

EFL University Learners' Profile of Reading Motivation and Reading Competence

Kim Jihye · Chon Yuah V.

[Abstract]

While reading motivation research has predominantly been conducted within the area of L1 reading with children and adolescent learners, this study was to examine how the multidimensional aspects of L2 reading motivation may transpire for L2 EFL university learners. This L2 reading motivation was researched with an adapted version of Motivations for Reading Questionnaire, along with information on the learners' L2 reading proficiency, L2 general proficiency, reading fluency, and affiliated majors. The factor analysis resulted in the loading of five reading motivation factors (i.e., reading involvement, reading curiosity, learning goal-oriented motivation, utility value, and reading efficacy & competence). The quantitative results demonstrated that the learners' reading motivation was characterized by goal-oriented reading motivation and utility value of L2 reading. On the other hand, the learners lacked reading involvement toward L2 reading. However, one-way ANOVA revealed that it was reading involvement that produced proficiency group differences. Linear multiple regression indicated goal-oriented motivation to be a significant predictor of language proficiency, and this validated the learners' endorsement of motivation for

instrumental reasons. Implications for increasing L2 reading motivation are discussed in the study.

Key Words: Reading motivation, Reading involvement, Reading curiosity, Reading efficacy, Goal-oriented reading motivation

1. Introduction

The effects of motivation on learning and achievement are central issues in learning a language in both foreign and second language (L2) contexts (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991; Lukmani, 1972) that may go beyond learners' cognitive characteristics. Motivation may be exhibited with different language skills, but L2 skill-specific types of motivation have not drawn sufficient attention. That is, students may be, for example, motivated to speak or listen, but not to read in a foreign or second language. Previous research has also found that reading motivation is multifaceted and multidimensional (Mori, 2002; Takase, 2007; Watkins & Coffey, 2004; Wigfield and Guthrie, 1997). In other words, students may be engaged in reading for a variety of reasons in many different ways (Chon, 2014; Kim & Chon, 2013; Kim & Chung, 2013; Lee & Chung, 2015). However, since the field lacks the theoretical basis for conceptualizing L2 reading motivation to represent the multidimensional aspects of L2 reading, the work relevant to L2 readers' motivation (e.g., Mori, 2002; Takase, 2007) has been framed in terms of first language (L1) motivation to read.

Theoretical basis for L1 reading motivation rests on the theory of first language reading proposed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997), but due to lack of literature

dealing specifically with reading motivation, they sought support by synthesizing several theories of motivation (i.e., expectancy-value theory, self-efficacy theory, achievement goal theory, and intrinsic motivation theory). Follow-up studies (Jung, 2009; Kim, 2011; Mori, 2002, Takase, 2007) researching L2 reading motivation also found reading motivation to be multidimensional. However, reading motivation was found to consist of different factors within each study, and this is not surprising considering the distinct learner populations that were involved. As such, reading motivation studies provide explanations about L2 learner reading profiles, but studies on this is lacking with regard to L2 learners. This is more of a case with reading motivational profiles of Korean EFL university learners.

While having recognized the research gap in the area of L2 reading motivation, the present study reports on the reading motivation of an intact group of university learners who can be considered to be at the low-intermediate level. The aims of the present study were to: (a) identify factors that motivate a sample of Korean college students to read in English, (b) examine if there are differences in L2 reading motivation by L2 reading ability, and (c) investigate how L2 reading motivation, together with other learner variables (e.g., L2 reading fluency, L2 general proficiency, learner affiliated majors) may be the predictors of general L2 proficiency.

2. Background

2.1 Conceptualizing Reading Motivation

For reading, motivation is assumed to be of particular significance because it affects the amount and breadth of students' reading, which, in turn, facilitates the

development of reading competence (Mol & Bus, 2011; Wigfield and Guthrie, 1997). Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997) found support from expectancy-value theory (Eccles, Lord & Midgley, 1991; Wigfield, 1994; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Expectancy-value theory claims that achievement behavior is predicted by two constructs: expectancy for success in a given task and the value the individual associates with success in that task. They also referred to the work of Eccles and Wigfield (1995) who hypothesized that the value the individual associates with success in that task consists of four components: Attainment Value, Intrinsic Value, Extrinsic Utility Value, and Cost. Other motivational theories that Wigfield and Guthrie consulted include self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986, 1989, 1993; Schunk, 1991), achievement goal theory (Crandall, Katkovsky & Preston, 1962), and intrinsic motivation theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Self-efficacy theory focuses on an individual's evaluation of their capacity to organize and execute courses of action whereas achievement goal theory focuses more on the individual's perception of how important achievement of different tasks are to them. Intrinsic motivation theory emphasizes intrinsic motivation, which is doing a task for its own sake. Using these mainstream motivational theories as reference points, Wigfield and Guthrie (1995) divided L1 reading motivation into the following three categories, which entail 11 sub-components, as indicated in the following:

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Competence and Reading Efficacy | (1) reading efficacy |
| | (2) reading challenge |
| | (3) reading work avoidance |
| Achievement Values and Goals | Intrinsic motivation |
| | (4) reading curiosity |
| | (5) reading involvement |
| | (6) importance of reading |
| | Extrinsic motivation |

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | (7) competition in reading |
| | (8) reading recognition |
| | (9) reading for grades |
| Social Aspects of Reading | (10) social reasons for reading |
| | (11) reading compliance |

Based on their 11 theoretical aspects of reading motivation, Wigfield and Guthrie (1995) developed the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ). They administered it to 105 fourth- and fifth-graders in the United States in an attempt to identify empirically aspects of reading motivation (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). According to Wigfield and Guthrie (1995), the first two aspects of motivation are based on the work on self-efficacy. These aspects are *reading efficacy*, the belief that one can be successful at reading, and *reading challenge*, the satisfaction of mastering or assimilating complex ideas in text. The intrinsic motivation and learning goals aspects include *reading curiosity*, the desire to learn about a particular topic of interest to the child, and *reading involvement*, the enjoyment of experiencing different kinds of literary or informational texts. *Importance* of reading is an aspect taken from Eccles' and Wigfield's work on subjective task values (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Another aspect concerns what students say they do not like about reading, and this dimension is referred to *reading work avoidance*.

Extrinsic motivation and performance goals aspects include *competition in reading*, the desire to outperform others in reading; *recognition for reading*, the gratification in receiving a tangible form of recognition for success in reading; and *reading for grades*, the desire to be evaluated favorably by the teacher. The final aspects concern social motivation for reading. One proposed aspect is *social reasons for reading*, the process of sharing the meanings gained from reading with friends and family; another is *compliance*, reading because of an external goal or requirement.

Baker and Wigfield (1999) also administered the MRQ to 371 fifth- and sixth-graders in the United States. The results demonstrated that all dimensions of reading motivation significantly correlated with the amount of reading children did and several dimensions of their performance on the tests. The statistical analyses of the data obtained confirmed Wigfield and Guthrie's claim for the multidimensionality of L1 reading motivation.

