

## INSTRUCTION STRATEGY TOWARD GRADE 10 STUDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THEIR ENGLISH PERFORMANCE

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Nina Nerie D. De Vela, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Franklin T. Dumayas, <sup>3</sup>Dr. John T. Dumayas, <sup>4</sup>Prof. Marites D. Dumayas

<sup>1</sup>Teacher, F. Buencamino Elementary School, Gabaldon, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines

<sup>3</sup>Professor, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines

<sup>4</sup>Professor, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines



### Article History

Received : 20/06/2022

Accepted : 23/06/2022

Published : 25/06/2022

### Corresponding author:

Dr. Franklin T. Dumayas

### Abstract

This study focused on the differentiated instruction strategy toward Grade 10 students' self-efficacy and its relationship to their English performance. This study was a quantitative research; it was utilized to determine the relationship between the socio-demographic profile of the respondents and the differentiated instruction strategy and self-efficacy within the population. The profile and English performance of the students were described using frequency, weighted mean, and percentage distributions. The differentiated instruction strategy and levels of students' self-efficacy were described using weighted mean and verbal descriptions. Significant relationships among the different variables were analyzed using Spearman's rho.

This study used quota sampling technique. First, the researcher identified the three secondary schools at Gabaldon, Nueva Ecija, after identifying the schools; the researcher determined the section in Grade 10 with 50 students. The respondents in the study were consists of 150 Grade 10 students who were enrolled in English 10 during the Academic Year 2019-2020 at F.Buencamino Sr. Integrated School, Gabaldon Vocational Agricultural High School, and

Ligaya National High School. This study was expected to end after the respondents completed the data to be collected and all the information was submitted.

In the light of the summary of findings, the following conclusions were drawn. Students' profile in terms of sex was associated with the differentiated instruction strategy and self-efficacy. Females had high level of self-efficacy in English. Educational attainments of the respondents' mothers were significantly correlated to the level of their self-efficacy and performance in English. The higher the educational attainments of the respondents' parents, the higher the respondents' level of self-efficacy and English performance. This revealed that the differentiated instruction strategy, students' self-efficacy, and English performance were being influenced by many factors. It included the students' sex, age, family income, and parents' educational attainments.

Generally, the performances of students in English were described as "strongly agree", which meant students performed very well in their English performance. Many students have high performances in English and this was influenced by several factors. This included the levels of self-efficacy.

Finally, the results strongly revealed that students who had high English self-efficacy tended to perform higher score in English performance while students who had low English self-efficacy performed fewer score in English. Associations between or among the given variables simply revealed that students' performances were being influenced by the levels of their self-efficacy. These two important variables played an important role to the student's achievements in their English performance.

**Keywords:** differentiated instruction strategy, self-efficacy, English performance

## INTRODUCTION

In modern education, the nations are more responsive to students' needs and more concerned to economic, political, social, and technological aspects in which will prepare the future societal roles. Teachers minimize the use of traditional teaching strategies and already feeling the pressure in preparing more interactive and useful activity for the student. According to Pearson (2009), it is no secret that a good education has the power to change life, and everyone is looking for new as the demand for the change in education.

In order to ensure progress of students, educators are trying to use different techniques and strategies that will suit the learners. Many innovations are also present, to create the better version of curriculum or the course content. Parts of the innovations are the strategy to be used inside the classroom that will surely address the needs of every student. These strategies are made to ensure learning will takes place and to motivate every single learner to actively participate in classroom activities.

Among the many newest strategies, is the differentiated instruction, also called as small group differentiated strategy. Here, teachers can differentiate their classrooms by [altering the content](#), process, product, or learning environment for students. Changing these different aspects of a classroom can help students feel more comfortable and experience more success. Developing the content of a lesson involves how students gain access to the information. Teachers can modify content by using the different learning styles and different senses to teach a subject. Give a mini-lesson where you show students how to accomplish the task followed by hands-on activities. Teacher may also use videos to introduce the topic of the day. Another way to differentiate instruction within the classroom is by grouping the students by their learning styles or in groups with 3-5 station moving around the room. Student can work on skills that must need to know like the auditory learners, they will work together because they probably have similar styles of communication.

This study is based on the ZPD (the Zone of Proximal Development) model of Lev Vygotsky, a developmental theorist who focus on the importance of using student interests to hook learners, connecting learning with real-life applications, and providing instruction that is at students' developmental level and also the theory of self-efficacy, Bandura (1977a) "in which the concept of *self-efficacy* is assigned a central role, for analyzing changes achieved in fearful and avoidant behavior".

