JLS

Journal of Language Studies

Academy of Language Studies

Articles

Promoting Competence Motivation via *Direct Explanation*: Developing a Self-efficacious ESL Reader

Bromeley Philip

This paper attempts to explore the possibility of implementing an explicit strategy instruction to teach academic reading. It provides some interesting review of the literature on the probable benefits of an explicit strategy instruction such as Direct Explanation type of strategy instruction. Besides teaching strategies explicitly, Direct Explanation also incorporates a motivational approach component whereby it emphasises enhancing the learners' level of competence motivation. This in turn helps enhance the learners' level of self-efficacy which enables the learners to a large extent use the strategies effectively in their meaning making process. The increase in the learners' level of self-efficacy beliefs over a period of time was measured using a non-parametric test of Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Rank Test (WMPSRT), which denotes a positive result. The learners' performance in recall and comprehension of propositions was also measured for level of significance vis-à-vis that of the control group's, and the results were in favour of the experimental group.

Introduction

The main objective of this paper is to demonstrate how competence motivation may be promoted through a Direct Explanation (DE) strategy instruction, and to some extent show how competence motivation can help enhance the learners' level of self-efficacy beliefs. In the context of the study, an increase in the level of self-efficacy beliefs represents learners who are self-efficacious in strategy use. The paper is divided into three major sections that include literature review, methodology and findings.

Literature Review

Explicit Strategy Instruction

Schunk's (1984) research indicates that explicit strategy training not only helps students acquire and use strategies, but also helps them develop self-efficacy. This is because in an explicit strategy training learners are not only instructed in the use of a strategy, but are also explicitly instructed on how to employ, monitor, check, and evaluate that strategy effectively (Brown et al., 1983). Jesse Ee and Moore (2004) argue that strategy training needs to address motivational influences such as values and beliefs, along with training in management and control strategies. Oka and Paris (cited in McCombs, 1988) suggest that motivational interventions should help students develop a sense of control, show them how to make academic goals personally relevant, help them acquire adequate self-management skills, and foster a balanced view of success and failure. Training of this nature instils in the learners a sense of metacognitive awareness. This awareness contributes to perception of competency and control; it generally contributes to learners' views of themselves as competent and self-directed; and, specifically, it contributes to ongoing feelings of personal efficacy (McCombs, 1988). A strong sense of personal efficacy implies that the learners have gained what is known as competence motivation.

Competence Motivation and Strategy Use

White (1959) defined competence or effectance motivation as an individual's fitness or ability to interact effectively with his or her environment (cited in Schunk, 2000). The ability to interact effectively with the environment provides learners with a great sense of efficacy. And as White argues, it is the feeling of efficacy, rather than the learning that comes as its consequence, which can lead to continuing interest. This continuing interest, which is met by competence motivation, is to bring environmental factors under greater control and thus enabling an individual to become more self-determining. Furthermore, competence motivation serves the function of not only producing feelings of efficacy, but also of directing attention and organizing actions that will result in effective interactions with the environment. Hence, a competence motivation is directed, selective, and persistent because it satisfies an intrinsic need to deal with the environment. This is clearly supported by

2

Thomas (1980) (cited in Schunk, 2000) who argues that what motivates learners to seek out or avoid learning activities is their positive perceptions of their competence, their positive perceptions of the value or rewards associated with successful task completion, and their positive perceptions of the extent to which their effort will lead to success.

McCombs (1988) is of the view that such positive motivational state is necessary in order for learners to discover and use learning strategies. This in fact, establishes the rationale and purpose of motivational skills training as necessary for the acquisition and use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. This in turn implies that teaching *learning strategies* to learners should aptly be done through motivation promotion approach. One approach that helps instil competence motivation in the learners is *Direct Explanation*.

Direct Explanation (DE)

Direct explanation method of strategy instruction involves procedures which include the following (Roehler & Duffy, 1984): (1) structuring the learning in terms of clear academic goals broken down for maximal content coverage into manageable steps (i.e. conducting a task analysis); (2) brisk pacing and selection of sequenced, structured materials; (3) providing detailed, redundant instructions and explanations with sufficient examples; (4) asking many questions and offering numerous overt active practice opportunities; (5) giving immediate, academically focused feedback and correction, especially when new material is being learned; and (6) active monitoring of student progress. DE suggests that learners do not passively learn from explanations but rather actively learn from them. They do not completely understand what the teacher is saying or doing, but the teacher's explanation and modelling is a starting point for the learner. As the learner attempts to understand the various strategies that the teacher modelled, he or she adapts those strategies to the particular tasks at hand and modifies them in ways that are sensible to him or her.

Most strategies can be taught via direct explanation. It is an extremely fluid approach to teaching, usually beginning with teacher explanations and modelling and then proceeding to student practice. Practice is monitored with additional explanations and modelling provided as needed, with such feedback and instruction reduced as the students becomes more independent (i.e., direct explanations and feedback are provided in a scaffolded fashion). An important part of this instruction is what Roehler and Duffy (1984) refer to as mental modelling, which is

3

simply showing the students how to apply the strategy by thinking aloud. Another extremely important idea in this approach to instruction is responsive elaboration: the information provided to students depends on the particular problems the students are encountering and the particular ways that their understandings are deficient. Re-instruction and re-explanations as well as follow-up mental modelling are responsive to student needs and usually are an elaboration of students' understandings up until that point (McCormick & Pressley, 1995: 195).

