Goals for Reading and Self-Efficacy among College Students

Nil Christopher V. Anania[1] & Celso L. Tagadiad [2]

[1,2]Department of Teacher Education, UM Panabo College, Panabo City, Philippines

Abstract: **The purpose of this quantitative non-experimental descriptive-correlational study was to determine the significant influence of goals for reading towards self-efficacy of college students on campuses of a particular university. Researcher-made questionnaires on the two variables validated by the experts and subjected to pilot testing for reliability tests were conducted among college students in a specific private college. Then these questionnaires were administered considering a stratified random sample of 339 students. Data analysis tools used were weighted mean, Pearson-r, and regression analysis to test the hypotheses. The results showed that all reading goals, curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, grades, and competition are all at a high level. Moreover, all the indicators of self-efficacy, to wit, identifying learning needs and setting goals, selecting learning resources and materials, seeking social assistance, organizing the learning process and environment, monitoring, evaluating, and transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts are also in high level. Further, it was found that there was a significant relationship between goals for reading and self-efficacy. In contrast, domains of goals for reading that significantly influence self-efficacy are importance and competition, while the rest of the domains do not considerably influence self-efficacy. Through this research, the reading goals, as it influenced students' reading self-efficacy, which in turn resulted in greater reading milestones and academic achievement and would help educators enhanced their instructional management abilities.**

Keywords: **education, students, goals for reading, self-efficacy, Philippines**

I. INTRODUCTION

Students' self-efficacy regarding their capabilities to succeed with a learning task predicts how successful they are with the job (Cantrell, Correll, Clouse, Creech, Bridges, & Owens, 2013). It is an element of reading motivation that is closely associated with a child's perceived attainments in reading and is less susceptible to the gender differences seen in broader measures (Carroll & Fox, 2017). However, it is found that low efficacy belief is related to students' weakened motivation to engage in challenging academic work and persist with completing study programs (Schunk & Mullen, 2012).

In addition, self-efficacy is important because it influences an individual's effort and willingness to persist with a task until a goal is achieved. When learners believe the desired outcome can occur and bring the result about, they will be more likely to work to achieve the desired effect. Goals are influenced by perceived self-efficacy or how people consider their abilities. The higher each individual's perceived self-efficacy, the loftier the goals they set for themselves, and the stronger their commitment is to achieve those goals (Tugsbaatar, 2020).

It is also discovered that learners' low self-efficacy can be linked to low reading proficiency, which has a strong relationship with low socio-economic status by providing or not providing adequate and rich reading experiences. The majorities of learners from low families are likely to attend poorly resourced public schools, receive poor reading instruction, have negative reading experiences, and are thus expected to perform poorly in reading assessment (Boakye, 2015).

In relation, self-efficacy is believed to exist in reading since students' belief in their capability to read well influences their reading behaviors, cognitive processes, reading motivation, and reading achievement (Li & Wang, 2010; Prat-Sala & Redford, 2010). However, only a few studies showed positive correlations between self-efficacy and reading achievement. One of which is Waleff (2010) found a positive correlation between students' self-efficacy for reading and reading achievement. He found that students' efficacy beliefs corresponded with their grade-level reading abilities. Additionally, Mizumoto (2012) iterates that students with high efficacy were active users of strategies, employed deep strategy, and were meta-cognitively superior to those without them. While those with average efficacy beliefs used shallow techniques, those with low efficacy beliefs were passive or non-users of reading strategies. Thus, it is concluded that efficacy beliefs could promote reading strategies. Still, over 100 million students currently have below-minimum reading competence due to COVID-related school closures (United Nations, 2021); hence, it is imperative to study how this decline could be addressed.

Therefore, the researcher is interested in conducting the study about the goals for reading and self-efficacy among college students. There are existing studies on the two variables mentioned above; however, those studies deal only with identifying factors in a foreign context and only on the main variables. Also, studies of the relationship between the goals for reading and self-efficacy among college students have not been initiated. Whereas, in this study, the researcher covers the specific domain of each variable, and the concentration is in the local set-up. Thus, the urgency of conducting this study is to find out if the goals for reading

may affect the self-efficacy among college students. The present study will contribute to the existing gap in the literature. It will contribute to advancing knowledge, theory, and practice, especially in the local setting, about which reading goals significantly influence self-efficacy among college students.

II. METHODS

Presented in this chapter are the discussions on the research design, the research locale, the population and sample, the research instruments, the data collection, the statistical tools, and the ethical considerations.

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative non-experimental research design with the application of correlational techniques. A quantitative design begins by looking at a theory, produces hypotheses from that theory, and then proceeds to test that theory and involves collecting a standard range of quantitative data from a significant sample of respondents through the use of survey questionnaires. Similarly, quantitative research describes how one variable impacts another. This study was non-experimental because the researcher could not control, manipulate or alter the predictor variable or subjects. Instead, it relies on interpretation, observation, or interactions to come up with a conclusion (Chiang, 2015; Creswell, 2012; & Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Specifically, this study employed descriptive-correlational research as this is concerned with establishing relationships between two or more variables in the same population or between the same variables in two populations. Furthermore, correlational statistical designs are used by researchers to define and quantify the degree of connection (or link) between two or more variables or sets of scores. Understanding the associations and relationships that exist among human phenomena was a remaining incentive for scientific investigation in all of the social science disciplines, and that motivation surpassed even the most differentiated model distinctions between various research methods (Creswell, 2012; Creswell & Creswell, 2018; & Curtis, Comiskey, & Dempsey, 2016).

The above-cited concepts from different authors justified the goal of this study which was to determine what domains of the goals for reading significantly influence the self-efficacy among college students.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in Davao del Norte. As published in PhilAtlas (2022a updated), Davao del Norte is a province in the Philippines situated in the Davao Region occupying the southeastern section of Mindanao. Its capital is the City of Tagum. The province has a land area of 3,422.61 square kilometers or 1,321.48 square miles. Its population as determined by the 2020 Census was 1,125,057.

This represented 21.46% of the total population of the Davao Region, 4.29% of the overall population of the Mindanao island group, or 1.03% of the entire population of the Philippines. Based on these figures, the population density is computed at 329 inhabitants per square kilometer or 851 inhabitants per square mile. Davao del Norte has 8 municipalities and 3 cities. The total number of barangays in the province is 223.

Specifically, this study was conducted in three branches of a certain university in the Davao Region located in the three cities, wit: Panabo City, Tagum City, and IGACOS, in Davao del Norte.