Edwards, Carr, & Siegel (2009) state "Principals of differentiated instruction reflect research findings of Vygotsky and other educational innovators, such as Howard Gardner (multiple intelligences, 1983), and Robert Sternberg (thinking styles/cognitive research, 1997), each of whom recognized the uniqueness of individuals". In addition, John Dewey believed making curriculum of interest and relating it to real-life applications of education is meaningful and important to children of all ages.

The main theorist that supported this research is Lev Vygotsky. His written works and research coincided with Tomlinson's philosophy

of differentiated instruction and were important to understand. Throughout the literature, Russian teacher and psychologist Lev Vygotsky and his theory of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is commonly articulated as an important way to teach students. The ZPD is the distance between a child's actual development level and the potential level. Vygotsky (1987) states that ZPD is "what the child is able to do in collaboration today he will be able to do independently tomorrow" (Kozulin, Gindis, Ageyev, & Miller, 2003). Miller (2002) speaks specifically to the importance of assessment, scaffolding curriculum, the process of learning, flexible grouping, and choice.

On the other hand, the Academic Self-Efficacy Scale for self-regulated learning is another **wonderful tool** for determining the relationship between academic performance, and self-efficacy. Academic self-efficacy is mainly about a student's opinion about what they can or cannot do as opposed to individual resources. Students with high self-efficacy tend to choose complex and challenging tasks while students with lower self-efficacy tend to avoid them. Academic self-efficacy also involves self-regulated learning, which helps a student use their own resources to plan, control and analyze the execution of tasks, activities, and the preparation of learning products. (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1995) Students with high self-efficacy tend to get better grades and show greater persistence in both engineering and science courses when compared to students with lesser.

Moreover, students with high self-efficacy use more cognitive strategies that are useful when it comes to learning, organizing their time, and regulating their own efforts. The academic self-efficacy questionnaire provides evidence of both internal consistency and validity. In a study done in Lima, Peru there was a positive and significant relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic performance in first-year university students in the city of Lima. (Alegre, 2014) There was also a positive correlation between self-regulated learning and academic performance.

Self-beliefs of efficacy are an important factor in human motivation. Beliefs of self-efficacy work in coordination with component skill and incentive to act. Inasmuch as a person has both the component skills needed to succeed, and the incentive to engage, self-efficacy plays an important role in determining what activities a person will choose to engage in, how much effort they will expend, and how long that effort will be sustained when things get tough: Self-efficacy typically comes into play when there is an actual or perceived threat to one's personal safety, or one's ability to deal with potentially aversive events (Bandura, 1983).

## Research Design

This study was a quantitative research, a type of educational research in which the researcher decides what to study and used quota sampling. This type of research asks specific narrow questions, collects data from participants, analyzes numbers using statistics, and conducts the inquiry in an unbiased, objective manner (Wadsworth, 2010). It was utilized to determine the relationship between the socio-demographic profile of the respondents and the differentiated instruction strategy and self-efficacy within the population.

The profile and English performance of the students were described using frequency, weighted mean, and percentage distributions. The differentiated instruction strategy and levels of students' self-efficacy were described using weighted mean and verbal descriptions.

Significant relationships among the different variables were analyzed using Spearman's rho.

## RESULTS

### Differentiated Instruction Strategy in English

The overall weighted mean was 3.14 verbally interpreted as "often occur this means that respondents had many times experienced the differentiated instruction strategy. It can be noted that most of the respondents fairly agreed in the statements, "The lesson was designed to engage students as member of a learning community", and "The instructional strategies and activities respect students.

This showed that most of the respondents were knowledgeable on differentiated instruction strategy in English. Students became more interested in English because of English activities and assessments. This supported the findings of the research were space, time, and materials are implemented to suit the needs of the various learners (Chamberlin & Powers, 2010).