Roehler and Duffy (1984) produced a well-designed study of the effects of direct explanation type of strategy instruction. The teachers were taught first to explain a strategy and then to mentally model use of the strategy for learners. The mental modelling showed learners how good readers apply the strategy when they read. Then came guided student practice with the students initially carrying out the processing overtly so that the teacher could monitor their use of the new strategy. At first, there was substantial assistance, which was reduced as learners became more proficient. It must be emphasised that re-explanations and re-modelling and prescription of additional practice were on as needed basis. Thus, although there was scaffolding of instruction, the teacher was not at all reluctant to provide additional input when learners needed it.

Teachers were also taught to encourage transfer of strategies by going over when and where the strategies being learned might be used. Teachers cued use of the new strategies when students encountered situations in which the strategies might be applied profitably, regardless of when these occasions arose. Cuing and prompting was continued until students autonomously applied the strategies they were taught. Thus, learners receiving direct explanations were more aware of lesson content and the strategic nature of reading at the end of the year than were control students receiving more conventional instruction. Even more important, however, was that the students in the direct explanation condition outperformed the control students on a number of measures of reading.

In direct explanation instruction, students are informed of the value and purpose of strategy training, whereas in embedded instruction, learners are presented with activities and materials structured to elicit the use of strategies being taught but are not informed of the reasons why this approach to learning is being practised. Argument in favour of direct explanation is that learners are aware of the purpose and importance of strategies and thus strategy use can be maintained over time and even

transferred to new tasks. What is essential is that learners gain self-efficacy because it has an important influence on motivation. Belief in self-efficacy determines the degree to which an individual will become engaged in and expend physical or mental energy in an activity (McCabe, 2003).

Winograd and Hare's Direct Explanation Model (L1)(1988)

Winograd and Hare (1988: 123-124) outlines a number of steps to teach strategies directly to learners. They believe that what constitutes a careful and complete explanation of a reading comprehension strategy is as follows:

1. **What the strategy is.** Teachers should describe critical, known features of the strategy or provide a definition/description of the strategy.

2. **Why the strategy should be learned.** Teachers should tell learners why they are learning about the strategy. Explaining the purpose of the lesson and its potential benefits seems to be a necessary step for moving from teacher control to student self-control learning.

3. **How to use the strategy.** Here, teachers break down the strategy, or re-enact a task analysis for students, explaining each component of the strategy as clearly and as articulately as possible and showing the logical relationships among the various components. Where implicit processes are not known or are hard to explicate, or where explanatory supplements are desired, assists such as advance organizers, think-alouds, analogies, and other attention clues are valuable and recommended.

4. **When and where the strategy is used.** Teachers should delineate appropriate circumstances under which the strategy may be employed, (e.g., whether the strategy applies in a story or informational reading). Teachers may also describe inappropriate instances for using the strategy.

5. **How to evaluate use of the strategy.** Teachers should show students how to evaluate their successful/unsuccessful use of the strategy, including suggestions for fix-up (improvise) strategies to resolve remaining problems.

Figure 1: Strategy Instruction Process

Winograd and Hare's Direct Explanation Model has most of what it means to be metacognitively-based instruction. It deals directly with not merely imparting features of strategies per se but also providing learners with metacognitive knowledge as regards strategy use in appropriate learning contexts. It also teaches learners how to evaluate their success in strategy use, which implicit in this experience is motivation for future strategy applications. It is clear that this is a metacognitive model of strategy instruction, which seeks to enhance learners' metacognitive control of strategy use, and as learners discover academic success they become motivated. The strength of the model is in its explicit metacognitive instruction while its concern for motivation is rather implicitly executed. It is important that learners be explicitly motivated through positive consequences of verbal praises. This is to make learners aware of their efficacy in using the strategies that they have learned. In this way, they can confidently attribute their success to strategy use, which in turn gradually transforms them into strategic learners. So, if there is one improvement that is needed in this model it better be the addition of an explicit approach to motivating the learners.

Self-efficacy and Strategy Use

Learners' belief or expectation of self-efficacy is important as the basis for achieving meaningful goals and intentions. An efficacy expectation is the belief that one can successfully execute behaviours that produced desired outcomes. Bandura (1978, 1997) contends that these efficacy expectations influence firstly, individuals' choice of activities, causing them to avoid activities they believe exceed their capabilities, and undertake those they think they can perform, secondly, how much effort learners will expend, and thirdly, how long learners will persist in the face of obstacles. Maehr's (1983) also agrees that learners' efficacy beliefs can either promote or deter continued motivation and learning for particular tasks. It appears that not only do the learners' self-efficacy beliefs energise strategic behaviours; they also directly influence strategy use. In other words, their expectations of personal efficacy mediate their actions through organising strategic allocation of effort for learning (Palmer & Goetz, 1988).

Competence motivation influences learners' self-efficacy beliefs, which in turn determines learners' intentions to use strategies. In fact, McCombs (1988) is strongly of the view that motivation is a necessary component of strategic behaviour and a precursor to strategy use. On

similar note, Paris et. al. (1984), who point out that motivational influences on strategy use include learners' values, beliefs, and attitudes. Bandura and Schunk (1981) have found that when presented with a difficult task, people who doubt their capability tend to give up. In contrast, those with a high sense of self-efficacy exert greater effort to meet the challenge. According to Palmer and Goetz (1988), learners will have greater confidence in their capability or competence to use a strategy if they perceive that they have the level of ability and effort required for effective use of the strategy, and the strategy is appropriate for tasks at hand.