Panabo City was a third-class city in the Province of Davao del Norte located between two major cities, Tagum City and Davao City. The city has an area of 25,123 hectares (62,080 acres). It is politically subdivided into 40 barangays and has a population of 209,230, according to the 2020 census (PhilAtlas, 2022b updated). The city was known as the "Banana Capital of the Philippines" because of numerous banana plantations scattered throughout the city; in particular, it houses the world's biggest banana plantation owned by Tagum Agricultural Development Company (TADECO). The lifeblood of the city was banana cultivation and exportation.

Tagum City was a coastal component city in the province of Davao del Norte and served as its capital. The city has a land area of 195.80 square kilometers or 75.60 square miles, constituting 5.72% of Davao del Norte's total area. As determined by the 2020 Census, its population was 296,202, which represented 26.63% of the total population of Davao del Norte province, or 5.65% of the overall population of the Davao Region. Based on these figures, the population density is computed at 1,513 inhabitants per square kilometer or 3,918 inhabitants per square mile (PhilAtlas, 2022d updated).

On the other hand, Samal was a coastal component city in the province of Davao del Norte. The city has a land area of 301.30 square kilometers or 116.33 square miles, which constitutes 8.80% of Davao del Norte's total area. As determined by the 2020 Census, its population was 116,771, representing 10.38% of the total population of Davao del Norte province, or 2.23% of the overall population of the Davao Region. Based on these figures, the population density was computed at 388 inhabitants per square kilometer or 1,004 inhabitants per square mile (PhilAtlas, 2022c updated).

Population and Sample

The respondents of this study were the three hundred thirty-nine First-Year college students of the three branches of a certain university in Davao Region for the academic year 2020-2021. These three branches are located in the three cities of Davao del Norte Province, namely Panabo City, Tagum City, and the Island Garden City of Samal. There were first-year college students from these three institutions: With this

baseline data, first-year college students were considered as samples based on raosoft.com. The selection of the respondents was due to the fact that the researcher was a resident teacher of the target institution and that the knowledge to be generated from the research can be utilized in the analysis of students' goals for reading and self-efficacy.

Only college students of the three branches for this academic year 2020-2021 were included in this study. Other year levels, except the first year, were not included, and students from different branches and other schools aside from the three branches specified were also excluded. The respondent can withdraw his participation anytime without penalty unless the research has already been approved. Moreover, the participant can withdraw when he feels threatened or uncomfortable responding to the survey questionnaire.

Specifically, only those first-year college students from the three institutions specified were considered. In case one or more students withdraw in the middle of the conduct of the survey, getting an alternative of the same gender within the same institution shall be taken as a replacement with voluntariness.

A stratified random sampling technique was used to choose the study's respondents since the population is too big to handle. The selection was based on the strata of the population, which was represented by its percentage size to achieve a substantial sample for data gathering. According to Blay (2007), the proportional allocation was reasonable to consider a stratified random sampling technique. Moreover, the use of raosoft.com guaranteed good results while the substantial number of samples was still achieved when the population was too big to handle. Hence, raosoft website was similar to Slovin's formula.

However, students that declined or were unavailable to answer the questionnaires were not forced and were excluded from the study. The researcher always established respect to unavailable respondents.

If they feel that they cannot discuss the information asked from them during the survey, the respondents may withdraw their consent and discontinue participation without penalty. Since their participation was voluntary, their refusal to participate involved no penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled. The researcher valued their participation and placed their welfare as the highest priority during the study. This study was conducted from December 2020 until January 2021.

Research Instrument

This study used two sets of survey questionnaires that assess the goals for reading and self-efficacy. Goals for reading has 30 items distributed to five items for curiosity, six items for involvement, four items for importance, five items for recognition, four items for grades, and six items for competition.

The next instrument was the survey questionnaire on self-efficacy with 35 items distributed in identifying learning needs and setting goals with four items, selecting learning resources and materials with five items, seeking social assistance with five items, organizing the learning process and environment with seven items, monitoring with three items, evaluating with seven items, and transferring acquired skills or information to other texts with four items.

For the level of goals for reading, the following Five-Point Likert Scale was used. To measure the level of the dependent variable, which was the competence and efficacy beliefs, the tool used in gathering the data was the modified-adapted questionnaires which originally developed by Ramirez in 2008 with its indicators: experiential learning, critical thinking, self-regulation, self-assessment.

In describing the goals for reading, the following five-point Likert scale was used:

Range of Means	Descriptive Level	Interpretation
4.20 - 5.00	Very High	This means that the student has an excellent Manifestation of goals for reading.
3.40 - 4.19	High	This means that the student has a very good manifestation of goals for reading.
2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	This means that the student has a good manifestation of goals for reading.
1.80 - 2.59	Low	This means that the student has a poor manifestation of goals for reading.
1.0 -1.79	Very Low	This means that the student has a very poor manifestation of goals for reading.

In describing the self-efficacy, the following five-point Likert scale was used:

Range of Means	Descriptive Level	Interpretation
4.20 - 5.00	Very High	This means that the student has an excellent manifestation of self-efficacy.
3.40 - 4.19	High	This means that the student has a very good manifestation of self-efficacy.
2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	This means that the student has a good manifestation of self-efficacy.
1.80 - 2.59	Low	This means that the student has a poor manifestation of self-efficacy.
1.0 -1.79	Very Low	This means that the student has a very poor manifestation of self-efficacy.

The survey questionnaires have undergone a validation process to ensure content validity. The first draft of the research instruments was submitted to the research adviser for comments, suggestions, and recommendations to improve the presentation with the corrections to be included and integrated. The final copies were submitted to a panel of experts for refinement. The final revision was made by incorporating the corrections, comments, and suggestions given by the expert validators before gathering data. The ratings of the validators were computed and consolidated to know the status of the questionnaires.

Further, a reliability index was observed through pilot testing on the same target respondents in other places. The data gathered have undergone the Cronbach Alpha test to identify the items to be removed and revised so that the questionnaires addressed the comprehension of the target respondents according to their level before the final conduct. The overall validation result of the questionnaires is 4.0, which means very good and having a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86 for goals for reading with an internal consistency of good, and 0.95 for self-efficacy with an internal consistency of excellent.