This is also related to the recent studies that differentiated instruction comprises the constructive response to what learners know. This means matching students' approach to learning with the most appropriate pedagogy, curriculum aims, and opportunities for displaying the acquired knowledge (Anderson T.R. & Schonborn K.J., 2009; Ellis, E., Gable, R. A., Gregg, M. & Rock, M. L., 2010). All learners do not have the same learning speed rate; therefore "the model of differentiated orientation requires that instructors are flexible in their approach towards teaching and adapt their syllabus and teaching to learners, and not adjust learners to the syllabus. All these require differentiation of the curriculum in effect. For all the learners who have learning difficulties, differentiation is seen as their instructors' responsibility (Vellutino, F.R., Scanlon, D. M., Small, S., & Fanuele, D.P., 2008). There is abundant information on differentiated instruction which instructors may access in order to be informed regarding the implementation of its procedures. Instructors usually differentiate their teaching modifying one of the following: the content that learners learn, the process how learners will learn it, and the final product, that is how the learners will demonstrate what they have learnt (Tomlinson, C. A., & Strickland, C. A., 2009). In order to achieve this, instructors need to consider learners' knowledge, preferences, and abilities, how they will be organized in order to learn (flexible group arrangement based on common interests, topic, or ability), as well as important characteristics of evaluation procedures (Tomlinson, C. A. & Eidson, C. C., 2008).

### Respondents' Level of Self-Efficacy

The overall weighted mean was 3.20 verbally interpreted as "much confidence". This meant that respondents had moderately high level of self-efficacy in English. It can be noted that most of the respondents strongly agreed in the statement, "I have the opportunity to succeed in the classroom." and "I can concentrate in

school projects". This indicated that most of the respondents had moderately high level of self-efficacy on the items.

Whereas in the statement, "I use the library to get the information for class assignments", most of the respondents had very little confidence, which showed that most of them had low level of self-efficacy on the given item and for the reason that students are now using internet in getting information for their assignments.

Most students responded in a positive manner to the question regarding their attitude towards their performance in English class. The findings showed that most of the respondents had moderately high level of self-efficacy, which will help them for the future endeavor.

This is supported by Bandura when he defined self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997 as cited by Causapin, 2012). People who have high self-efficacy beliefs in a particular domain, "act, think, and feel differently" from those with low self-efficacy (Bandura, 1984). They are more persistent, more effective, and more self-regulated (Magno, 2008; Pajares & Urdan, 2006). English self-efficacy is commonly defined as the individuals' beliefs or perceptions regarding their abilities in English.

Students with high self-efficacy tend to believe in their abilities to perform English-related tasks because of having positive attitudes.

The results also revealed that they motivate themselves to do schoolwork. This implied that most of the respondents have high level of self-belief and attitude toward English as cited by Yang, Noels, and Saumure (2009) highlighted the role of English self-confidence in the process of socio-cultural and psychological adjustment to an English-speaking academic environment.

Barrows, Dunn, and Lloyd (2013) found that there is a strong relationship between test anxiety and exam grades, also self-efficacy and exam grades. Similarly, Yildirim (2012) found that high

English self-efficacy is positively related to English achievement and high test anxiety is negatively related to English achievement.

### Relationship between the students' profile and the differentiated instruction strategy, levels of students' self-efficacy, and performance in English.

It can be noted from the table that the respondents' sex was significantly related to the differentiated instruction strategy ( $r=0.276$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and self-efficacy ( $r=0.184$ ,  $p<0.024$ ). The analysis found with evidence that the null hypothesis is rejected; thus, there is a significant relationship between respondents' sex and the differentiated instruction strategy and self-efficacy. This implies that sex greatly influenced the self-efficacy that leads to better achievement and progress and the used of differentiated instruction strategy. The positive relationship of sex to the differentiated instruction strategy and self-efficacy indicated that female respondents had very satisfactory performance in English than males. EFA (Education for all) Review Report (2015) supported by United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) that the reasons why males do not perform well in

school because boys are less ready for school, parents tend to view girls as more academically inclined than male. These factors can adversely affect school attendance and performance, as well.

Previous researches had shown that gender differences were related to English self-efficacy. However, other research findings have been inconclusive regarding these differences. They hypothesized that gender differences diminish when male and female students have comparable prior coursework experiences in English.

It has also repeatedly been shown that people expect men to be agentic – assertive, dominant, competent, and authoritative, and women to be communal – warm, supportive, kind, and helpful (Bem, 1974; Carli & Eagly, 2011). Drawing on the transformational leadership model (Bass & Riggio, 2016), it was recently claimed that women behave more transformationally and men more controlling/transactionally (Alvesson, Blom, & Svenningsson, 2016).

Reports in public media suggest the existence of a stereotype that women are better at multitasking than men. , a majority of 80% believed that women were better at multitasking. Findings were consistent across the different countries, thus supporting the existence of a widespread gender stereotype that women are better at multitasking than men (Szameitat\*, Hamaida, Tulley, Saylik, Otermans, 2015).