Having experienced success and attributing the success to their ability, learners will perceive their efficacy in strategy use positively. Their positive perception of self-efficacy provides a sense of competence motivation, which encourages them to engage in future strategy use. An important cognitive mechanism influencing learning and behaviour change is perceived self-efficacy, or personal beliefs about one's capabilities to organise and implement actions necessary to attain designated levels of performance. Self-efficacy can affect choice of activities. People who hold a low sense of efficacy for accomplishing a task may attempt to avoid it, whereas those who believe they are more capable should participate more eagerly. Self-efficacy is also hypothesised to affect effort expenditure and persistence. Especially when facing obstacles, learners with a high sense of efficacy are motivated learners and they normally work harder and persist longer than those who doubt their capabilities (Schunk, 1986). Hence, self-efficacious learners are motivated learners. McCombs (1988) states that learning can be understood as motivational behaviours, that is, abilities that are influenced by feelings of efficacy and worth rather than mere cognitive competencies. As far as strategy use is concerned, it is a motivated behaviour. Since motivation shapes learners' efficacy beliefs, which subsequently influences strategy use, it is crucial that motivation is viewed as one component necessary for strategy instruction.

Ames and Archer (1988) believe that learners who perceive strategies as important to learning become motivated, and they become more confident in their competence which leads them to engage in self-regulated activities. According to Vrugt (1994), people whose perceived self-efficacy is positive will pursue a relatively high level of performance;

They will not be put off easily, they will do their best, seek new solutions and also persevere in the case of difficult task assignments. Effort, strategy development and perseverance not only lead to good achievement but also to the development of people's actual competence (Vrugt, 1994: 465-466).

7

Strategies are employed as goal-directed actions only after positive perceptions and evaluations of strategy in terms of its utility and economy are made (McCombs, 1986). A self-efficacious learner is a motivated learner who is able to self-regulate his or her own learning. While the greater part of the effort of becoming a self-efficacious and self-regulated learner comes from the learner himself, not less an effort may also be attributed to the teacher. The teacher can also enhance learners' motivation by providing attributional feedback particularly with regard to the learners' successful performance.

Motivational processes need to be incorporated into strategy instruction context to enable learners to attain self-regulatory status. Once learners have obtained self-regulatory abilities in using strategies, this helps promote learning and the perception of greater competence, which in turn sustains motivation to attain new goals (Schunk, 1994). Self-regulated learners adaptively use motivation and volition-control strategies to keep themselves on task when they become discouraged or encounter an obstacle. In summary, self-regulated learners actively manage their learning activities as they engage with a task, flexibly adjusting their approaches as required (Butler, 1998). Learners engaged in self-regulated activity deliberately plan each step, select strategies, and control and evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies. This evaluation permits them to reach an appropriate decision about how to pursue their endeavours, and finally to verify the results of their strategy use in order to perform to the best of their capacities. The learner who undertakes this kind of self-regulation is labelled as strategic. A strategy instruction model must therefore recognise that in order for a learner to engage in this kind of strategic behaviour, he/she must be disposed and motivated to invest the required effort (Bouffard et al., 1995). Self-regulated learners perceive themselves as self-efficacious, autonomous, and intrinsically motivated (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1988; Zimmerman et.al.,1992; 2002).

Methodology

This section will report on results and findings of a small part of a larger study involving the implementation of a Direct Explanation strategy instruction model. The report will focus only on one variable that is, self-efficacy; to what extent the participant learners gain knowledge of self-efficacy in strategy use over a period of strategy instruction sessions.

The level of significance for self-efficacy knowledge is determined using non-parametric test of Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Rank Test (WMPSRT) (Norusis, 2002; Pallant, 2001; Miller et al, 2002; Green & Salkind, 2003). The level of significance is established at **$p < 0.05$**.

Classroom Procedure

The study involved implementing a Direct Explanation (DE) strategy instruction for academic reading class. The strategy instruction was conducted over a period of a semester (4 months) involving ESL undergraduates at UiTM Sarawak (Philip, 2005).

Direct Explanation Strategy Instruction

During the instruction, the teacher explicitly models learning strategies to learners through DE (Figure 2). Each feature of a strategy is clearly explained to the learners. The learners are also introduced to a strategic learning approach called Self-Regulated Approach to Strategic Learning (SRSL) which is used through strategic implementation of metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective strategies (Figure 3). Strategy training is contextualised in that strategies are taught in the context of actual applications using content-based reading text. The teacher's role is that of constructive scaffolding. This still involves giving explicit explanation of the various features of strategies with the intent of assisting learners to move in their *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD) of strategy knowledge and use. The teacher's amount of effort on constructive scaffolding decreases over time. The learners on the other hand, attend to the teachers explanation while at the same time are given the freedom to partake in the instruction process with questions, clarifications and confirmations of understanding. The learners' amount of effort increases, giving them ample opportunity to gain efficacy and confidence as the lesson unfolds, until ultimately the learners can consider themselves as being self-efficacious.