2.2 Reading Motivation and Reading Performance

Recent studies on both first language and second/foreign language reading motivation have provided evidence that the reading motivation of students influences their reading performance in various ways (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Cox & Guthrie, 2001; Day & Bamford, 1998; Kim, 2011; Mori, 2002; Nishino, 2005; Wang & Guthrie, 2004).

A number of studies using the MRQ confirmed the multidimensionality of first language reading motivation (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Watkins & Coffey, 2004; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), and indicated that certain aspects of reading motivation (e.g., reading efficacy and intrinsic motivation) were more significantly associated with reading performance than other aspects of reading motivation (Guthrie, Wigfield, Metsala, & Cox, 1999; Wang & Guthrie, 2004).

Day and Bamford (1998) first attempted to explain the nature of motivation for L2 extensive reading and developed an expectancy-value model. According to their model, four factors contribute to the formulation of L2 reading motivation: reading materials, ability, attitudes, and classroom environment. Their claim is that appropriate reading materials and attitudes play a more crucial role in motivating students than reading ability and classroom situations.

With regard to L2 reading motivation, a few researchers have attempted to explain reading motivation using MRQ. Mori (2002) investigated what comprises foreign language reading motivation with Japanese university learners of English. This study was designed to fit an EFL context, drawing upon the model proposed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997). Mori also included some items to assess Gardner's (1985, 1988) notion of integrative motivation to read in English. In support of multidimensionality in reading motivation, four sub-components of L2 reading motivation were identified, namely Intrinsic Value of Reading in English, Attainment Value of Reading in English, Extrinsic Utility Value of Reading in English, and Expectancy for Success in Reading in English. The results demonstrated that L2 reading motivation is independent of general motivational constructs. Also, Wigfield and Guthrie's 11 factors of motivation were found not to adequately fit her data and that MRQ should be revised in terms of the research context. This is likely since Wigfield and Guthrie's model of L1 reading motivation was initially designed for L1 learners in mind, who seemed to have endorsed reading motivation that is different from those of L2 learners.

Takase (2007) also constructed a questionnaire based on studies of L1 reading (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997) and L2 learning (Gardner, 1985; Schmidt, Boraie, & Kassabgy, 1996). Her target population was Japanese high school students in an extensive English reading program. Her analysis revealed that reading motivation is related to intrinsic motivation for L1 and L2 reading, parents' involvement in and family attitudes toward reading, extrinsic motivation, fondness for written materials, and negative attitudes toward extensive reading. Results indicated that intrinsic motivation for reading in English and Japanese were the two strongest predictors of extensive reading in English.

With EFL university students, Jung (2009) aimed to explore the nature of foreign

language reading motivation and the relationship between reading motivation and achievement in English reading with EFL university students. Five underlying dimensions of foreign language reading motivation were discussed in relation to student reading achievement. It was found that self-confident engagement in English reading and perceived usefulness of reading in English were positively related to reading achievement ($p < .001$). A stepwise multiple regression indicated self-confident engagement in English to be the significant predictor of reading achievement. Overall, the study provides support for the key role of motivational factors in the development of foreign language reading skills.

Kim (2011) designed a study to identify underlying factors that motivate language learners to read in a foreign language (L2) context with 259 Korean EFL college students. In line with previous studies (Mori, 2002; Takase, 2007; Watkins & Coffey, 2004), certain sub-components of reading motivation did not cluster as proposed in Wigfield and Guthrie's study. The study yielded a four-factor solution for L2 reading motivation: learning goal-oriented motivation, intrinsic motivation, avoidance of reading, and utility value of L2 reading. The results indicated that learning goal-oriented motivation and utility value of L2 reading were the two primary indicators for the participants' desire to read in English. All L2 reading motivation scales revealed significant differences between English and non-English majors except in utility value of L2 reading. The similarity of utility values in the two groups, the researcher contends, can be attributed to how the learners considered English to be important for gaining higher grades and better career opportunities.

The previous studies have added to our understanding of reading motivation and its relationship to reading performance. However, research on reading motivation (RM hereafter) has been predominant with children and adolescents reading in their first language, which suggests that generalizing the results to different learner

populations may result in different explanations of RM. In the context of the present study, there was attention to the RM of Korean university learners, particularly a group of low-intermediate learners who may be characterized by particular motivational orientations, however, who need to excel on reading English to pass the requirements set by the university. Also, we were interested in how other learner variables, that is reading fluency or student affiliated majors would explain language proficiency in relation to reading motivation. With having recognized the lack of examination of L2 RM research, the following research questions guided the present study:

1. What are the sub-scales of motivation to read in English for Korean college students?
2. What is the relationship between students' L2 reading motivation and L2 reading competence?
3. In what way do the learners' L2 reading motivation, reading fluency (i.e., reading speed and reading comprehension), and major area of study predict learners' L2 general language proficiency?

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The participants of the study were 74 freshman university learners from the majors in Art and Humanities (n = 11, 14.9%), Natural Sciences (n = 35, 47.3%), Social Sciences (n = 9, 12.2%), Education (n = 4, 5.4%), Business (n = 8, 10.8%), Buddhist

Culture (n = 6, 8.1%), and Elective Majors (n = 1, 1.4%). The students were from a course, *Freshman English*, which was a requirement for graduation. The students could be classified as low-intermediate learners since they belonged to Class C among A - D groups where A was classified as the most advanced. The classes had been divided by proficiency levels according to their TOEIC scores obtained in the previous semester, and the students had scored a mean of 362.24 (Total = 990 points).

3.2. Context and Teaching Procedures of *Freshman English*

Freshman English was a course in which the students met for two hours a week during the 16 week instruction. The course description states that the purpose of the course is to provide students with reading opportunities by reading on a variety of topics in order to acquire English, which was a foreign language to the students. The learners are also encouraged to learn the language by increasing their knowledge of English vocabulary and grammar to ultimately understand the gist of the reading passages. Another purpose of the course was to help learners increase their strategic competence by being able to employ reading strategies for different purposes. By the end of the course, the learners were expected to infer meaning of vocabulary within the reading passages, conduct fluent reading, and improve reading comprehension skills.

The main textbook for the course was *Skills for Success: Reading and Writing 1*. The coursebook was organized so as to offer readings in a number of topics that would be interesting to young adult learners: The eight topics that were covered in the semester were: 1) What is Laughter?, 2) The Best Medicine is Laughter, 3) Music and Shopping, 4) Music and the Movies, 5) The Lies People Tell, 6) Honesty

and Parenting, 7) Becoming an Adult, and 8) A Dangerous World.