Students' family income was significantly related to the differentiated instruction strategy, but not to the levels of self-efficacy in English ( $r=-.163$ ,  $p<.046$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The negative correlation meant that the lower the family income, the higher the differentiated instruction strategy. Boys from low-income family particularly from the rural areas are pulled out of school; they are the ones most likely to drop out in order to make a financial contribution to aid the family by taking on jobs that do not require academic skills but rather practical skills, e.g., working as farm helpers or stevedores. (Education For All, 2015).

It is contradicted on the findings of Guo and Harris (2000), that the negative effects of low family income on children's academic achievement are indirect. According to their view, economic hardship causes emotional distress in parents, which, in turn, causes them to be less attentive and less interested in their children's education.

It can be observed from the table that the age, general average, and parents' educational attainment of the respondents were not significantly correlated to their performance in English.

#### **Relationship between the respondents' levels of self-efficacy and the differentiated instruction strategy.**

It can be noted that the respondents' level of self-efficacy was significantly and positively related to the differentiated instruction strategy in English at  $r$  – value of 0.497

Respondents' self-efficacy was significantly related to the differentiated instruction strategy ( $r=0.497$ ,  $p<0.000$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This positive correlation of respondents' self-efficacy to the differentiated strategy indicated the higher the self- efficacy of the students the better performance of differentiated instruction strategy. The positive relationship of

the respondents' level of self- efficacy and differentiated instruction strategy meant that the higher the level of self- efficacy, the higher the respondents' performed the differentiated instruction strategy.

To better understand differentiated instruction, one needs to understand how students learn. The ways in which a student learns most effectively can be described through a learning profile. A learning profile includes a student's learning preference(s), family structure, favorite hobbies, interests, state assessment scores, reading scores, and fluency in reading recordings. Leading elements also include group orientation, cognitive styles, intelligence preferences, and learning environment preferences. Differentiation guided by learning profiles allows students to learn by means that are natural and efficient (Anderson, 2007; Santangelo & Tomlinson, 2009). Previously, instructional researchers have focused primarily on learning styles (e.g., Pham, 2012).

#### **Relationship between the respondents' levels of self-efficacy and their English performance.**

It can be noted that the respondents' level of self-efficacy was significantly related to the level of their performance in English at  $r$  – value of 0.604. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. A positive correlation was found between self-efficacy and their performance in English. This implied that the higher the number of self-efficacy, the higher the level of performance in English.

The positive relationship of the respondents' level of self-efficacy and performance in English meant that the higher the level of self-efficacy, the higher the respondents' performance in English. However, the result supported the ideas of Bandura (2009), students with higher levels of self-efficacy tend to be more motivated to learn and more likely to persist when presented with challenging tasks. Conversely, poor mathematics self-efficacy often decreased their motivation to learn and eventually can lead the students in low mathematics performance. Interestingly, a research finding conducted by Higbee and Thomas (2009) suggested that teachers should also focus on and consider emotional and attitudinal factors that influence how students learn mathematics. This includes enabling the learners to have better self-belief and attitude to perform in mathematics tasks. According to the research conducted by Yazachew Alemu Tenaw 2013, self-efficacy predicts intellectual performance better than skills alone, and it directly influences academic performance through cognition. Self-efficacy also indirectly finding conducted by Higbee and Thomas (2009) suggested that teachers should also focus on and consider emotional and attitudinal factors that influence how students learn mathematics. This includes enabling the learners to have better self-belief and attitude to perform in mathematics tasks. According to the research conducted by Yazachew Alemu Tenaw 2013, self-efficacy predicts intellectual performance better than skills alone, and it directly influences academic performance through cognition. Self-efficacy also indirectly affects perseverance. Perceived self-efficacy predicts future achievement. Self-efficacy, and positive beliefs also contribute to performance since they influence thought processes, motivation, and behavior. Individuals high in self-efficacy attempt challenging tasks more often persist longer at them and exert more effort. However,

"Those who regard themselves as inefficacious shy away from difficult tasks, slacken their efforts and give up readily in the face of difficulties, dwell on their personal deficiencies, lower their aspirations, and suffer much anxiety and stress. Such self-misgivings undermine performance". Conversely, individuals with high self-efficacy frequently persevere despite difficult tasks or challenging odds and often succeed because perseverance usually results in a successful outcome.