Data Collection

A letter asking for permission to conduct the study was sent to the Dean Professional Schools of the said university to issue a certificate to conduct. A letter requesting permission to conduct the study to the directors of the three institutions was sent, including the research instrument. A letter and an informed consent to the student respondents were sent. After the approval of the Dean of Professional Schools and school directors of the three branches, the researcher then brought the informed consent before personally administering the survey questionnaires to the respondents in every school chosen. The researcher administered the survey questionnaires to the students after they had signed the informed consent. The researcher retrieved the questionnaires after the respondents had answered. The researcher checked, tabulated, and consolidated the results and then gave them to the Statistician for analysis.

All data collected for this research were secured to safeguard confidentiality, especially during periods when the data is transported. It was ensured that the identifying information such as names was stored separately from other personal information collected as part of the research, like questionnaire responses, and secured in a locked filing cabinet. In contrast, the soft copy of the data was stored in a password-protected computer. Further, the gathered information was not even passed on to random people. Alternatively, it might mean the information can be used, but people's names and other identifying features of the situation will be removed. Eventually, paper records were disposed of in a manner that leaves no possibility for reconstructing information such as burning or shredding then cross shredding. The gathered data of survey responses were tabulated and placed by the researcher in an Excel spread sheet emailed to the statistician for statistical treatment.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Presented are the data and analysis of findings based on the responses of the respondents on Goals for Reading and Self-Efficacy among College Students. The discussions are sequenced according to the following sub-headings: level of goals for reading of college students; level of self-efficacy of college students; the relationship between goals for reading and self-efficacy among college students; and influence of goals for reading to self-efficacy among college students.

The Level of Goals for Reading

Shown in Table 1 are the descriptive statistics result on assessing the level of goals for reading which has an overall mean of *3.69 (standard deviation=0.51)*, described as high. Taken individually, the indicators of the level of goals for reading of the participants were as follows: curiosity *(mean=4.03; standard deviation=0.54)*, involvement *(mean=3.70; standard deviation =0.63)*, importance *(mean=4.00; standard deviation=0.70)*, recognition *(mean=3.44; standard deviation=0.69)*, grades *(mean=3.60; standard deviation =0.74)*, and competition *(mean=3.44; standard deviation=0.69)* are measures assessed to be high. In general, it is surmised that first-year college students are fairly reliable on their goals for reading. The high level of curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, grades, and competition means that these dimensions are pronounced among college students. An overall high rating is indicative that the college students have a very good manifestation of goals for reading.

Table 1. Level of Goals for Reading

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Curiosity	0.54	4.03	High
Involvement	0.63	3.70	High
Importance	0.70	4.00	High
Recognition	0.69	3.44	High
Grades	0.74	3.60	High
Competition	0.94	3.44	High
Over-all	**0.51**	**3.69**	**High**

The Level of Self-Efficacy

Shown in Table 2 are the results of the descriptive statistics in measuring the level of self-efficacy among first-year college students. The overall self-efficacy mean is *3.71 (standard deviation= 0.50)*, assessed to be high. All seven indicators are also in high level which are identifying learning needs and setting goals *(mean=3.72; standard deviation=0.50)*, selecting learning resources and materials *(mean=3.92; standard deviation=0.74)*, seeking social assistance *(mean=3.45; standard deviation=0.84)*, organizing the learning process and environment *(mean=3.63; standard*

deviation=0.70), monitoring *(mean=3.79; standard deviation=0.73)*, evaluating *(mean=3.49; standard deviation=0.52)*, and transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts *(mean=3.71; standard deviation=0.50)*. It is concluded that first-year college students are relying on their self-efficacy. It means that these dimensions are marked among college students. An overall high rating is indicative that the college students have a very good manifestation of self-efficacy.

Table 2. The Level of Self-Efficacy

Indicator	S.D.	Mean	Descriptive Level
Identifying Learning Needs and Setting Goals	0.50	3.72	High
Selecting Learning Resources and Materials	0.74	3.92	High
Seeking Social Assistance	0.84	3.45	High
Organizing the Learning Process and Environment	0.70	3.63	High
Monitoring	0.73	3.79	High
Evaluating	0.52	3.49	High
Transferring Acquired Skills or Information to Other Contexts	0.71	3.83	High
Over-all	**0.50**	**3.71**	**High**

The Significant Relationship Between Goals for Reading and Self-efficacy

Displayed in Table 3 are the results of the relationship between the independent (goals for reading) and dependent (self-efficacy) variables. Bivariate correlation analysis using Pearson product-moment correlation was employed to determine the relationship between the variables mentioned. The first zero-ordered correlation analysis between goals for reading and self-efficacy revealed a computed r-value of 0.604 with a probability value of $p<0.000$, which is significant at the 0.05 level. This indicates that there exists a positive and strong association between the two variables. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship is therefore rejected.

Table 3. Correlation Analysis of the Variables

Variable	Mean	S.D.	r-value	p-value	Decision on Ho
Goals for Reading	3.69	0.51	0.604	0.000	Reject
Self-efficacy	3.71	0.50			

Displayed in Table 4 is the correlation analysis of all indicators between the independent (goals for reading) and dependent (self-efficacy) variables. All indicators of the two variables have a positive relationship. Indicator *curiosity* from the independent variable and indicator *identifying learning needs and setting goals* from the dependent variable has the highest *r-value of 0.821*, which has a descriptive level of very high correlation. At the same time, indicators *grades* and *transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts* from independent and dependent variables have the lowest *r-value of 0.088*, with a very low descriptive level of correlation.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis of All Indicators

Variables Goals for Reading (Independent Variable)	Self-Efficacy (Dependent Variable)						
	Indicator 1	Indicator 2	Indicator 3	Indicator 4	Indicator 5	Indicator 6	Indicator 7
Indicator 1	0.821	0.452	0.275	0.468	0.445	0.303	0.177
Indicator 2	0.662	0.297	0.182	0.244	0.238	0.197	0.260
Indicator 3	0.645	0.481	0.122	0.414	0.447	0.389	0.260
Indicator 4	0.786	0.400	0.381	0.379	0.322	0.304	0.100
Indicator 5	0.789	0.438	0.316	0.483	0.402	0.311	0.088
Indicator 6	0.815	0.432	0.230	0.426	0.495	0.351	0.216

The Significant Influence of Goals for Reading to Self-efficacy

As shown in the table below, only importance and competition indicators of goals for reading significantly influence *(p-value<0.05)* self-efficacy. The rest of the indicators, to wit: involvement, curiosity, recognition, grades, and competition, do not significantly influence *(p-value>0.05)* self-efficacy.