While one of the researchers took the role of the instructor, the lessons were designed so that there were pre-, while- and post-reading activities. Before reading every chapter, the instructor deployed activities for schema building by asking students to watch videos or reflect on some photographs that she had prepared. The reading skills of skimming and scanning were practiced with comprehension questions. Towards the latter part of the semester, the instructor was able to increasingly address the questions in English, but considering the level of the learners and their motivation level, most classroom instruction and questions had to be addressed in the learners' L1, Korean.

After the skimming and scanning sessions, close reading was also conducted with translations provided by the instructor. Comprehension of the reading text was checked by the true/false questions provided in the coursebook or by asking the learners to solve comprehension questions developed by the instructor. As another post-reading activity, the learners were given vocabulary exercises to encourage noticing or consolidation of new lexical items in the text. For instance, the instructor used Power Point slides to provide definition of words whereafter the learners were asked to find the matching word in the reading passages. Another requirement of the course was also to learn the grammar points of each chapter. Assignments for the course also consisted of finding the definition of words, summarizing, and short essay writing. The learners were asked to write a paragraph (i.e., of at least 5 lines) on their 'Favorite Celebrity' and 'The Most Memorable Event in College' by making use of at least two words met in the reading passage. During the course, there was focus on reading, first and foremost.

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ)

Questionnaire for the study was developed by referencing Mori's (2002) Nine Hypothesized Motivational Components (30 items) and Wigfield and Guthrie's (1997) Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ). Mori's (2002) study was on the validation of MRQ with Japanese university learners based on Wigfield and Guthrie's theoretical aspects of reading motivation.

From the different constructs available from the previous MRQ studies, the researcher selectively included those that seemed most relevant to the students' reason for L2 reading. This was an informed decision process since the instructor, one of the researchers, had taught similar types of students in *Freshman English* at the university for more than three years. In the end, the learners' RM was measured on four subscales, that is, reading competence & reading efficacy (i.e., reading efficacy, reading challenge), intrinsic motivation (i.e., reading curiosity, reading involvement, importance of reading in English), extrinsic motivation (i.e., reading for grades, competition in reading), and integrative orientation. Items for Competition in Reading were added from Wigfield and Guthrie's (1997) study since this construct was expected to be perceived as important for the target learners. The questionnaire consisted of 26 items to be marked on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The internal reliability of the scale with Cronbach's alpha was .874. The questionnaire items are presented in Appendix 1.

3.3.2. Reading Fluency Task

As another measure of reading ability, the learners' reading fluency was of interest. A speed reading task with reading comprehension questions were utilized for

this purpose. Eskey and Grabe (1988) have pointed out the importance of speed or automaticity in word recognition and it needed to be tapped into for assessing reading ability of the learners.

A speed reading task was selected from *Asian and Pacific Speed Readings for ESL Learners* (Quinn, Nation & Millett, 2007). The package has been created for the purpose of training students to increase students' reading speed through a daily speed reading exercise. Each reading passage is approximately 550 words, each with ten comprehension questions. The readings are based on topics related to Asia and the Pacific and are written within the 1,000 most frequently used words of English (West & West, 1953). The only exceptions are words that are explained in the text, the titles of passages or content words like country names and animal names. In addition, the grammar has been restricted by limiting the number of relative clauses, passives and difficult time references. For the speed reading task, the reading titled China with the ten accompanying comprehension questions were selected from the package (see Appendix 2).

3.3.3. Background Questionnaire

The learners were asked in the questionnaire on their background, such as their gender and affiliated majors. In the questionnaire, the learners were also asked to report on their total TOEIC scores with separate scores for listening and reading comprehension. At the university, it is mandatory for the students to take the TOEIC test every semester. As such, all the learners had scores to report as a measure of their L2 proficiency. For the purpose of the study, the reading comprehension score (Total = 495) was used to analyze RM while the total score of TOEIC (Total = 990) was used as a measure of general L2 proficiency.

3.4. Procedure

At the end of the semester, the learners were asked to respond to the questionnaire on their background and RM while reflecting on their reading experience in the course. Thereafter, the learners were also asked to try out the speed reading task. The testing procedure for this task was as follows: First, the students were asked to record their accurate reading time by indicating both minutes and seconds as soon as they had finished reading the passage within 6 minutes by watching the timer set in front of the classroom. Students who could not finish reading within 6 minutes were allowed to record 'more than 6 minutes.' Thereafter, ten short reading comprehension questions were distributed to the students, and they were required to answer the questions without looking back at the passage. The results of the speed reading tasks were collected for analysis together with the responses to the MRQ and background questionnaires.

3.5. Data Analysis

The questionnaires were analyzed with SPSS 21.0. To research RM of L2 university EFL learners, descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were computed for the participants' responses to the items in the MRQ, speed reading task and background questionnaire. Cronbach alphas were calculated to estimate the reliability of the questionnaires in measuring each RM subscale. An exploratory factor analysis was applied to identify the factors that were related to the participants' responses for L2 RM. The extracted factors were used throughout the rest of the analyses. Factorial one-way ANOVA analyses including post-hoc tests were adopted to examine whether L2 reading competence had an influence on L2

RM. In the final analysis, to examine whether L2 RM, reading fluency, and student majors may have an influence on L2 general proficiency, linear multiple regression was conducted. The student major variables needed to be dummy coded for the analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. L2 Reading Motivation

This section examines RQ1. What are the sub-scales of motivation to read in English for Korean college students? In order to determine the underlying constructs of RM in English, principal axis factoring analysis with an oblique rotation (Promax) was conducted. In measuring psychological constructs (e.g., motivation, attitudes, anxiety), there is theoretical and empirical basis for assuming these constructs to be correlated to one another. Principal axis factoring may thus yield a more accurate and realistic representation of how motivational factors are likely to be associated with one another than Principal components analysis (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). The number of factors to be extracted was based on the following criteria: eigenvalues of 1.0 or greater, the scree test, and the interpretability of the resulting solutions (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). Two items were dropped from the analysis due to low communalities (.296 and .349, respectively). Items 9 (*Even if reading were not a required subject, I would take a reading class anyway*) and 18 (*I am learning to read only because I want to get a good grade*) were excluded which left 24 items with a five factor solution. This accounted for 66.75% of the total variance in English RM. The results of the five-factor solution including means and standard

deviations for each item are summarized in Table 1.

Factor 1 was associated with six items and represented participants' fondness for and engagement in reading English texts. Therefore, this factor was interpreted as Reading Involvement. Factor 2 exhibited learners' interest in reading a variety of genres. This variable was labeled Reading Curiosity. Factor 3 was associated with six items and represented participants' RM in relation to practical goals that they would achieve by learning to read in English. The goals are not limited to immediate outcomes, but may extend beyond those that can be achieved in the classroom (i.e., reading novels, coping with internalization.) Thus, this factor was called Learning Goal-oriented Motivation for L2 reading.