#### **Proposed Differentiated Instruction Plan for the Improvement of English Performance of the Students**

English is regarded chiefly as a skill, as a tool-subject, and as a discipline. In fact, it is the foundation substance of thought and experience upon which the rest of the academic knowledge is built. Each student comes to school, not only with unique academic needs, but also with unique background experiences, culture, language, personality, interests, and attitudes toward learning. Effective teachers recognize that all of these factors affect how students learn in the classroom, and they adjust or differentiate, their instruction to meet students' needs. Thus, "differentiated instruction is not the same as individualized instruction. Every student is not learning something different; he/she is learning the same thing but in different ways. And every student does not need to be taught individually; differentiating instruction is a matter of presenting the same task in different ways and at different levels, so that all students can approach it in their own ways" (Trujo, 2004).

#### **Conclusion**

Generally, the performances of students in English were described as "strongly agree", which meant students performed very well in their English performance. Many students have high performances in English and this was influenced by several factors. This included the levels of self-efficacy. Finally, the results strongly revealed that students who had high English self-efficacy tended to perform higher score in English performance while students who had low English self-efficacy performed fewer score in English. Associations between or among the given variables simply revealed that students' performances were being influenced by the levels of their self-efficacy. These two important variables played an important role to the student's achievements in their English performance.

#### **Recommendations**

1. Teachers may help the learners develop their high self-efficacy to perform in English by employing differentiated instruction strategies that will make the learners more interested to learn English concepts and theories.
2. Further research study may be conducted to further analyze the relationship between the students' profiles and the differentiated instruction strategy, levels of their self-efficacy, and performance in English.
3. Students may develop their positive attitudes toward English by participating in English tutorial sessions through online learning sites or other form of peer tutoring.

4. Research study may be conducted to determine the sources of students' self-efficacy in English and ways in lightening it.
5. Parents may take part on helping the learners develop positive perceptions about English by guiding their children in studying English.
6. School administration may support the advocacy of some groups who help the students in developing English performance like organizations who give tutorial sessions for the students.

#### **References**

1. Aas, H., Klepp, K., Laberg, J. C., & Aaro, L. E. (2009). Predicting adolescents' intentions to drink alcohol: Outcome expectancies and self-efficacy. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 56, 293-299.
2. Abdalla, I. A. (2013). Sex, sex-role self-concepts and career decision-making self-efficacy among Arab students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 23, 389-402.
3. Abel, E. (Ed.). (2009). *What's news: The media in American society*. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
4. Abelson, R. P., Aronson, E., McGuire, W. J., Newcomb, T. M., Rosenberg, M. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (2014). *Theories of cognitive consistency: A sourcebook*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
5. Abramson, P. R., & Aldrich, J. H. (2007). The decline of electoral participation in America. *The American Political Science Review*, 76, 502-521
6. Ader, R. (Ed.). (2009). *Psychoneuroimmunology*. New York: Academic Press.
7. Ader, R., & Cohen, N. (2010). Conditioned immunopharmacologic responses. In R. Ader (Ed.), *Psychoneuroimmunology* (pp. 281-319). New York: Academic Press.
8. Ader, R., & Cohen, N. (2009). CNS-immune system interactions: Conditioning phenomena. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 8, 379-394.
9. Adler, A. (2009). (H. C. Ansbacher & R.R. Ansbacher, Eds.). *The individual psychology of Alfred Adler*. New York: Harper & Row.
10. Adler, N. E., Boyce, T., Chesney, M. A., Cohen, S., Folkman, S., Kahn, R. L., & Syme, S. L. (2010). Socioeconomic status and health: The challenge of the gradient. *American Psychologist*, 49, 15-24.
11. Affleck, G., Tennen, H., Pfeiffer, C., & Fifield, J. (2011). Appraisals of control and predictability in adapting to a chronic disease. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 273-279.
12. Agnew, R., & Jones, D. H. (2009). Adapting to deprivation: An examination of inflated educational expectations. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 29, 315-337.
13. Agras, W. S. (2009). *Eating disorders: Management of obesity, bulimia and anorexia nervosa*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Books.
14. Agras, W. S., Schneider, J. A., Arnow, B., Raeburn, S. D., & Telch, C. F. (2010). Cognitive-behavioral and response-prevention treatments for bulimia nervosa.

*Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 215-221.