Direct Explanation	• Introduce each strategy explicitly • Define each strategy explicitly • Describe each strategy very clearly • Outline critical features of each strategy • Explain the significance of each strategy • Provide reasons/rationales for learning each strategy • Break down each strategy into components • Explains the relationship among various components of a single strategy • Recommend the use of graphic organiser to facilitate strategy use • Delineate clearly appropriate circumstances when and where each strategy may be used • Show how to evaluate successful or unsuccessful use of each strategy • Explain clearly an ineffective use of strategy in some circumstances • Emphasise the importance of evaluating the success of one's strategy use • Explain that it is possible to monitor strategy selection and implementation • Initiate modelling of strategies

Figure 2: Direct Explanation of Strategies

The teacher continues to provide re-explanation of strategies as and when needed by the learners. Giving re-explanation may decrease as learners gain efficacy in strategy use. The teacher devotes more effort into motivating learners for their success in strategy use through verbal praises. This explicit motivation is intended to build learners' confidence in using strategies as outlined in Figure 3 below.

Strategy	Macro-Strategies	Micro-strategies
Metacognitive	1. Planning	a. Preview b. Predict c. Activate prior knowledge
	2. Selective Attention	a. Pre-task SA b. During-task SA
	3. Monitoring	a. Comprehension monitoring b. Double-check monitoring c. Strategy monitoring

	4. Evaluation	a. Strategy evaluation b. Performance evaluation c. Ability evaluation
	5. Graphic Organizer	Mind-map, concept map etc.
Cognitive	1. Inference	a. Look for contextual clues b. Make logical guess c. Make intelligent guess d. Fill in missing information e. Predict outcome
	2. Summarisation	a. Mental summary b. Integrate information c. Identify topic sentences d. Create topic sentences e. Delete redundant/ unimportant information
	3. Elaboration	a. World elaboration b. Personal elaboration c. Questioning elaboration d. Academic elaboration e. Between-parts elaboration
Social	1. Questioning for clarification	a. Ask for explanation, verification, b. Ask for clarification or verification about task c. Pose questions to self
	2. Cooperation	a. Work together with peers to solve problem b. Pool information c. Check a learning task d. Get feedback on performance

Figure 3: Learning strategies

The teacher shares his/her understanding of strategy use with learners while simultaneously listens and accepts learners' understanding of strategy use through dialogical interactions. Besides motivating the learners (Figure 4), the teacher also gives learners ample opportunity to voice their views and understandings of strategies to help them gain confidence.

Motivational Approach	• Explain how strategy can benefit student learning • Encourage appropriate strategy selection and use • Encourage learners to first analyse, and then plan their strategic move before the actual implementation • Present each strategy using a very interesting approach • Vary ways of presenting strategies most of the time • Maintaining learners' attention via varied instructional presentation • Present strategies in a creative way • Relate instructional goals with learners' personal goals as far as possible • Show concern about learners' personal goals • Increase familiarity by building on learners' previous knowledge and experiences • Relate the relevance of strategy knowledge to learners' needs • Create positive expectation for success by making clear instructional goals and objectives • Allow learners to set their own goals with respect to strategy use • Use positive remarks (verbal praises) on learners' progress • Encourage learners to reflect on and enjoy their learning success

Figure 4: Motivational Approach

Subjects

The subjects used in this study was selected from a group of undergraduates reading business administration at UiTM Sarawak Campus. These undergraduates had previously completed their diploma courses at UiTM. They were in their first year of a three-year BBA (Bachelor in Business Administration) study programme. English is used as the main medium of instruction. These students need to complete a number of English Language courses, one of which is an Academic Reading course. The main rationale for having academic reading as part of their English Language requirements is that these students need to use reference and textbooks written in English. It is important that these students are equipped with the appropriate skills for academic reading.

Criterion for Selection of Subjects

The main criterion used to select the students to participate in this study was their performance in BEL 250 paper (Advanced level), which they took in the final part of their Diploma years. The main reason for using the BEL 250 is to determine their proficiency level which is deemed more relevant as the students were not fresh from SPM. It is no longer relevant to use their SPM English subject grade to determine their proficiency level because they had gone through many levels of English courses throughout their progression in their diploma programmes. As this study involved determining the effects of strategy instruction on the learners' internalisation of strategy knowledge, strategy effectiveness and strategy use, it was important that the subjects fulfilled the requirement of a 100% attendance for both groups.

Sample

The selected sample was divided into two main groups namely, Direct Explanation (DE) strategy instruction as the experimental group (45 subjects), and Non-Strategy Instruction (NSI) as the control group (57 subjects). There were altogether 102 students involved in the study but only 72 students could satisfy the requirement of this study in terms of attendance and were deemed suitable for the purpose of data analysis. At the end of the experiment, it was found that 10 subjects did not fulfil the 100% attendance requirement. Only 35 subjects were used for the purpose of data analysis. Out of those 35 subjects, 18 were high-proficient (HP) learners and another 17 low-proficient (LP) learners. In the NSI group, at the end of the experiment, only 37 students fulfilled the 100% attendance requirement. Out of 37 subjects, 17 were high proficient and the other 20 low-proficient learners.