Factor 4 loaded on four items that were concerned with practical values of reading in English such as getting good grades, noting importance of reading as a language skill and learning more about English-speaking cultures. This factor was labeled Utility Value of L2 Reading. Factor 5 had loadings from six items. The statements indicated that the learners were concerned with how they evaluated themselves in relation to their peers. As such, this factor was labeled Reading Efficacy & Competition in L2 Reading.

Based on the results of the factor analysis, scale scores for each factor of L2 RM were computed by calculating the mean. Reliabilities of five factors, as shown in Table 2, represented high internal consistency having a value greater than .70.

Table 1. Five-factor Solution for Reading Motivation in L2

| | Loading | M | SD |
|--|---------|------|------|
| <i>Factor 1: Reading Involvement</i> | | | |
| 5. I enjoy the challenge of difficult reading passages. | .539 | 2.31 | 1.02 |
| 6. I like it when the questions in books make me think. | .799 | 2.77 | 1.00 |
| 7. I usually learn difficult things by reading | .707 | 2.97 | 0.94 |
| 8. If a book is interesting I don't care how hard it is to read. | .703 | 3.07 | 1.21 |
| 14. I get immersed in interesting stories even if they are written in English. | .635 | 2.89 | 1.01 |
| 15. It is fun to read in English. | .658 | 2.73 | 0.94 |
| <i>Factor 2: Reading Curiosity</i> | | | |
| 10. I like reading English novels. | .804 | 2.08 | 0.95 |
| 11. I like reading English newspapers and/or magazines. | .800 | 2.15 | 1.00 |
| <i>Factor 3: Learning goal-oriented Motivation for L2 Reading</i> | | | |
| 12. By learning to read in English, I hope I will be able to read English novels. | .800 | 3.32 | 1.21 |
| 13. By learning to read in English, I hope to be able to read English newspapers and/or magazines. | .964 | 3.50 | 1.15 |
| 16. Learning to read in English is important because it will broaden my view. | .446 | 3.58 | 0.88 |
| 17. Learning to read in English is important because it will be conducive to my general education. | .511 | 3.68 | 0.91 |
| 22. Learning to read in English is important in that we need to cope with internationalization. | .601 | 3.82 | 1.00 |
| 25. By learning to read in English, I hope to learn about various opinions in the world. | .672 | 3.53 | 0.91 |
| <i>Factor 4: Utility Value of L2 Reading</i> | | | |
| 19. I like being the best at reading. | .612 | 3.38 | 1.12 |
| 23. I am learning to read in English because I might study abroad in the future. | .733 | 3.07 | 1.16 |
| 24. By being able to read in English, I hope to understand | .619 | 3.58 | 0.88 |

more deeply about lifestyles and cultures of English speaking countries (such as America and England).

| | | | | |
|-----|--|------|------|------|
| 26. | I think learning to speak and/or listening is more important than learning to read in English. (R) | .605 | 2.51 | 1.00 |
|-----|--|------|------|------|

Factor 5: Reading Efficacy & Competition in L2 Reading

| | | | | |
|-----|--|------|------|------|
| 1. | I am good at reading in English. | .757 | 2.64 | 0.96 |
| 2. | English reading is my weak subject. (R) | .665 | 2.93 | 1.05 |
| 3. | My grades for English reading classes at junior and senior high schools were good. | .694 | 2.84 | 0.99 |
| 4. | I liked reading classes at junior and senior high schools. | .691 | 2.73 | 1.10 |
| 20. | I like to finish my reading before other students | .551 | 3.35 | 1.05 |
| 21. | I try to get more answers right than my friends | .640 | 3.42 | 0.92 |

Note: (R) = Reverse-coded items

Table 2. Reliabilities and Descriptive Summary for L2 Reading Motivation

| | No. of Items | Alpha | M | SD |
|--|--------------|-------|------|-----|
| Reading Involvement | 6 | .851 | 2.79 | .78 |
| Reading Curiosity | 2 | .838 | 2.11 | .90 |
| Learning goal-oriented Motivation for L2 Reading | 6 | .861 | 3.57 | .78 |
| Utility Value of L2 Reading | 4 | .740 | 3.14 | .78 |
| Reading Efficacy & Competition in L2 Reading | 6 | .819 | 2.98 | .74 |

Repeated measures ANOVA indicated that the five factors were statistically different from one another ($F = 51.940$, $p = .000$) except for Factors 1 & 5 ($p = .10$), and Factors 4 & 5 ($p = 1.00$), respectively indicating that the mean differences between Reading Involvement vs. Reading Efficacy & Competition, and Utility Value vs. Reading Efficacy & Competition were not different. The mean scores on all reading motivational subscales were above the median score of 2.5 except for Factor

2 (i.e., Reading Curiosity) indicating that the participants characterized themselves as being motivated in relation to the four factors (Baker & Wigfield, 1999).

The results, however, indicated that the learners reading motivational profiles could be characterized by the higher mean scores on Learning Goal-oriented Motivation and Utility Value; Learning Goal-oriented Motivation was also significantly different from the other four factors ($p < .01$). The nature of the two factors, Learning Goal-oriented Motivation and Utility Value, is closely linked to the concepts of instrumental motivation (Gardner, 1985, 1988) and extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1995). This indicates that to the university learners, it was not for pleasure, enjoyment or personal well-being, but rather for instrumental purposes that they wanted to read. For instance, the learners felt that English reading was going to help them become a more global person (*Learning to read in English is important in that we need to cope with internationalization*, $M = 3.82$) and that it would help them become a more knowledgeable person (*Learning to read in English is important because it will be conducive to my general education*, $M = 3.68$). The learners also endorsed the desire to learn more about English-speaking cultures (*By being able to read in English, I hope to understand more deeply about lifestyles and cultures of English speaking countries*, $M = 3.58$). The statements indicate that the university learners' purpose of L2 reading in the course, *Freshman English*, may be closely related to utilitarian and immediate purposes, such as to obtain higher grades and expand career opportunities.

In comparison to Learning Goal-oriented Motivation, the mean values of learners' Reading Efficacy & Competition and Reading Involvement resulted in lower mean values ($p < .01$). In fact, Reading Involvement, which can be considered a similar construct to intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1995) indicates that the learners do not endorse reading motivation for internal reasons, such as for enjoyment or

emotional growth. Similarly, the mean value for Reading Curiosity ($M = 2.11$) also demonstrated that the learners may have not been motivated to read English simply because they were interested in reading about a particular genre or topic.

4.2. L2 Reading Motivation and L2 Reading Competence

This section deals with investigating RQ2. What is the relationship between students' L2 RM and L2 reading competence? For any reading proficiency group differences, factorial one-way ANOVA was conducted. Here the learners' reading TOEIC score was used as the measure of L2 reading competence, the dependent variable. The learners were divided into different reading proficiency groups. Visual binning is a facility that creates groups from a continuous variable and is available at SPSS for grouping participants. As presented in Table 3, a statistically significant proficiency effect was found with Reading Involvement and Reading Efficacy & Competition. In contrast, no group differences were found for Reading Curiosity, Learning Goal-oriented Motivation, and Utility Value. This shows a similar pattern to the university learners in Kim's (2011) study, whose learners were found to endorse utility values and lack motivation by internally-driven reasons.