As can be seen, goals for reading has a significant influence to self-efficacy. The regression model produced R^2 = 0.392, F= 31.506, p>0.05. This is in rejection of the

hypothesis that goals for reading do not significantly influence self-efficacy. Moreover, 61.31% of the competence of teachers can be attributed to social skills.

Thus, the following working model is generated based on the statistical results:

Self-efficacy = 1.43 + 0.126* importance + 0.108*competition

Table 5. The Significant Influence of Goals for Reading to Self-efficacy

Variable	Multiple Regression Weight		p-value
	b	β	
Constant	1.43		0.000
Curiosity	0. 126	0.136	0.067
Involvement	0.017	0.021	0.724
Importance	0.190	0.264	0.000
Recognition	0.089	0.122	0.061
Grades	0.075	0.111	0.140
Competition	0.108	0.153	0.033
Self-efficacy			0.000

$\alpha = 0.05$
R-SQUARED = 0.392
F-VALUE   = 31.506
P-VALUE = 0.000

Discussions

Presented are the discussions of data, conclusion, and recommendations on the goals for reading and self-efficacy among college students with supporting reviews of literature.

The Level of Goals for Reading

There is a very good manifestation of goals for reading among first-year college students. This means that students have very good studying habits in dealing with their personal learning behaviors inside the classroom. Also, they have a very good manifestation of curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, grades, and competition.

The first-year college students have a very good manifestation of curiosity as one dimension of goals for reading. This very good manifestation allows the students to gain interest in reading from their curiosity. College students often read more about what the teacher discusses, often read about hobbies to understand them, always read about the topics they are interested in, often read about new things, and always spend more time reading topics that interest me.

Also, the very good manifestation of involvement as one dimension of goals for reading allows the first-year college students to become part of reading activities affecting their perspective as readers. College students often read fantasy stories, often make pictures in their mind of what they read, often consider making friends with people through reading good books, often read mystery stories, often enjoy reading fiction, and often read adventure stories.

The very good manifestation of importance as one dimension of goals for reading promotes and fosters reading among first-year college students to create a community of readers. This means that college students always consider being a good reader very important, often consider reading important than any other activities, often

regard reading as a part of life skills, and always believe reading contributes to their well-being.

Further, a very good manifestation of recognition as one dimension of goals for reading allows first-year college students to experience receiving tangible rewards for good performance in reading. This means that college students often recognize themselves as good reader according to their friends, often read well according to their teachers, and are often happy when someone recognizes their reading, were sometimes praised by their parents about their reading habits, and sometimes get compliments for their reading.

While very good grades of first-year college students gave a clearer framework for first-year college students to consider essential factors and the accumulated value of achievement. This means that college students often look forward to finding out their grades in reading, often considering grades a good way to see how well they are doing in reading, often read to improve their grades, and were sometimes monitored by parents regarding their grades in reading.

Lastly, the very good manifestation of competition among first-year college students fueled the desire to outperform others in reading. This means that college students often find pleasure in being the only one who knows the answer in what they read, often like being the best in reading, often find it important to see their names in the list of being good readers, often try to find more right answers than their friends, often like to finish their reading before other students, and often willing to work hard to read better than my friends.

The above discussion on goals for reading supports the theory of Brevik and Hellekjær (2018) that good participation in education and community, reading skills are essential. When a student reads to learn, every article of the week creates context information, every textbook passage develops vocabulary, every poem becomes a chance, and every annotation becomes deliberate.

Moreover, reading is an activity with a reason. An individual can read to obtain information, check existing knowledge, or criticize the author's ideas or writing style. An individual can also read for pleasure or improve the language's knowledge to be read. The intent of reading shall also decide the appropriate approach to reading comprehension. It conforms to the study of Sheeba (2018) that the communicative approach to language teaching has provided teachers and students with a different understanding of the role of reading in the classroom language.

Additionally, it also supports the findings from Oregon Literacy Framework (2009), mentioned that achieving comprehensive reading ensures that students have the knowledge and skills they need to read a range of competent academic materials, are able to use reading as a method to deepen their knowledge of difficult academic content in a variety of educational fields, and can read for a variety of

functions across their lives, including enjoyment and enhancement.

Furthermore, the result confirms the study of Cabral-Márquez (2015), from the use of theoretical concepts structure, has been found that students are more likely to be attracted if the reading standard of their interest, skills, and consistency are met by their teachers, where their curiosity and choice of the genre will be the significant factors.

The Level of Self-Efficacy

The first-year college students have very good self-efficacy. This means they have very good competency in personal judgments of their intellectual capability. Also, they have a very good manifestation in learning needs and setting goals, selecting learning resources and materials, seeking social assistance, organizing the learning process and environment, monitoring, evaluating, and transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts.

A very good manifestation in identifying learning needs and setting goals allows for identifying the needs of students and setting of teachers' objectives for the teaching-learning process. This means that college students often analyze their learning needs in language, often analyze what skills they need to finish their assignments, often determine what they want to learn, often identify what specific skills they wish to acquire.

While a very good manifestation on *selecting learning resources and materials* gives a good point in appropriating materials and other resources for the teaching-learning process. This means they often select effective, relevant, and engaging learning materials, often evaluate learning materials for relevance, ad often select an appropriate learning routine for the task at hand.

Also, the very good manifestation of *seeking social assistance* enables the first-year college students to ask for help for the activities. This means that college students often ask help from their classmates to make learning more effective, often ask help from their schoolmates to make learning more effective, often ask help from their mentors to make learning more effective, often ask help from instructors outside the class to make learning more effective, and sometimes ask help from instructors through email to make learning more effective.

Moreover, a very good manifestation of *organizing the learning process and environment* allows the first-year college students to set-up in being organized. This means that college students often plan realistically, often stick to what they plan, often organize their spatial learning environment, often keep their learning environment clean and tidy, often turn off their phone when studying, often keep their laptop away when studying, and often consider a learning pace.

Further, the very good manifestation of monitoring allows the students to perform checking the progress. This

means that college students often reflect whether the selected learning routine is effective, often adapt their learning process to reach their goals, and often monitor their learning progress based on the plan.

In addition, a very good manifestation of evaluating first-year college students refers to the assessment of the process. This means that they often select criteria in evaluating their learning outcome, often evaluate the quality of their learning outcome, often ask help from their peers in evaluating their learning outcome, sometimes ask help from the professor to evaluate their learning outcome, and often evaluating if they reached their goals, whether the learning process was effective, and whether their planning is realistic.