15. Ahles, T. A., Blanchard, E. B., & Leventhal, H. (2009). Cognitive control of pain: Attention to the sensory aspects of the cold pressor stimulus. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 7, 159-178.
16. Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (2009). Mother-infant interaction and the development of competence. In K. Connolly & J. Bruner (Eds.), *The growth of competence* (pp. 97-118). London: Academic Press.
17. Ajzen, I. (2009). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg: Springer.
18. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2010). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
19. Ajzen, I., & Madden, T. J. (2009). Prediction of goal-directed behavior: Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioral control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 453-474.
20. Alagna, S. W., & Reddy, D. M. (2010). Predictors of proficient technique and successful lesion detection in breast self-examination. *Health Psychology*, 3, 113-127.
21. Alban-Metcalfe, B., & West, M. A. (2014). Women managers. In J. Firth-Cozens & M. A. West (Eds.), *Women at work: Psychological and organizational perspectives* (pp. 154-171). Milton Keynes, U. K.: Open University Press.
22. Alden, L. (2009). Self-efficacy and causal attributions for social feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 20, 460-473.
23. Alden, L. (2010). Attributional responses of anxious individuals to different patterns of social feedback: Nothing succeeds like improvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 100-106.
24. Alden, L. E., Bieling, P. J., & Wallace, S. T. (2014). Perfectionism in an interpersonal context: A self-regulation analysis of dysphoria and social anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 18, 297-316.
25. Alinsky, S. D. (2009). *Reveille for radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.
26. Allen, J. K., Becker, D. M., Swank, R. T. (2011). Factors related to functional status after coronary artery bypass surgery. *Heart Lung*, 19, 337-343.
27. Allan, K., & Coltrane, S. (2008). Gender displaying television commercials: A comparative study of television commercials in the 1950s and 1980s. *Sex Roles*, 35, 185-203.
28. Allen, J. P., Leadbeater, B. J., & Aber, J. L. (2009). The relationship of adolescent's expectations and values to delinquency, hard drug use, and unprotected sexual intercourse. *Development and Psychopathology*, 2, 85-98.
29. Alloy, L. B., & Abramson, L. Y. (2009). Depressive realism: Four theoretical perspectives. In L.B. Alloy (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in depression* (pp. 223-265). New York: Guilford.
30. Alloy, L. B., Abramson, L. Y., & Viscusi, D. (2010). Induced mood and the illusion of control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 1129-1140.
31. Alloy, L. B., & Clements, C. M. (2009). Illusion of control: Invulnerability to negative affect and depressive symptoms after laboratory and natural stressors. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 101, 234-245.
32. Alloy, L. B., Clements, C. M., & Koenig, L. J. (2010). Perceptions of control: Determinants and mechanisms. In G. Weary, F. Gleicher, & K. L. Marsh (Eds.), *Control motivation and social cognition* (pp. 33-73). New York: Springer Verlag.
33. Altmaier, E. M., Russell, D. W., Kao, C. F., Lehmann, T. R., & Weinstein, J. N. (2015). Role of self-efficacy in rehabilitation outcome among chronic low back pain patients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40, 1-5.
34. American Association of University Women Educational Foundation (2014). *Gender Gaps*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.
35. Ames, C. (2009). Competitive, cooperative, and individualistic goal structures: A cognitive-motivational analysis. In R. E. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: Student motivation* (Vol. 1, pp. 177-207). New York: Academic Press.
36. Anderson, C. A., & Jennings, D. L. (2009). When experiences of failure promote expectations of success: The impact of attributing failure to ineffective strategies. *Journal of Personality*, 48, 393-407.
37. Anderson, D. C., Crowell, C. R., Doman, M., & Howard, G. S. (2010). Performance posting, goal setting, and activity-contingent praise as applied to a university hockey team. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 87-95.
38. Anderson, J. R. (2010). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. San Francisco: Freeman.
39. Anderson, N. H. (2009). *Foundations of information integration theory*. New York: Academic Press.
40. Anderson, R. B., & McMillion, P. Y. (2009). Effects of similar and diversified modeling on African American women's efficacy expectations and intentions to perform breast self-examination. *Health Communication*, 7, 327-343.
41. Anderson, R. N., Greene, M. L., & Loewen, P. S. (2010). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 34, 148-165.
42. Annis, H. M. (2009). *Situational confidence questionnaire ((C) A.R.F.)*. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation.
43. Annis, H. M., & Davis, C. S. (2009). Relapse prevention. In R. K. Hester & W. R. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of alcoholism treatment approaches: Effective alternatives* (pp. 170-182). New York: Pergamon Press.
44. Anson, A. R., Cook, T. D., Habib, F., Grady, M. K., Haynes, N., & Comer, J. P. (2009). The Comer school