Table 3. ANOVA for L2 Reading Motivation by Proficiency Groups

| | | M | SD | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | F | Sig. |
|---|---|------|------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------|--------|
| | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| Reading Involvement | 1 | 2.49 | 0.85 | 2.18 | 2.81 | 4.101 | 0.021* |
| | 2 | 2.94 | 0.69 | 2.65 | 3.24 | | |
| | 3 | 3.05 | 0.62 | 2.76 | 3.34 | | |
| Reading Curiosity | 1 | 2.05 | 1.06 | 1.65 | 2.45 | 1.748 | 0.182 |
| | 2 | 1.94 | 0.84 | 1.58 | 2.29 | | |
| | 3 | 2.43 | 0.65 | 2.12 | 2.73 | | |
| Learning Goal-oriented Motivation | 1 | 3.42 | 0.87 | 3.09 | 3.74 | 2.853 | 0.064 |
| | 2 | 3.48 | 0.72 | 3.17 | 3.78 | | |
| | 3 | 3.92 | 0.62 | 3.63 | 4.21 | | |
| Utility Value | 1 | 3.02 | 0.82 | 2.71 | 3.32 | 1.769 | 0.178 |
| | 2 | 3.05 | 0.82 | 2.7 | 3.4 | | |
| | 3 | 3.41 | 0.63 | 3.12 | 3.71 | | |
| Reading Efficacy & Competition | 1 | 2.69 | 0.78 | 2.4 | 2.98 | 4.457 | 0.015* |
| | 2 | 3.19 | 0.69 | 2.89 | 3.48 | | |
| | 3 | 3.18 | 0.58 | 2.91 | 3.46 | | |

Note: 1 = low, 2 = mid, 3 = high; * $p < .05$

The results demonstrate that it was Reading Involvement and Reading Efficacy & Competition that had relationships to learners' reading competence. The level of Reading Involvement, which is related to learners' willingness to take the initiative to read, was related to learners' reading ability ($F = 4.101$, $p = .021$). As seen in Table 3, descriptive statistics indicate that the high level learners were associated with higher reading involvement. In a similar vein, different levels of Reading Efficacy & Competition were associated with learners' reading ability ($F = 4.457$, $p = .015$).

Further Bonferroni post-hoc tests (see Table 4) also showed that there were

statistically significant differences in Reading Involvement and Reading Efficacy & Competition between groups. Reading Involvement of the low level group was significantly lower than that of the high level group (difference = $-.56$, $p = .04$). Reading Efficacy & Competition of the low level group was also found to be significantly lower than that of the mid level group (difference = $-.50$, $p = .03$). This type of information on how learners may exhibit different levels of motivation according to proficiency can be helpful in diagnosing the types of motivation that needs to be encouraged in reading instruction, for instance, among the lower proficiency group learners. The results validate that Reading Involvement and Reading Efficacy & Competition may be the important types of RM that need to be sustained among low level EFL university learners, as with those in the current study. According to Wigfield & Guthrie (1997), Reading Involvement, a component of intrinsic motivation, would require the learners to feel that they are enjoying the experience of reading different kinds of literary or informational text. Increased reading involvement, in turn, is expected to lead to improved reading achievement.

Bandura's (1977) interpretation of self-efficacy provides further implications on the results. He proposed that individuals' efficacy expectations for different achievement tasks are a major determinant of activity choice, willingness to expend effort, and persistence. Schunk and his colleagues also demonstrated that children's sense of efficacy relates to their academic performance, and that training students both to be more efficacious and to believe they are more efficacious improves children's achievement (Schunk, 1991; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997). In a similar vein, when the EFL university learners believe that they are competent and efficacious at reading, they may also be able to engage in more reading and improve reading ability.

Table 4. Post-hoc for L2 Reading Motivation and Proficiency Groups

| | | | Mean Difference (I-J) | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Reading Involvement | 1 | 2 | -0.45 | 0.09 | -0.95 | 0.05 |
| | | 3 | -0.56 | 0.04* | -1.08 | -0.03 |
| | 2 | 3 | -0.11 | 1.00 | -0.66 | 0.45 |
| Reading Efficacy & Competition | 1 | 2 | -0.50 | 0.03* | -0.97 | -0.03 |
| | | 3 | -0.49 | 0.05 | -0.99 | 0.00 |
| | 2 | 3 | 0.00 | 1.00 | -0.52 | 0.53 |

Note: * $p < .05$, 1 = low, 2 = mid, 3 = high

On the other hand, the motivational orientations of Reading Curiosity, Learning Goal-oriented Motivation, and Utility Value did not seem to be related to reading competence. Particularly for Learning Goal-oriented Motivation and Utility Value, differences between proficiency groups were not significant. It seems that the learners were collectively driven to read by instrumental types of motivation. The participants in the present study were from a college whose academic levels were at or below the national norm. This may have caused the group as a whole to be more focused on the importance of English reading since English reading skills can help them attain higher grades and better career opportunities. As mentioned previously, these students were categorized as low-intermediate learners so their aspirations to achieve instrumental goals may have been stronger than those at higher levels of proficiency. Another explanation for the learners' orientation toward the Utility Value would stem from competitiveness in the job market after their graduation (Kim, 2011). Considering the status of the undergraduates who may have more immediate goals after graduation, it is not surprising to see how the learners endorsed Learning Goal-oriented Motivation, and Utility Value of L2 reading regardless of proficiency

levels. Another explanation is that the learners at the specific university may have been under pressure to do well since they are required to take the TOEIC and pass the compulsory English courses to graduate.

4.3. Reading Motivation, Reading Fluency, and Majors as Predictors of General Proficiency

To grasp a comprehensive view of RM in relation to other learner variables, the RQ 3. of interest was: In what way do the learners' L2 RM, reading fluency (i.e., reading speed and reading comprehension), and major area of study predict learners' L2 general language proficiency?

A significant regression equation was found ($F = 4.458$, $p = .000$) with an R^2 of .491, explaining that RM, reading fluency (i.e., reading speed and reading comprehension), and major area of study can account for approximately 49% of the variation in L2 general proficiency. At statistically significant levels ($p < .05$), β and t values indicated that Learning Goal-oriented Motivation, and no. of items correct for reading comprehension in the speed reading task were positively related to L2 general language ability.