Lastly, the very good manifestation of *transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts* of first-year college students enabled their learning transferred to other disciplines. This means that they often ensure the retention of the newly acquired knowledge, often ensure the retention of the newly acquired skills, often integrate the acquired information into their own knowledge, and often utilize the newly acquired information in similar contexts.

The discussion above about self-efficacy supports Peura et al. (2019) proposition that effort and persistence of learning. Moreover, self-efficacy beliefs may be fundamental in achieving skills that require persistent practice, such as fluent reading. Although reading self-efficacy has been directly linked to reading comprehension, much less is known about its relationship to reading fluency. Specific and intermediate self-efficacy was directly correlated to fluency, while another general self-efficacy was not. Intermediate self-efficacy predicted the development of fluency.

The current result backed Ortlieb and Schatz (2020), stating that literacy learning had been based on skills over emotional aspects, such as self-efficacy, since the beginning of the 21st century. Self-efficacy is confidence in one's ability to achieve the desired outcomes hence self-efficacy in reading can create confidence that a person may achieve the desired goal to read and comprehend.

Further, the study supports the findings of Conway (2017), which tested the correlation between the students' self-efficacy and reading comprehension. It was shown that there was a moderate correlation between the two variables; therefore, it implies that the more students are self-efficient, the better they can read and comprehend.

The Significant Relationship Between Goals for Reading and Self-efficacy

It has been found that goals for reading and self-efficacy are significantly related to each other, which implies that as goals for reading increase (respectively decreases), self-efficacy also increases (respectively decreases).

The above supports the proposition of Boakye (2015) that a clear association between reading self-efficacy and

reading abilities for this group of students. Effective and well-organized reading and writing practices improve self-efficiency and enthusiasm and contribute to a high degree of reading comprehension, leading to improved academic success. Self-efficacy has been viewed as coming from a variety of outlets.

Consequently, the study conforms to the theory of Hedges and Gable (2016), which mentioned that there is a significant rapport between the student's goal of reading and self-efficacy; it was clearly stated that self-efficacy is the blood of every learner or student to move forward to their primary goal, and it is to read with knowledge and understanding.

It also supports the study of Naseri and Zaferanieh (2012); the findings of Spearman's coefficient of association, descriptive statistics, and canonical correlation showed that there was a strong positive correlation between reading self-efficacy and reading comprehension, as well as between reading self-efficacy and reading strategies; the most common application of the reading approach was the semantic strategy followed by the testing strategy, the metacognitive strategy, and eventually the countervailing strategy; With respect to gender, there was no disparity in the relationship between Reading Self-Efficacy and Reading Strategies by students.

Academic self-efficacy has been strongly linked to academic success in previous student studies. Furthermore, the present research conforms with the findings of Hager (2017), which showed a non-significant positive association between student reading self-efficacy and student reading achievement. The results were not definitive as to students' capacity in this age group to correctly measure their reading self-efficacy and achievement capabilities

The Significant Influence of Goals for Reading to Self-efficacy

Only curiosity and competition indicators of goals for reading significantly influence self-efficacy. This implies that these two indicators are two important factors that can be used to predict self-efficacy. While involvement, importance, recognition, grades, and competition do not significantly influence self-efficacy, which implies that they can't be used to predict self-efficacy. With this, a working model is generated based on the statistical results:

Self-efficacy = 1.43 + 0.126*curiosity + 0.108*competition

The above result supports the proposition of Boakye (2015), who enunciated that a regression analysis conducted with other affective variables revealed self-efficacy as the greatest indicator of student reading abilities.

In addition, the study confirms with Tobing (2013), which provided a regression study that revealed that the cumulative use of reading goals had a substantial relationship to reading comprehension and made a minor contribution to the estimation of reading comprehension capabilities. Hence, the findings also showed that self-efficacy had a significant

association with reading comprehension and contributed as much as 20% to the prediction of reading comprehension. When there were two independent variables around the same time, reading techniques had a non-significant relationship to reading comprehension, while self-efficacy was a significant indicator of reading comprehension.

Moreover, the study is aligned with the proposition of Sasson (2010), stating that reading goals as an element of competitiveness and self-efficacy, reading goals helps them to have long-term ideas and short-term boosts. Reading goals helps students define their capabilities and let them take a stand on committing those goals, but reading goals is only for a long-drawn process.

Lastly, the result confirms the study of Sasson (2010) that goals for reading in correlation with self-efficacy affect competencies as mentioned by many studies above, reading goals boost competitiveness among students by boosting one's confidence as the student has the ability to extract knowledge from the text read. Also, it tells different goals to manifest those reading goals. Settling reading goals makes the students more capable of dealing with firm verdicts inside the campus, making them more confident and logically more competitive. Knowing their prior goals inside the campus helps them concentrate and focus on a certain field.

IV. CONCLUSION

The following are conclusions gleaned from the results of this study:

There is a high level of goals for reading among first-year college students. This means that students have very good studying habits in dealing with their personal learning behaviors inside the classroom. Also, they have a high level of curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, grades, and competition.

The first-year college students have a high level of self-efficacy. This means they have very good competency in personal judgments of their intellectual capability. Also, they have a high level of learning needs and setting goals, selecting learning resources and materials, seeking social assistance, organizing the learning process and environment, monitoring, evaluating, and transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts.

It has been found that goals for reading and self-efficacy are significantly related to each other. Only curiosity and competition indicators of goals for reading significantly influence self-efficacy. With this, a working model is generated based on the statistical results:

Self-efficacy = 1.43 + 0.126*curiosity + 0.108*competition

The study's overall recent findings conform with schema theory, which had a major impact on reading instruction. It is based on the notion that past experiences create mental frameworks that help readers make sense of new experiences.

The finding also supports the theory of metacognitive view. Metacognitive reading strategies are conscious means by which students monitor their reading processes, including evaluating the effectiveness of cognitive strategies being used. Metacognitive strategies may involve, for example, planning how to approach the reading of a text, testing, and revising according to purpose and time available.

In addition, the finding also conforms to the social constructivist theory because it examines teachers' experiences in implementing reading programs, which is a process. Teachers' experiences are, without a doubt, based only on learners' experiences in creating their knowledge through reading and out of programs provided. This research is based on the social constructivist teaching philosophy. The collaborative nature of much learning is emphasized in this idea. According to this idea, learning was not merely the process of learner's assimilation and adaptation of new knowledge; it was also the process of learners' integration into a knowledge community.