Instruments

The main instruments used were Self-efficacy Inventories (see **Appendix**), that is, **Self-efficacy Beliefs I (pre-test)** and **Self-efficacy Beliefs II (post-test)**. Both sets comprise parallel item statements which were conceptualised to represent the learners' self-efficacy beliefs as regards the following strategies: planning, selective attention, graphic

organiser, inference, elaboration, summarisation, monitoring, evaluation and, cooperation and questioning. Both inventories were pilot tested and then refined before they were used in actual research.

Procedure

This section outlines the procedure followed in this study. This includes administration of inventories in the forms of pre-test and post-test, the implementation of the DE and the non-strategy instruction as well.

Administration of inventories

The Inventories were administered to both DE and NSI groups at two different stages. The first administration of the inventories was carried out before the actual experiment in the form of pre-test, and the next administration was at the end of the experiment as post-test.

Pre-Test

The main purpose of the pre-test was to ascertain the participants' levels of self-efficacy beliefs before the actual investigation. The Self-efficacy Belief I Inventory was administered to both DE and NSI groups of which the collected data were compared to the results in the post-test.

Post-Test

The main purpose of the post-test was to determine the participants' levels of self-efficacy beliefs after the investigation proper. The Self-efficacy Belief II Inventory was administered to both DE and NSI groups to assess probable effects of the experiment on the participants' levels of self-efficacy beliefs. The results of the pre-test were compared to those obtained in the post-test in order to ascertain any level of significance in terms of probable increase in the levels of self-efficacy beliefs for both groups.

Results and Discussion

Research question 1

What are the effects of *DE* as compared to *NSI* on the learners' *self-efficacy beliefs* in strategy use for reading?

In **Table 1** below, the WMPSRT test results on the DE group show a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test of self-efficacy belief, at a **p = .000** level of significance. This implies that the DE group had significantly gained an increase in self-efficacy beliefs over time. However, the WMPSRT test results on the NSI group indicate a non-significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test of self-efficacy beliefs, at **p = .282**. This reflects that the NSI group had not obtained any significant gain in terms of their self-efficacy beliefs.

The results which favour the DE group, reflect quite clearly that the learners form beliefs in their own self-efficacy of using the strategies. The DE sessions provided the learners with ample opportunities to practise using the instructed strategies. The practice opportunities enabled learners to discover their own strength in using the strategies to a maximal level of effectiveness. Through those practice opportunities these learners experiment using the strategies during which they ought to have discovered success or even failure in strategy implementation. Success in strategy implementation would often lead learners into believing in their self-efficacy of using the strategies. As they discovered their actual ability, they also began to recognise their own strength and weakness, and consequently they were in a better position to strategise their learning process. They began to feel more self-efficacious in their learning approach, and eventually becoming strategic in their strategy use.

Table 1: DE & NSI – Self-efficacy Beliefs

GROUP	SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS						NPAR TEST
	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST			WMPSRT
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	z = - 5.16
DE (HP & LP)	35	129	7.06	35	166	17.0	p = .000

	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST			WMPSRT
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	z = - 1.07
NSI							p = .282
(HP & LP)	37	135	7.24	37	134	8.13	

Legend: N – Number of Learners; M – Mean; SD – Standard Deviation

Research question 2

What are the effects of *DE* on the self-efficacy beliefs in strategy use of *HP* learners as compared to *LP* learners for reading?

In **Table 2** below, the WMPSRT test results on HP learners (15 learners) in the DE group indicate a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test of self-efficacy beliefs, at a **p = .001** level of significance. This depicts that HP learners in the DE group had significantly gained an increase in self-efficacy beliefs over time. The WMPSRT test results on LP learners (15 learners) in the SMMSI group also establish a significant difference, at a **p = .001** level of significance. This also implies that LP learners had significantly gained an increase in self-efficacy beliefs.

Based on the results, both HP and LP learners indicate significant increase in their self-efficacy beliefs of using the strategies. This strongly reflects that both learner types were motivated in using the strategies. One most likely reason for their motivation is that they must have experienced success in using the instructed strategies so much that they formed the belief that they were capable of using the strategies in future tasks.

Another probable explanation for their motivation is that they received positive feedback from the teacher who took a particular concern on the learners' success experience in their strategy use. The positive feedback could have been in the forms of verbal praises and encouragement which helped shape the learners' eventual beliefs about that strategic processing ability. The teacher's positive feedback also became a source of satisfaction on the part of the learners, who felt that their successful efforts were acknowledged by the teacher. This then in turn helped instilled confidence in the learners on their ability to use the strategies fruitfully. And, that sense of confidence seems to explain why

both HP and LP learners gained over time in their perceptions of their self-efficacy in strategy use. Both HP and LP learners viewed themselves as being self-efficacious, and hence, autonomous.