- development program: A theoretical analysis. *Urban Education*, 26, 56-82.
45. Antoni, M. H., Schneiderman, N., Fletcher, M. A., Goldstein, D. A., Ironson, G., & Laperriere, A. (2010). Psychoneuroimmunology and HIV-1. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 58, 38-49.
46. Antonuccio, D., Danton, W. G., & DeNelsky, G. Y. (2009). Psychotherapy vs. medication for depression: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Professional Psychology*, 26, 574.
47. Appley, M. H. (2009). Motivation, equilibration, and stress. In R. A. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Perspectives on motivation: Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Vol. 38, pp. 1-67). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
48. Arbona, C. (2010). Career counseling research and Hispanics: A review of the literature. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 18, 300-323.
49. Arch, E. C. (2009). Affective control efficacy as a factor in willingness to participate in a public performance situation. *Psychological Reports*, 71, 1247-1250.
50. Arch, E. C. (2009). Sex differences in the effect of self-efficacy on willingness to participate in a performance situation. *Psychological Reports*, 70, 3-9.
51. Ardel, M., & Eccles, J. S. (2011). Effects of mothers' parental efficacy beliefs and promotive parenting strategies on inner-city youth. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22, 944-972.
52. Arisohn, B., Bruch, M. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (2009). Influence of assessment methods on self-efficacy and outcome expectancy ratings of assertive behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35, 336-341.
53. Armstrong, C. A., Sallis, J. F., Hovell, M. F., & Hofstetter, C. R. (2010). Stages of change, self-efficacy, and the adoption of vigorous exercise: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 15, 390-402.
54. Arnold, H. J. (2007). Effects of performance feedback and extrinsic reward upon high intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 17, 275-288.
55. Ashby, M. S., & Wittmaier, B. C. (2009). Attitude changes in children after exposure to stories about women in traditional or nontraditional occupations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 945-949.
56. Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (2010). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.
57. Astin, H. S. (2010). The meaning of work in women's lives: A sociopsychological model of career choice and work behavior. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12, 117-126.
58. Atkin, C. K. (2009). Effects of media alcohol messages on adolescent audiences. *Adolescent Medicine*, 4, 527-542.
59. Atkin, J. M. (2007). The government in the classroom. *Daedalus*, 109, 85-89.
60. Atkinson, J. W. (2010). *An introduction to motivation*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
61. Audia, G. (2009). *The effect of organizations' and individuals' past success on strategic persistence in changing environments*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Maryland.
62. Austin, J. H. (2008). *Chase, chance, and creativity: The lucky art of novelty*. New York: Columbia University Press.
63. Averill, J. R. (2009). Personal control over aversive stimuli and its relationship to stress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 286-303.
64. Azrin, N. H. (2009). Improvements in the community-reinforcement approach to alcoholism. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 14, 339-348.
65. Bigge, M., & Shermis, S. (2009). *Learning theories for teachers* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
66. Brodie, P., & Irving, K. (2009). *Assessment in work-based learning: Investigating a pedagogical approach to enhance student learning*. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32 (1), 11-19.
67. Brook, C., & Lock, G. (2010). *Reflective practice, professional learning, and educational partnerships: Effecting change in classroom settings*. In E. Ng (Ed.), *Comparative blended learning practices and environments*, (pp. 188-203). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
68. Brooks, R., & Everett, G. (2008). *The predominance of work-based training in young graduates' learning*. *Journal of Education and Work*, 21 (1), 61 - 73.
69. Brown, A., & Green, T. (2010). *The essentials of instructional design: Connecting fundamental principles with process and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
70. Clark, D. (2008). Visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning style (VAK). Retrieved December 7, 2010, from
71. Cook, D., Gelula, M., Dupras, D., & Schwartz, A. (2007). Instructional methods and cognitive and learning styles in web-based learning: Report of two randomized trials. *Medical Education*, 41(9), 897 -905.
72. Dunn, R. (2009). *Capitalizing on college students' learning styles: Theory, practice, and research*. , *Practical approaches to using learning styles in higher education* (pp. 3-33). Westport, CT: Bergin Garvey.
73. Fenwick, T. (2009). *The practice-based learning of educators: A co-emergent perspective* *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 2 (4), 43 -59.
74. Gagn , R., Wager, W., Golas, K., & Keller, J. (2010). *Principles of instructional design* (5th ed.).Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
75. Hsieh, P., & Dwyer, F. (2009). *The instructional effect of online reading strategies and learning styles on student academic achievement*. *Journal of educational technology & Society*, 12(2), 36-50.
76. Jenlink, P. (2009). *Editorial: On bricolage and the intellectual work of the scholar-practitioner*. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 3(1), 3-12.