Also, the finding supports Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory of motivation, which states that one's self-efficacy influences behavior. According to this idea, students' self-efficacy in their reading abilities can influence their success on a reading task. If the student performs poorly, these self-efficacy beliefs may become increasingly negative, affecting the student's future reading performance. Because of their mental condition, the student may be less motivated the next time they are required to read. This is why it's crucial to evaluate students' motivation when they're having difficulties in reading.

V. RECOMMENDATION

With the above knowledge generated, the following are recommended:

The school administrator and school leaders ought to keep track of the programs that will maintain the high level or may enhance into very high level the goals for reading and self-efficacy of the college students. Also, teachers in Language and Reading are recommended to check the strategies in teaching reading so that goals for reading and self-efficacy will be sustained at a high level or may be enhanced to a very high level.

Teachers in reading subjects are also recommended to improve their instructional management abilities so that the dimensions of goals for reading like curiosity, involvement, importance, recognition, grades, and competition will be maintained at a high level or maybe enhanced to a very high level. Also, the dimensions of self-efficacy, which are learning needs and setting goals, selecting learning resources and materials, seeking social assistance, organizing the learning process and environment, monitoring, evaluating, and transferring acquired skills or information to other contexts, can be sustained in high level or may be enhanced to a very high level.

Further research on the correlation between goals for reading and self-efficacy is recommended to be replicated, and also exploration on the influence of other domains is recommended to be tested for further enhancement. This study is recommended to be replicated in different contexts and other dimensions on the goals for reading and self-efficacy for confirmation and additional generation of knowledge.

REFERENCES

[1] Al-Bataineh, A.T., Brenwall, L., Stalter, K. & York, J. (2019). Student growth through goal setting. International Journal of Learning and Teaching. 11(4), 147-161. https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v11i4.4329

[2] Álvarez-Cañizo, M., Suárez-Coalla, P., & Cuetos, F. (2015). The role of reading fluency in children's text comprehension. Front. Psychol. 6:1810. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01810

[3] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman and Company. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1503664160/9129E9AD17794299PQ/6?accountid=31259

[4] Bigozzi, L., Tarchi, L., Vagnoli, L., Valente, E., & Pinto, G. (2017). Reading Fluency As a Predictor of School Outcomes across Grades 4–9. Original Research Article. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00200

[5] Bingham, A. J., Pane, J. F., Steiner, E. D., & Hamilton, L. S. (2016). Ahead of the curve: Implementation challenges in personalized learning school models. Educational Policy, 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904816637688

[6] Blay, B. (2007). Elementary Statistics. Anvil Publishing Inc.

[7] Boakye, N. (2015). The relationship between self-efficacy and reading proficiency of first-year students: An exploratory study. Reading & Writing, 6(1), 1-9. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1737493474?accountid=3125

[8] Bouhedjam, D.N. (2015). Importance of Reading Activity in Education. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314094530_Importance_of_Reading_Activity_in_Education

[9] Bray, B., & McClaskey, K. (2015). Make learning personal: The what, who, WOW, where, and why. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

[10] Brevik, L.M. & Hellekjær, G.O. (2018). The outliers: Upper secondary school students who read better in the L2 than in L1. International Journal of Educational Research, 89, 80-91. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S08830355173104800

[11] Britt, A., Rouet, J., & Durik, A. (2018). Literacy Beyond Text Comprehension: A Theory of Purposeful Reading https://srcd.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/cdep.12184

[12] Burrows, L. (2013). The effects of extensive reading and reading strategies on reading self-efficacy [e-book]. US: ProQuest Information & Learning; 2013. https://www.proquest.com/docview/1019055686

[13] Bušljeta, R. (2013). Effective Use of Teaching and Learning Resources. Czech-Polish

[14] Cabral-Marquez, C. (2011). The effects of setting reading goals on reading motivation, reading achievement, and reading activity (Order No. 3457771). Available from ProQuest Central. (874246328). https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/effects-setting-reading-goals-on-motivation/docview/874246328/se-2?accountid=31259

[15] Cabral-Márquez, C. (2015). Motivating Readers Helping Students Set and Attain Personal Reading Goals. Volume68, Issue6 Pages 464-472 https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1332

[16] Cambria, J., & Guthrie, J. (2010). Motivating and engaging students in reading. The NERA Journal, 46(1). http://www.academia.edu/download/30317068/nera-v46-n1-2010.pdf#page=22

[17] Camp, D. (2010). Here, There, and Anywhere: Transfer of Learning. Eric publication. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1047001.pdf

[18] Cantrell, S. C., Correll, P., Clouse, J., Creech, K., Bridges, S., & Owens, D. (2013). Patterns of self-efficacy among college students in developmental reading. Journal of College Reading and Learning, 44(1), 8-34. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1503664160?accountid=31259

[19] Carroll County Public Schools. (2017). Selection, Evaluation, and Adoption of Instructional Materials. https:// www. carrollk12.org/ instruction/ curriculum/ Documents/Selection%20Evaluation%20and%20Adoption%20of %20Instructional%20Materials%20Handbook_revised%204.19.17 .pdf

[20] Carroll, J., & Fox, A. (2017). Reading Self-Efficacy Predicts Word Reading But Not Comprehension in Both Girls and Boys. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02056

[21] Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2012). A model of behavioral self-regulation. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of theories of social psychology (pp. 505–525). Sage Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n25

[22] Caster, T. (2015). Behaviorism: The Dominant Educational Perspective. https://www.slideshare.net/tele1957/chapter-3-behaviorism-slides .

[23] Chiang, I. (2015). Overview of Nonexperimental Research. https://opentextbc.ca/researchmethods/chapter/overview-of nonexperimental-research/.

[24] Conway, B. (2017). Reading Comprehension and Self Efficacy. All Capstone Projects. 283. http://opus.govst.edu/capstones/283

[25] Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Pearson.

[26] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, D. J. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

[27] Curtis, E. A., Comiskey, C., & Dempsey, O. (2016). Importance and use of correlational research. Nurse Researcher (2014+), 23(6), 20. http://dx.doi.org/10.7748/nr.2016.e1382

[28] Elio, S. (2015). The Importance of Reading. Nord Anglia International School Al Khor. https://www.nordangliaeducation.com/our-schools/al-khor/parent-resources/ our-school-enewsletter/primary/the-importance-of-reading#:~: text=Learnin g%20to% 20read% 20is% 20about,as%20they%20start%20to%20read.