Table 2: DE – Self-efficacy Beliefs

GROUP	SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS						NPAR TEST
	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST			WMPSRT
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	z = - 3.40
DE HP Learners	15	127	6.22	15	159	15.5	p = . 001
	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST			WMPSRT
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	z = - 3.40
DE HP Learners	15	131	7.42	15	173	17.9	p = . 001
Legend: N – Number of Learners; M – Mean; SD – Standard Deviation							

Implication

The impact of DE on the learners' level of self-efficacy beliefs was clearly evident. Based on the findings in the study, it can be argued that DE serves as an effective method in enhancing *competence motivation* that enables learners to gain self-efficacy and hence, self-efficacious in their strategy use. For a learner to be effective, he or she must have available not only a repertoire of efficient learning strategies but also know when and where to use them to maximise learning (Wood et al., 1998). Such efficacious ability to monitor strategy use is critical for the learners to form accurate strategy metacognitions that form the basis for successful strategy maintenance and transfer (Levin, 1988). With a strong sense of self-efficacy learners are more willing to engage in self-regulated activities involving strategy use (Sawyer et al., 1992; Graham & Harris, 1989). While this study is by no means conclusive in its findings, it is interesting to note that it is illustrative and suggestive of how DE can contribute towards developing self-efficacious learners/readers. What seems clear is that the learners need to be motivated in terms of their competence in using strategies because with *competence motivation*

the learners tend to become more confident in using strategies as and when necessary.

Conclusion

To conclude, the study has shown to some extent that *Direct Explanation* of teaching strategies has the capacity to provide ample room for the learners to not only discover components of strategies but also the benefits and utility of each strategy. More importantly, through DE the teacher is able to motivate the learners to use strategies competently especially when learners are provided with positive attributional feedback on their strategic performance. By promoting *competence motivation* through DE, the teacher helps enhance the learners' self-efficacy beliefs in using the strategies effectively, thus developing learners who are not only better strategy users but also to a large extent self-efficacious readers.

References

Ames, C. and Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology.* **80**(3): 260-267.

Bandura, A. (1978). Reflections on self-efficacy. In S. Rachman (ed.). *Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy,* 1, 237-269.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy. The Exercise of Control.* New York: W.H. Freeman & Company.

Bouffard, T., Boisvert, J., Vezeau, C., & Larouche, C. (1995). The impact of goal orientation on self-regulation and performance among college students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology.* **65**: 317-329.

Brown, A.L., Palincsar, A.S., & Armburster, B.B. (1984). Instructing comprehension-fostering activities in interactive learning situations. In H. Mandl, N.L. Stein, & T.Trabasso (Eds), *Learning and Comprehension of Text,* pp. 255-286. Hillsdale, NJ,: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Butler, D.L. (1998). The strategic content learning approach to promoting self-regulated learning: a report of three studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **90**(4), 682-697.

Butler, D.L. (1998). The strategic content learning approach to promoting self-regulated learning: a report of three studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. **90**(4): 682-697.

Graham, S., and Harris, K. R. (1989). Components analysis of cognitive strategy instruction: effects on learning disabled students' compositions and self-efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. **81**(3): 353-361.

Green, S.B. & Salkind, N.J. (2003). Using SPSS for windows and Macintosh: analyzing and understanding data. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Jesse Ee & Moore, P.J. (2004). Motivation, strategies and achievement: A comparison of teachers and students in High, Average, and Low achieving class. In Jessie Ee, Agnes Chang & Oon-Seng Tan (Eds) *Thinking About Thinking*, pp. 88-107. Singapore: McGraw Hill.

Levin, J.R. (1988). Elaboration-based learning strategies: powerful theory = powerful application. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *13*, 191-205.

McCabe, P.P. (2003). Enhancing self-efficacy for high-stakes reading tests. *The Reading Teacher*. **57**(1): 12-20.

McCombs, B.L. (1988). Motivational skills training: combining metacognitive, cognitive, and affective learning strategies. In Weinstein, C.E., Goetz, E.T. & Alexander, P.A. (Eds). *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation*, pp. 141-165. San Diego: Academic Press.

McCombs, B.L. (1988). Motivational skills training: combining metacognitive, cognitive, and affective learning strategies. In: Weinstein, C.E., Goetz, E.T. & Alexander, P.A. (eds). *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation*, pp. 141-165. San Diego: Academic Press.

McCormick, C. & Pressley, M. (1995). *Cognition, Teaching and Assessment.* New York: HarperCollins.

Miller, R.L., Acton, C., Fullerton, D.A. & Maltby, J. (2002). *SPSS for Social Scientists.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Norusis, M.J. (2002). *SPSS 11.0 Guide to Data Analysis.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual.* Philadephia: Open University Press.

Palmer, D.J & Goetz, E.T. (1988). Selection and use of study strategies: the role of the studier's beliefs about self and strategies. In Weinstein, C.E., Goetz, E.T. & Alexander, P.A. (Eds). *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation,* (pp. 41-57), San Diego: Academic Press.

Paris, S.G., Cross, D.R., & Lipson, M.Y. (1984). Informed strategies for learning: A program to improve children's reading awareness and comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 76, 1239-1252.

Philip, B. (2005). *Towards a Social-Motivational Metacognitive Strategy Instruction Model: Theory and Practice.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.

Roehler, L.R. & Duffy, G.G. (1984). Direct explanation of comprehension processes. In G.G. Duffy, L.R. Roehler, & J. Mason (eds.), *Comprehension Instruction: Perspectives and Suggestions,* pp. 265-280. New York: Longman.

Sawyer, R.J., Graham, S., and Harris, K.R. (1992). Direct teaching, strategy instruction, and strategy instruction with explicit self-regulation: effects on the composition skills and self- efficacy of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 84(3),* 340-352.

Schunk, D. H. (1986). Verbalization and children's self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology.***11**: 347-369.