77. Lambert, C., Parker, A., & Neary, M. (2007). Entrepreneurialism and critical pedagogy Reinventing the higher education curriculum. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(4), 525-537.
78. Lilienfeld, S., Lynn, S., Ruscio, J., & Beyerstein, B. (2009). *50 great myths of popular psychology: Shattering widespread misconceptions about human behavior*. Malden, MA: Wiley- Blackwell.
79. Lyons, R., McIntosh, M., & Kysilka, M. (2010). *Teaching college in an age of accountability*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
80. Meyers, S. (2009). Service-learning is an opportunity for personal and social transformation. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 21 (3), 373 -381.
81. Nordlund, M. (2003). *Differentiated instruction: Meeting the educational needs of all students in your classroom*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
82. Oliva, P. (2009). *Developing the curriculum* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
83. Orlich, D., Harder, R., Callahan, R., Trevisan, M., & Brown, A. (2004). *Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
84. Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). *Learning styles: Concepts and evidence*. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 9 (3), 105-119.
85. Riener, C., & Willingham, D. (2010). *The myth of learning styles*. *Change*, 42 (5), 32- 35.
86. Scott, C. (2010). *The enduring appeal of "learning styles"*. *Australian Journal of Education*, 54 (10), 5- 17.
87. Strati, A. (2007). *Sensible knowledge and practice-based learning*. *Management Learning*, 38 (1), 61 -77.
88. Stronge, J. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
89. Tomlinson, C. (2009). *Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
90. Tomlinson, C. (2010). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd ed.) Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
91. Zailian, M. (1978, April 30). [Interview with Victor Borge: "If I were not a humorist, I'd be a pianist"] *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. 22.
92. Zajonc, R. B., & Markus, G. B. (2005). Birth order and intellectual development. *Psychological Review*, 82, 74-88.
93. Zaltman, G., & Wallendorf, M. (2000). *Consumer behavior: Basic findings and management implications*. New York: Wiley.
94. Zane, G., & Williams, S. L. (2008). Performance-related anxiety in agoraphobia: Treatment procedures and cognitive mechanisms of change. *Behavior Therapy*, 24, 625-643.
95. Zautra, A. J., Reich, J. W., & Newsom, J. T. (2006). Autonomy and sense of control among older adults: An examination of their effects on mental health. In L. Bond, S. Culter, & A. Grams (Eds.), *Promoting successful and productive aging*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
96. Zeiss, A. M., Lewinsohn, P. M., & Muñoz, R. F. (2009). Nonspecific improvement effects in depression using interpersonal skills training, pleasant activity schedules, or cognitive training. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47, 427-439.
97. Zigler, E., & Butterfield, E. C. (2000). Motivational aspects of changes in IQ test performance of culturally deprived nursery school children. *Child Development*, 39, 1-14.
98. Zillmann, D. (2007). Transfer of excitation in emotional behavior. In J. T. Cacioppo & R. E. Petty (Eds.), *Social psychophysiology* (pp. 215-240). New York: Guilford.
99. Zillman, D. (2007). The psychology of the appeal of portrayals of violence. In J. H. Goldstein (Ed.), *Why we watch: The attractions of violent entertainment* (pp. 179-211). New York: Oxford University Press.
100. Zillman, D. (2007). Cognition-excitation interdependencies in aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14, 51-64.
101. Zimbardo, P. G. (2009). *Shyness: What it is, what to do about it*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
102. Zimbardo, P. G. (2009). The psychology of evil: A situationist perspective on recruiting good people to engage in anti-social acts. *Research in Social Psychology [Japanese Journal]*, 11, 125-133.
103. Zimmerman, B. J. (2009). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 329-339.
104. Zimmerman, B. J. (2009). Self-regulating academic learning and achievement: The emergence of a social cognitive perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2, 173-201.
105. Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (2009). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23, 614-628.
106. Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (2009). Construct validation of a strategy model of student self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 284-290.
107. Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (2009). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 51-59.
108. Zimmerman, B. J., & Ringle, J. (2009). Effects of model persistence and statements of confidence on children's self-efficacy and problem-solving. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 485-493.
109. Zimmerman, M. A., & Rappaport, J. (2009). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological



empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 725-750.

110. Zubin, J., Eron, L. D., & Schumer, F. (1965). *An experimental approach to projective techniques*. New York: Wiley.

111. Zurcher, L. A., & Monts, J. K. (2009). Political efficacy, political trust, and anti-pornography crusading: A research note. *Sociology and Social Research*, 56, 211-220.