Table 5. Multiple Regression with Predictors of General Proficiency

| | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | 89.69 | 104.85 | | .855 | .396 |
| <u>Reading Motivation</u> | | | | | |
| Reading Involvement | 15.99 | 20.87 | .107 | .766 | .447 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Reading Curiosity | 16.06 | 13.68 | .125 | 1.174 | .245 |
| Learning Goal-oriented Motivation | 39.88 | 18.68 | .268 | 2.135 | .037* |
| Utility Value | -3.09 | 18.47 | -.021 | -.167 | .868 |
| Reading Efficacy & Competition | -7.03 | 20.73 | -.044 | -.339 | .736 |
| <u>Fluency</u> | | | | | |
| Speed Reading (Seconds) | -0.11 | 0.20 | -.056 | -.518 | .607 |
| No. of Items Correct on Reading Speed Comprehension | 18.37 | 5.57 | .334 | 3.300 | .002* |
| <u>Majors</u> | | | | | |
| Natural Science vs. Humanities & Art | -28.00 | 32.86 | -.086 | -.852 | .398 |
| Natural Science vs. Social Science | -26.92 | 34.83 | -.076 | -.773 | .443 |
| Natural Science vs. Education | -202.54 | 49.54 | -.397 | -4.088 | .000** |
| Natural Science vs. Business Administration | 58.65 | 36.28 | .158 | 1.617 | .111 |
| Natural Science vs. Buddhist Culture | -22.98 | 42.15 | -.054 | -.545 | .588 |
| Natural Science vs. Free Major | -72.07 | 98.59 | -.072 | -.731 | .468 |

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

By unstandardized coefficients of B, the learners' L2 general proficiency (i.e., TOEIC) was found to increase 39.88 points for each level of Learning Goal-oriented Motivation on the 5-point Likert scale ($p = .037$). Also, with an increase in the No. of Items Correct on Reading Speed Comprehension, there was an increase of 18.37 points in L2 general proficiency. For improved L2 general proficiency, the pattern of results suggest that when RM is perceived with specific aims, such as, being able to 'read novels and magazines regularly in English' and 'broaden one's scope of the world', it is likely to bring increases in L2 general proficiency scores. Consequently, the participants' perception of reading goals will play a crucial role in motivating them to study or read in English to reach desired outcomes.

Noting how the number of items correct was significantly related to L2 proficiency, the results also confirm that reading comprehension is an important component of general proficiency rather than the speed taken to read the target text. This points out that reaching satisfactory levels of comprehension of the text is essential for improved L2 proficiency, even while there may be time constraints to read a text. As explained by Alderson (2000), comprehension will often consist of parsing sentences, understanding sentences in discourse, building a discourse structure, and then integrating this understanding with what one already knows.

In the regression model, the 'Education' majors were also found to score 200 points lower than the 'Natural Science' majors on the TOEIC exam ($p < .01$). In fact, the proficiency score for the 'Education' group was the lowest of the group (i.e., 182.50, Total = 990 points). The mean scores for the other majors ranged from 330 to 456 points. This raises a point for one of the researchers who was in charge of instructing the students at the university. It needs to be found whether these Education major learners ($N = 4$) have other factors (beyond the scope of the study) that is contributing towards their poor performance. When computed, their RM total score was not statistically different from those of other majors. However, this result is not surprising considering the small number of Education major participants. Future studies, additionally via qualitative methods (e.g., interviews), may be needed to examine what other individual difference variables may be influencing their RM, reading competence and reading behavior. The number of participants for the Education majors will also need to be supplemented for comprehensive results.

5. Conclusion

The present study demonstrated for the lower-intermediate EFL Korean university learners that RM encompasses a variety of constructs such as Reading Involvement, Reading Curiosity, Learning Goal-oriented Motivation, Utility Value, and Reading Efficacy & Competence. The multidimensionality of RM provided an explanation for why the learners chose to read or not to read (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Kim, 2011; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997).

The strongest indicators of RM for the university learners were Learning Goal-oriented Motivation and Utility Value of L2 reading. This finding reflects that the role of L2 reading in English college classrooms is to prepare them for more advancement in classes and for career opportunities. The learners may therefore set goals and expectations based on rewards to be gained from an improved English proficiency. For instance, the learners may have believed that 'reading in English may be conducive to their general education and that 'English was needed to be able to cope with internalization.' Consequently, the participants' perceptions of the goals to be achieved by learning English was found to have played a crucial role in motivating them to study or read in English. In addition, participants' lack of Reading Involvement or Reading Curiosity provided evidence for the learners' lack of intrinsic motivation toward L2 reading. However, analysis revealed that it was Reading Involvement that produced group differences; seeing that greater levels of Reading Involvement was exhibited by the more skilled learners, this indicates that internally driven types of motivation may be beneficial for improved achievement (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Linear multiple regression indicated Learning Goal-oriented Motivation to be a significant predictor, and this confirmed the learners' endorsement of motivation for practical reasons.

The results of this study have pedagogical implications for teaching L2 learners. This study indicated that students were motivated to read in L2 for different reasons or purposes. That is, learners' motivational orientations should be scrutinized and not simply be regarded as being motivated or unmotivated to read in the L2. Although the students' RM was not characterized by high levels of Reading Involvement or Reading Efficacy & Competence, these were associated with general proficiency. Therefore, teachers should encourage lower level students to be engaged in L2 reading activities, such as by giving them opportunities to experience the pleasure of reading via manageable texts so their perception of reading efficacy can be improved. When teachers are able to set personally relevant goals for the learners, the learners will have greater possibilities in reaching their goals (Schunk, 1991; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997).

The study is not without its limitations. The first relates to the limited number of learners due to examination of an intact class that one of the researchers was in charge of. A larger sample of learners may yield a more nuanced understanding of L2 RM. Second, to more accurately explain learners' L2 reading motivational profiles, there is need to include qualitative data as a means of cross-validating the questionnaire results. Also, in order to develop a more reliable model of RM of L2 university learners, future research will need to consider a number of additional factors, such as, type of instruction received, reading curriculum, cultural differences, and socio-educational variables (e.g., gender, abroad experience, study styles).