[29] Graduate School Instructor (2018). Social Constructivism. https://gsi.berkeley.edu/gsi-guide-contents/learning-theory-research/social-constructivism/ on October 27, 2018.

[30] Gulas, S. (2010). The Impact of Parent Involvement on Reading Comprehension Test Scores of Fourth-Grade https:// mdsoar.org/ bitstream/ handle/ 11603/ 2822/ actionres_ Gulas_paperFA09.pdf?sequence=1

[31] Hager, J. (2017). "The Relationship of Reading Self-Efficacy and Reading Achievement in Second Grade Students". Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 11062. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/11062

[32] Hedges, J., & Gable, R. (2016). "The Relationship of Reading Motivation and Self-Efficacy to Reading Achievement" (2016). https:// scholarsarchive .jwu.edu /k12_ ed/31Historical and Pedagogical Journal, 5/2, 55–69. doi: 10.2478/cphpj-2013-0014

[33] Hosseini, S. (2019). The Effects of Competitive Team-Based Learning and Student Teams-Achievement Divisions on Reading Comprehension of Iranian EFL Intermediate Students. https:// www. researchgate.net/ publication/ 334108781_ The_Effects_of_Competitive_Team-Based_Learning_and_Student_Teams-Achievement_ Divisions_ on_ Reading_ Comprehension_ of_ Iranian_ EFL_ Intermediate_Students. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0123 -34322011000200001.

[34] Jimaa, S. (2011). The impact of assessment on students learning. Project: Educational research. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 28:718-721 https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.sbspro. 2011.11.133

[35] Karageorgos, P., Richter, T., Haffmans, M., Schindler, J., Nauman, J. (2020). The role of word-recognition accuracy in the development of word-recognition speed and reading comprehension in primary school: A longitudinal examination. https:// doi.org/ 10.1016/ j.cogdev.2020.100949

[36] Karbalaei, A. (2011). METACOGNITION AND READING COMPREHENSION.

[37] Khairuddin, Z. (2013). A Study of Students' Reading Interests in a Second Language. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education. ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039. Vol. 6, No. 11 International Education Studies. http:// dx.doi.org/ 10.5539/ ies.v6n11p160

[38] Learning First Alliance. (2019) Strategies for Achieving the Goal of Every Child Reading. https://www.readingrockets.org/article/strategies-achieving-goal-every-child-reading

[39] Li, Y., & Wang, C. (2010). An empirical study of reading self-efficacy and the use of reading strategies in the Chinese EFL context. The Asian EFL Quarterly, 12(2), 144-162.

[40] Literacy Online, (2010). Evaluating. http://lisalozenski.weebly.com/evaluating.html

[41] Matrix Education, (2018). 5 reason why students should read. Matrix education publication. https://www.matrix.edu.au/5-reasons-students-should-read-books-2/#:~:text=Develop%20Analytical%20Thinking%20Skills,subject %2C%20making%20them%20more%20knowledgeable.

[42] McLean, S., & Poulshock, J. (2018). Increasing reading self-efficacy and reading amount in EFL learners with word-targets. Reading in a Foreign Language, 30(1), 76–91. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1176293.pdf

[43] McMahon, A. (2010). The Impact of Parent Involvement on Children's Reading Achievement and Effective Methods of Increasing Parent Involvement. http://dl.uncw.edu/Etd/2010-1/mcmahona/amymcmahon.pdf

[44] Middle Level Education Research Special Interest Group. (2016). The MLER SIG research agenda. http://mlersig.net/research/mler-sig-research-agenda

[45] Milly, K. (2010). Parental Involvement and Children's Literacy Success. Education Masters. Paper 10.

[46] Ministry of Education, (2018). The Importance of Learning Materials in Teaching. https://education.gov.gy/web/index.php/teachers/tips-for-teaching/item/2036-the-importance-of-learning-materials-in-teaching#:~: text=Learning% 20materials%20 are%20important%20because,new%20skill%20gained%20in%20c lass.

[47] Mississippi College, (2017). Importance of Reading for Elementary Students. https://online.mc.edu/degrees/education/med/elementary/reading-for-elementary-students/

[48] Mizumoto, A., (2012). 'Exploring the effects of self-efficacy on vocabulary learning strategies', Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 3(4), 423–437.

[49] Movchan, S. (2018). What Makes a Good Learning Environment. https:// raccoongang. com/blog/what-makes-good-learning-environment/

[50] Naseri, M., & 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, No. http:// dx.doi.org/ 10.5430/wje.v2n2p64

[51] National Academies Press. (2020 updated). Deeper Learning of English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. https://www.nap.edu/read/13398/chapter/7

[52] Nese, J. F. T., Biancarosa, G., Cummings, K., Kennedy, P., Alonzo, J., & Tindal, G. (2013). In search of average growth: Describing within-year oral reading fluency growth across Grades

1-8. J. Sch. Psychol. 51(5), 625–642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.05.006

[53] Nunes, G., Pirovani., O., Silva, H., & Butarelo, A. (2018). The importance of student monitoring in academic learning: A two-year follow-up. Brazilian Journal of Oral Sciences 17:1-7. https://doi.org/10.20396/bjos.v17i0.8652940

[54] Nunes, T., Bryant, P., & Barros, R. (2012). The development of word recognition and its significance for comprehension and fluency. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(4), 959–973. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027412

[55] OECD (2013). Pisa 2015 Draft Reading Literacy Framework March 2013. Available online at: http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/Draft PISA 2015 Reading Framework.pdf

[56] Oregon Literacy Framework, (2009). Measurable reading goals anchor a school's comprehensive reading plan and the Oregon K-12 Literacy Framework.https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/ standards/ ELA/ Documents/chapter-1-goals.pdf

[57] Ormand, J. E. (2012). Human Learning, Sixth Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc. https://spierson61.wordpress.com/papers/ed511-learning-and-teaching-concepts-and-models/the-importance-of-transfer-to-the-learning-process/

[58] Ortlieb, E., & Schatz, S. (2020). Student's Self-Efficacy in Reading – Connecting Theory to Practice. Reading Psychology, 41(7). Affective Dimensions of Student Literacy Learning: Issue 2. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2020.1783146

[59] Pardede, P. (2010). A Review on Reading Theories and its Implication to the Teaching of Reading. https://parlindunganpardede.wordpress.com/articles/language-teaching/a-review-on-reading-theories-and-its-implication-to-the-teaching-of-reading/ on October 31, 2018.