Schunk, D. (1994). Self-regulation of self-efficacy and attributions in academic settings. In D.H. Schunk & B.J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-Regulation of Learning and Performances: Issues and Educational Applications,* pp. 75-99, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schunk, D.H. (1984). Enhancing self-efficacy and achievement through rewards and goals: Motivational and informational effects. *Journal of Educational Research,* 78: 29-34.

Schunk, D.H. (1984). Enhancing self-efficacy and achievement through rewards and goals: Motivational and informational effects. *Journal of Educational Research,* 78, 29-34.

Schunk, D.H. (2000). *Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective.* 3rd Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Vrugt, A. (1994). Perceived self-efficacy, social comparison, affective reactions and academic performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology.* **64:** 465-472.

Winograd, P. & Hare, V.C. (1988). Direct instruction of reading comprehension strategies: The nature of teacher explanation. In Weinstein, C.E., Goetz, E.T. & Alexander, P.A. (Eds). *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation,* (pp.121-137), San Diego: Academic Press.

Wood, E., Motz, M., & Willoughby, T. (1998). Examining students' retrospective memories of strategy development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90,* 698-704.

Zimmerman, B.J. & Martinez-Pons, M. (1988). Construct validation of a strategy model of student self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 80(3),* 284-290.

Zimmerman, B.J., Bonner, S. & Kovach, R. (2002). *Developing self-Regulated Learners: Beyond Achievement to Self-Efficacy.* USA: American Psychological Association.

BROMELEY PHILIP, PhD, is a senior language lecturer at the Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Sarawak Campus. He obtained his PhD from the National University of Malaysia. His areas of specialisation and interests include socio-psychology of learning, content-based instruction, strategic learning, self-regulated learning, metacognition, ESP, methodology and ethnolinguistics.

APPENDIX

Self-Efficacy Beliefs (I) (Pre-test)

Name: _____

You will find statements about process of reading. Write your response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in the space provided after each statement. Each number represents how true of you with regard to each statement below. Respond in terms of how well the statement describes your belief/opinion.

(1)   Strongly Disagree
(2)   Disagree
(3)   Undecided
(4)   Agree
(5)   Strongly Agree

Read the statement and choose a response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) as above, and TICK your response in the space provided after each statement.

	Statement	Response					Official Use
	I believe...						
	PLANNING (PL)	1	2	3	4	5	
1	I am able to get the overall picture of the text by making a preview.						☐
2	I am able to get some idea of each part in the text through skimming.						☐
3	I am able to look for specific clues about the text through scanning.						☐
4	I am able to enhance my understanding of the text through making predictions.						☐
5	I am able to get myself familiarized with the text by recalling some key words/terms for clues.						☐
	SELECTIVE ATTENTION (SA)						
6	I am able to fully concentrate on the text by directing my full attention.						☐
7	I am able to gain insight into the text by identifying and selecting specialized terms used in the text.						☐
8	I am able to look for main ideas and topic sentences by focusing on specific parts of the text.						☐

9	I am able to lead-in my reading into the text by looking for familiar terms.						☐
10	I am able to understand one whole paragraph by looking at the topic sentence only.						☐
	GRAPHIC ORGANIZER (GOR)						
11	I am able to extract information systematically from the text by using graphic organizer or mind map.						☐
12	I am able to structure my understanding of the text by presenting it in the form of mind map.						☐
13	I am able to identify the main ideas/points easily by fitting them into my mind map.						☐
14	I am able to easily identify examples and single out the important ones.						☐
15	I am able to get the overall picture of the article just by looking at the structures of my mind map / graphic organizer.						☐
	INFERENCE (INF)						
16	I am able to know the meaning of a difficult word (without access to a dictionary) and sentence by looking for contextual clues.						☐
17	I am able to understand some parts of the text by making an intelligent guess.						☐
18	I am able to understand some parts of the text by making a logical guess.						☐
19	I am able to relate causes to effects by making predictions of its outcome.						☐
20	I am able to resolve difficulty in understanding by filling up the missing information.						☐
	ELABORATION (ELAB)						
21	I am able to prepare my next reading move to overcome difficulty in understanding by reacting personally to it (getting myself better prepared in reading with full concentration).						☐
22	I am able to understand the text by matching certain contents/concepts in the text to my own world self-experience.						☐
23	I am able to understand the text by matching certain academic content to what I have learned in other academic subjects.						☐

24	I am able to get some probable answer on certain things in the text by asking myself "brainstorming questions".						☐
25	I am able to understand sections in the text by looking at connections that exist between those sections.						☐
	SUMMARISATION (SUM)						
26	I am able to understand just the main idea by ignoring illustrations and examples.						☐
27	I am able to understand just the main point by ignoring redundant information.						☐
28	I am able to understand similar ideas in the text by summarizing them into one term or shorter phrase.						☐
29	I am able to capture the gist of meaning in a paragraph by creating a topic sentence.						☐
30	I am able to summarise important points in the text effectively.						☐
	MONITORING (MONT)						
31	I am able to double-check my understanding.						☐
32	I am able to check the effectiveness of reading strategies I used.						☐
33	I am able to check the usefulness of graphic organizer I used.						☐
34	I am able to check how much have I learned/ understood.						☐
35	I am able to double-check my previous undertaken moves /acts.						☐
	EVALUATION (EVA)						
36	I am able to reflect on and evaluate whether or not strategies I used were effective.						☐
37	I am able to self-evaluate myself to know what specifically new things I have learned.						☐
38	I am able to check whether I have understood everything in the text or almost everything.						☐
39	I am able to check my level of understanding at reading intervals.						☐
40	I am able to check on my work upon completing the reading task at hand.						☐

