you are agreeing that your son or daughter, Student A, may participate in this one-week research study.

 Name of Student (please print)

 Name of Parent/Guardian
 (please print)

 Signature

 Date

 Name of Person Obtaining
 Consent
 (please print)

 Signature

 Date

*Permission form modified from James Breckinridge Davis