[60] Peura, P., Arob, T., Viholainen, H., Räikkönen, E., Usher, E., Sorvo, R., & Aro, A. (2019). Reading self-efficacy and reading fluency development among primary school children: Does specificity of self-efficacy matter. Learning and Individual Differences. Volume 73, Pages 67-78

[61] PhilAtlas. (2022a updated). Davao del Norte Profile. PhilAtlas. https://www.philatlas.com/mindanao/r11/davao-del-norte.html

[62] PhilAtlas. (2022b updated). Panabo City, Davao del Norte Profile. https://www.philatlas.com/mindanao/r11/davao-del-norte/panabo.html

[63] PhilAtlas. (2022c updated). Samal City, Davao del Norte Profile. https://www.philatlas.com/mindanao/r11/davao-del-norte/samal.html

[64] PhilAtlas. (2022d updated). Tagum City, Davao del Norte Profile. https://www.philatlas.com/mindanao/r11/davao-del-norte/tagum.html

[65] Prat-Sala, M., & Redford, P. (2010). The interplay between motivation, self-efficacy, and approaches to studying. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 283-305. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709909X480563

[66] Primary Project. (2017). The Importance of Social Support. https://phctheproject.org/the-importance-of-social support/# :~:text=Social% 20support% 20means% 20having% 20friends,buffer% 20against% 20adverse% 20life% 20events.

[67] Print Skills, (2014). Recognition. https://s0606310.weebly.com/

[68] Reschly, A. L., Busch, T. W., Betts, J., Deno, S. L., & Long, J. D. (2009). Curriculum-based measurement oral reading as an indicator of reading achievement: a meta-analysis of the correlational evidence. J. Sch. Psychol. 47, 427–469. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2009.07.001

[69] Rogiers, A., Keer, H.K., & Merchie, E. (2020). The profile of the skilled reader: An investigation into the role of reading enjoyment and student characteristics. International Journal of Educational Research, 99, 2020, 101512 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.101512

[70] Ruelens, E. (2019). Measuring language learner autonomy in higher education: The Self-Efficacy Questionnaire of Language Learning Strategies. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336600495_Measuring_l anguage_learner_autonomy_in_higher_education_The_Self-Efficacy_Questionnaire_of_Language_Learning_Strategies.

[71] Safer, N., & Fleischman, S. (2005). Research Matters / How Student Progress Monitoring Improves Instruction. Volume 62 | Number 5. How Schools Improve Pages 81-83. Issue Table of Contents

[72] Samar, R. (2013). Sociocultural theory and reading comprehension: The scaffolding of readers in an EFL context. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286430070_Sociocultura l_theory_and_reading_comprehension_The_scaffolding_of_reader s_in_an_EFL_context.

[73] Sasson, D. (2010). Effective Goal Setting for Students. http://teaching.monster.com/benefits/articles/9440-effective-goal-setting-for students

[74] School Tannzania. (2014). Factors That Determine the Choice Method to Be Used In Teaching History. http://myfreeschooltanzania.blogspot.com/2014/08/factors-that-determine-choice-method-to.html?m =1#:~:text =Some% 20determining% 20factors% 20for% 20selecting,(collaborating)%2C% 20and% 20Vis ual.

[75] Schunk, D. H., & Mullen, C. A. (2012). Self-efficacy as an engaged learner. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), Handbook of research on student engagement (pp. 219-236). Springer

[76] Shah, P., Weeks, H., Richards, B., & Kaciroti, N. (2018). Early childhood curiosity and kindergarten reading and math academic achievement. Pediatr Res 84, 380–386 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-018-0039-3

[77] Sheeba, S. (2018). Teaching Reading: Goals and Techniques https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328449849_Teaching_R eading_Goals_and_Techniques

[78] Smith, J., Smith, L., Gilmore, A., & Jameson, M. (2012). Students' self-perception of reading ability, enjoyment of reading and reading achievement. https://www.academia.edu/2523410/Students_self_perception_of_ reading_ability_enjoyment_of_reading_and_reading_achievement

[79] Stuart. D. Jr. (2017). The Goal of Reading (and Basic Strategies for Achieving It https://davestuartjr.com/goal-reading-basic-strategies-achieving/

[80] Tobing, I. (2013). The Relationship of Reading Strategies and Self-Efficacy with The Reading Comprehension of High School Students in Indonesia. https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/15094/Tobin g_ku_0099D_12919_DATA_1.pdf;sequence=1

[81] Tugsbaatar, U. (2020). Albert Bandura: Self-Efficacy for Agentic Positive Psychology. https://positivepsychology.com/bandura-self-efficacy/.

[82] U.S. Department of Education. (2013). FY 2013 race to the top-district executive summary. https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/2013-executive-summary.pdf

[83] United Nations. (2021, March 29). 100 million more children fail basic reading skills because of. UN News. https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/03/1088392

[84] University of Michigan. (2018). Study explores link between curiosity and school achievement. Science news daily. https:// www. sciencedaily. com/ releases/ 2018/ 04/ 180430075616.htm

[85] Villiger, C. (2020). Benefits and Constraints of Parent Involvement in Children's Reading Promotion: General Research Trends and Evidence from a Swiss Paired Reading Intervention https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.93136

[86] Waleff, M.L. (2010). The relationship between mastery orientation goals, student self-efficacy for reading achievement in intermediate level learners in a rural district', PhD thesis, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Database number (3427217).

[87] Weissberg, R. (2016). Why Social and Emotional Learning Is Essential for Students. Social and Emotional Learning.

https://www.edutopia.org/blog/why-sel-essential-for-students-weissberg-durlak-domitrovich-gullotta

[88] Whitten, C., Houston, S., Labby, S., & Sullivan, S. (2016). The impact of Pleasure Reading on Academic Success. The Journal of Multidisciplinary Graduate Research. 2016, Volume 2, Article 4, pp. 48-64. https://www.shsu.edu/academics/education/journal-of-multidisciplinary-graduate-research/documents/2016/WhittenJournalFinal.pdf

[89] Wilhelm, J. (2017). The Benefits of Reading for Pleasure. George Lucas Educational Foundation. https://www.edutopia.org/article/benefits-reading-pleasure

[90] William, S. (2019). A.2 What is a learning environment. https://opentextbc.ca/ teachinginadigitalage/chapter/5-2-what-is-a-learning-environment/

[91] Wilson-Fleming, L., & Wilson-Younger, D. (2012). Positive Classroom Environments = Positive Academic Results.