	COOPERATION & QUESTIONING (COOP & QUEST)						
41	I am able to ask for explanation on difficulties encountered in the text.						☐
42	I am able to ask for clarification on how to do the tasks given in the text.						☐
43	I am able to work together with my peers effectively to solve a problem(s) in the text.						☐
44	I am able to pool information with my peers to help understand the text.						☐
45	I am able to get some feedback from my peers on my comprehension level of the text.						☐

Self-Efficacy Beliefs (II) (Post-Test)

Name: _____

You will find statements about process of reading. Write your response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in the space provided after each statement. Each number represents how true of you with regard to each statement below. Respond in terms of how well the statement describes your belief/opinion.

(1) Strongly Disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Undecided
(4) Agree
(5) Strongly Agree

Read the statement and choose a response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) as above, and TICK your response in the space provided after each statement.

	Statement	Response					Official Use
	I believe now that...(LS)...effectively.						
	PLANNING (PL)	1	2	3	4	5	
1	I should be able to get the overall picture of the text by making a preview.						☐
2	I should be able to get some idea of each part in the text through skimming.						☐
3	I should be able to look for specific clues about the text through scanning.						☐
4	I should be able to enhance my understanding of the text through making predictions.						☐

5	I should be able to get myself familiarized with the text by recalling some key words/terms for clues.						☐
	SELECTIVE ATTENTION (SA)						
6	I should be able to fully concentrate on the text by directing my full attention.						☐
7	I should be able to gain insight into the text by identifying and selecting specialized terms used in the text.						☐
8	I should be able to look for main ideas and topic sentences by focusing on specific parts of the text.						☐
9	I should be able to lead-in my reading into the text by looking for familiar terms.						☐
10	I should be able to understand one whole paragraph by looking at the topic sentence only.						☐
	GRAPHIC ORGANIZER (GOR)						
11	I should be able to extract information systematically from the text by using graphic organizer or mind map.						☐
12	I should be able to structure my understanding of the text by presenting it in the form of mind map.						☐
13	I should be able to identify the main ideas/ points easily by fitting them into my mind map.						☐
14	I should be able to easily identify examples and single out the important ones.						☐
15	I should be able to get the overall picture of the article just by looking at the structures of my mind map / graphic organizer.						☐
	INFERENCE (INF)						
16	I should be able to know the meaning of a difficult word (without access to a dictionary) and sentence by looking for contextual clues.						☐
17	I should be able to understand some parts of the text by making an intelligent guess.						☐
18	I should be able to understand some parts of the text by making a logical guess.						☐

19	I should be able to relate causes to effects by making predictions of its outcome.						☐
20	I should be able to resolve difficulty in understanding by filling up the missing information.						☐
	ELABORATION (ELAB)						
21	I should be able to prepare my next reading move to overcome difficulty in understanding by reacting personally to it (getting myself better prepared in reading with full concentration).						☐
22	I should be able to understand the text by matching certain contents/concepts in the text to my own world self-experience.						☐
23	I should be able to understand the text by matching certain academic content to what I have learned in other academic subjects.						☐
24	I should be able to get some probable answer on certain things in the text by asking myself "brainstorming questions".						☐
25	I should be able to understand sections in the text by looking at connections that exist between those sections.						☐
	SUMMARISATION (SUM)						
26	I should be able to understand just the main idea by ignoring illustrations and examples.						☐
27	I should be able to understand just the main point by ignoring redundant information.						☐
28	I should be able to understand similar ideas in the text by summarizing them into one term or shorter phrase.						☐
29	I should be able to capture the gist of meaning in a paragraph by creating a topic sentence.						☐
30	I should be able to summarise important points in the text effectively by deletion of superfluous information.						☐
	MONITORING (MONT)						
31	I should be able to check on my comprehension level by making a double check.						☐
32	I should be able to check on the effectiveness of reading strategies I use by making a double check.						☐

33	I should be able to check on the usefulness of graphic organizer I use by making a double check.						☐
34	I should be able to check on how much have I learned/understood by verifying it consciously with myself.						☐
35	I should be able to check on my previous undertaken moves/acts by making a double check.						☐
	EVALUATION (EVA)						
36	I should be able to reflect on and evaluate whether or not strategies I used were effective.						☐
37	I should be able to self-evaluate myself to know what specifically new things I have learned.						☐
38	I should be able to check whether I have understood everything in the text or almost everything.						☐
39	I should be able to check my level of understanding at reading intervals.						☐
40	I should be able to check on my work upon completing the reading task at hand.						☐
	COOPERATION & QUESTIONING (COOP & QUEST)						
41	I should be able to ask for explanation on difficulties encountered in the text.						☐
42	I should be able to ask for clarification on how to do the tasks given in the text.						☐
43	I should be able to work together with my peers effectively to solve a problem(s) in the text.						☐
44	I should be able to pool information with my peers to help understand the text.						☐
45	I should be able to get some feedback from my peers on my comprehension level of the text.						☐