Appendix 1

Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ)

| | 질 문 | 응 답 |
|-----|--|-----------|
| 1. | 나는 영어읽기를 잘 한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 2. | 영어읽기(리딩클래스)는 나의 취약한 과목이다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 3. | 중고등학교때 영어읽기 수업의 내 점수는 좋았다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 4. | 나는 중·고등학교때 영어읽기 수업을 좋아했다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 5. | 나는 어려운 리딩지문 읽기 도전을 즐긴다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 6. | 나는 생각할 수 있는 지문이해도 질문들이 있는 것이 좋다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 7. | 나는 읽기를 함으로써 어려운 것들에 대해 배우게 된다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 8. | 영어 지문내용이 재미있다면, 그것이 얼마나 어려운가는 상관이 없다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 9. | 심지어 필수과목이 아니였더라도, 나는 영어읽기 수업을 수강했을 것이다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 10. | 나는 영어소설을 읽는 것을 좋아한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 11. | 나는 영어신문이나 잡지 읽는 것을 좋아한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 12. | 영어 읽기를 배움으로써, 나는 영어 소설까지도 읽을 수 있기를 희망한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 13. | 영어 읽기를 배움으로써, 나는 영어신문이나 잡지를 읽을 수 있기를 희망한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 14. | 심지어 영어로 된 책이라도 나는 재미있는 이야기에 몰두된다. 영어읽기는 재미있다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 15. | 나의 견해를 넓힐 수 있다는 면에서 영어읽기를 배우는 것은 중요하다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 16. | 나의 교육적인 면에서 좋기 때문에 영어읽기를 배우는 것은 중요하다 | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 17. | 다 | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 18. | 나는 단지 좋은 점수를 받기 위해 영어읽기를 배운다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 19. | 나는 읽기에서 최고가 되고싶다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 20. | 나는 다른 친구들보다 먼저 읽기(빠른속도)를 끝낼 때 좋다. 나는 지문관련 이해도 질문들에 내 친구들보다 더 많은 정답을 찾 | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 21. | 으려고 노력한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 22. | 영어읽기를 배우는 것은 우리가 국제화시대에 대처하기 위해 중요하다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 23. | 나는 미래에 해외로 공부하러 갈 것이기 때문에 영어읽기를 배운다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 24. | 영어읽기를 할 수 있게 됨으로써, 나는 영어권 문화들에 대해 더 자세히 이해할 수 있기를 희망한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 25. | 영어읽기를 배움으로써, 나는 전 세계의 다양한 의견들에 대해 배우는 것을 희망한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |
| 26. | 나는 말하거나 듣기보다는 영어읽기가 더 중요하다고 생각한다. | ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ |

Appendix 2

Speed Reading Task with Comprehension Questions

China

Today China is a modern country with a population of over a billion people. It is a world leader in trade and industry and the standard of living for many Chinese people is getting better, but about 100 years ago life was very different in China.

For thousands of years, China was ruled by emperors. The emperor, his family and a small number of people were very rich while most of the people were poor. The rich people lived in beautiful big houses and many of the poor people worked as their servants without being paid. The rich people owned all the land and the poor worked on small pieces of land as farmers. They had to work very hard to make enough food for their families and they also had to give some of the food they produced to the rich land owners.

In old China, the family was the most important thing. Children usually lived with their parents, even after they got married and had children of their own. The head of the family was the father. He made all the decisions, and everyone in the family had to do what he said. When the father died, his oldest son took his place. Children did not go to school. In a rich family, the boys learned to read and write at home. They did not learn to write with a pen or pencil, but with a little brush. They also had to study old books. If they wanted to get a good position in society, they had to pass a very difficult examination. In this examination, they were asked to read and write poems and they were asked questions about the old books. Women did not have an important place in old China. Girls did not learn to read or write and the daughters of rich families could not go out to work. They only learned to look after the family. When they were very young, their parents found husbands for them. When they grew up, they were married and they went to live with their husband's family.

In 1911 the poor began to fight against their leaders. They won the war and the rule of the Chinese emperors came to an end. After that, the Communist Party started to become powerful, and China became a communist country in 1949. Communism meant that all people had a say in making decisions, not just a few rich people. Life got a lot better for the working people

and there was not such a big difference between rich and poor.

Under communism, women in China gained more freedom. Girls went to school and universities. They became teachers, soldiers or farmers. Some worked in offices and some worked in factories. Some drove trucks and some were doctors. Women continued to work after they were married and had children. Because both husbands and wives worked during the day, they could not look after their children. So they left their children at special places where they were looked after. In 1979, China started the One Child Policy to try to reduce the size of the population.

China continues to change especially in the large cities, but some of the old ways of life are still found in the smaller villages and country areas.

리딩을 끝낸 후, 본인의 Reading시간을 적으세요. (분 초)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Before 1911 people in China were a very rich b very poor c very rich or poor. d all about the same.</p> <p>2. In old China, many servants, were a the children of rich people. b children with no parents. c rich people. d poor people.</p> <p>3. For their work, servants received, a a lot of money. b no money. c land. d food.</p> <p>4. Chinese families were big because a not many people died. b married children lived with their parents. c their houses were big. d many people came to stay.</p> <p>5. When the head of the family died, his place was taken by a his wife. b his oldest brother. c his oldest son. d his wife's brother.</p> | <p>6. In rich families, children studied a at home. b at the teacher's house. c at school. d at the temple.</p> <p>7. Writing was done with a a pen. b a long thin stick. c a brush. d a pencil.</p> <p>8. To pass the examination, a boy had to a read many old books. b learn many languages. c know about foreign countries. d study in school.</p> <p>9. In old China, girls a did not study books. b worked outside the house. c were quite free. d went to school.</p> <p>10. Now, in China, women a do not go to school. b only work at home. c can do any job. d do not work after they marry</p> |
|---|--|

Works Cited

- Alderson, Charles. *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- Baker, Linda, and Allan Wigfield. "Dimensions of Children's Motivation for Reading and their Relations to Reading Activity and Reading Achievement." *Reading Research Quarterly* 34 (1999): 452-77. Print.
- Bandura, Albert. "Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change." *Psychological Review* 84 (1977): 191. Print.
- _____. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Upper Saddle Rivers, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986. Print.
- _____. *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman, 1997. Print.
- _____. "Perceived Self-efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning." *Educational Psychologist* 28 (1993): 117-48. Print.
- Chon, Yuah V. "Lexical Threshold of L2 Reading in the Korean CSAT." *Journal of British & American Studies* 31 (2014): 341-376. Print.
- Cox, Kathleen E., and John T. Guthrie. "Motivational and Cognitive Contributions to Students' Amount of Reading." *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 26 (2001): 116-31. Print.
- Crandall, Vaughn J., Walter Katkovsky, and Anne Preston. "Motivational and Ability Determinants of Young Children's Intellectual Achievement Behaviors." *Child Development* (1962): 643-61. Print.
- Csizér, Kata, and Zoltán Dörnyei. "Language Learners' Motivational Profiles and their Motivated Learning Behavior." *Language Learning* 55 (2005): 613-59. Print.
- Day, Richard R., and Julian Bamford. *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1998. Print.

- Deci, Edward L., and Richard M. Ryan. "The General Causality Orientations Scale: Self-determination in Personality." *Journal of Research in Personality* 19 (1985): 109-34. Print.
- _____. "Human Autonomy." *Efficacy, Agency, and Self-esteem*. New York: Springer, 1995. 31-49. Print.
- Eccles, Jacquelynne S., Sarah Lord, and Carol Midgley. "What are We Doing to Early Adolescents? The Impact of Educational Contexts on Early Adolescents." *American Journal of Education* 17 (1991): 521-42. Print.
- _____, and Allan Wigfield. "In the Mind of the Actor: The Structure of Adolescents' Achievement Task Values and Expectancy-related Beliefs." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 21 (1995): 215-25. Print.
- Eskey, David E., and William Grabe. "15 Interactive Models for Second Language Reading: Perspectives on Instruction." *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (1988): 223. Print.
- Gardner, Robert C. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Arnold, 1985. Print.
- _____. "The Socio-Educational Model of Second Language Learning: Assumptions, Findings, and Issues." *Language Learning* 38 (1988): 101-26. Print.
- _____. and Peter D. MacIntyre. "An Instrumental Motivation in Language Study." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13 (1991): 57-72. Print.
- Guthrie, John T., Allan Wigfield, Jamie L. Metsala, and Kathleen E. Cox. "Motivational and Cognitive Predictors of Text Comprehension and Reading Amount." *Scientific Studies of Reading* 3 (1999): 231-56. Print.
- Jung, Sei-Hwa. "Foreign Language Reading Motivation and Achievement." *English Language Teaching* 21 (2009): 209-29. Print.
- Kim, Do Youn, and Hye Jin Chung. "A Study on Different Level Students' Interest

- and Self-confidence in English Extensive Reading.” *Journal of British & American Studies* 28 (2013): 235-68. Print.
- Kim, Jihye, and Yuah. V. Chon “L2 Reading Ability and Lexical Writing Development: Does University In-class Extensive Reading Work?” *English Teaching* 68 (2013): 89-115. Print.
- Kim, Kyung Ja. “Reading Motivation in Two Languages: An Examination of EFL College Students in Korea.” *Reading and Writing* 24 (2011): 861-81. Print.
- Lee, Young-Geun, and Hyejin Chung. “Differential Effects of Comprehension Strategy and Grammar Instruction on Second Language Reading Comprehension.” *Journal of British & American Studies* 34 (2015): 291-334. Print.
- Lukmani, Yasmeen M. “Motivation to Learn and Language Proficiency.” *Language Learning* 22 (1972): 261-73. Print.
- Mol, Suzanne E., and Adriana G. Bus. “To Read or Not to Read: A Meta-analysis of Print Exposure from Infancy to Early Adulthood.” *Psychological Bulletin* 137 (2011): 267. Print.
- Mori, Setsuko. “Redefining Motivation to Read in a Foreign Language.” *Reading in a Foreign Language* 14 (2002): 91. Print.
- Preacher, Kristopher J., and Robert C. MacCallum. “Repairing Tom Swift’s Electric Factor Analysis Machine.” *Understanding Statistics: Statistical Issues in Psychology, Education, and the Social Sciences* 2 (2003): 13-43. Print.
- Quinn, E., I. S. P. Nation, and Sonia Millett. “Asian and Pacific Speed Readings for ESL learners.” *ELI Occasional Publication* 24 (2007). Print.
- Schmidt, Richard, Deena Boraie, and Omneya Kassabgy. “Foreign Language Motivation: Internal Structure and External Connections.” *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century* 2 (1996): 9-70. Print.

- Schunk, Dale H. "Self-efficacy and Academic Motivation." *Educational Psychologist* 26 (1991): 207-31. Print.
- _____, and B. J. Zimmerman. "Developing Self-efficacious Readers and Writers: The Role of Social and Self-regulatory Processes." *Reading Engagement: Motivating Readers through Integrated Instruction* 34 (1997): 50. Print.
- Takase, Atsuko. "Japanese High School Students' Motivation for Extensive L2 Reading." *Reading in a Foreign Language* 19 (2007): 1. Print.
- Watkins, Marley W., and Debra Young Coffey. "Reading Motivation: Multidimensional and Indeterminate." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 96 (2004): 110. Print.
- West, Michael, and Michael Philip West, eds. *A General Service List of English Words: With Semantic Frequencies and a Supplementary Word-list for the Writing of Popular Science and Technology*. Addison-Wesley: Longman, 1953. Print.
- Wigfield, Allan. "Expectancy-value Theory of Achievement Motivation: A Developmental Perspective." *Educational Psychology Review* 6 (1994): 49-78. Print.
- _____, and Jacquelynne S. Eccles. "The Development of Achievement Task Values: A Theoretical Analysis." *Developmental Review* 12 (1992): 265-310. Print.
- _____, and John T. Guthrie. "Dimensions of Children's Motivations for Reading: An Initial Study." *Reading Research Report* 34 (1995). Print.
- _____, and John T. Guthrie. "Relations of Children's Motivation for Reading to the Amount and Breadth of their Reading." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 89 (1997): 420. Print.

국문초록

EFL 배경 대학생들의 영어 읽기 동기 및 읽기 능력 요인들의 관계 분석

김 지 혜 (동국대학교)

전 유 아 (한양대학교)

읽기동기에 관련된 연구는 대부분 모국어 읽기의 분야에서 아동이나 청소년을 대상으로 실시가 된 반면, 성인을 대상으로 한 제2언어로서의 영어학습에서는 그 연구가 상대적으로 드문 상태이다. 본 연구에서는 대학생들의 다차원적인 읽기동기에 대한 연구를 목적으로 “읽기동기를 조사하기 위한 설문지”를 활용하여 학습자의 영어 읽기 능력, 영어 학업 성취도, 읽기 능숙도, 그리고 학생들이 속한 전공 변인들을 대상으로 연구를 실시하였다. 요인분석을 실시한 결과 대학생들의 읽기동기는 다섯 가지의 요인인 “읽기 몰입”, “읽기 호기심”, “목표지향적 읽기동기”, “효용 가치”, 그리고 “읽기 효능감 및 능력”으로 구분할 수 있었다. 정량적 분석 결과 대학생 학습자들의 ‘목표지향적 동기’와 ‘유용성 가치’가 유의미한 읽기동기인 것으로 나타났다. 반면, 학습자들은 영어 읽기에 대하여 ‘읽기 몰입’이 부족한 것으로 드러났다. 하지만, 일월변량분석의 결과 ‘읽기 몰입’이 학습자의 영어 능력 간에 차이가 나는 것으로 드러났다. 선형 다중 회귀 결과 ‘학습 목표 지향적 동기’는 학습자의 영어 능력의 유의미한 예측 변인인 것으로 드러났으며, 이것을 통해 학습자들이 영어를 읽는 이유는 도구적이라는 것을 알 수 있다. 결과적으로 본 연구는 제2언어 학습을 위한 읽기동기를 함양하기 위한 시사점에 관한 논의라 할 것이다.

주제어 : 읽기동기, 읽기몰입, 읽기 호기심, 읽기 효능감, 목적지향적 읽기

논문접수일: 2016.05.15

심사완료일: 2016.06.17

게재확정일: 2016.06.20

이름: 김지혜 (제 1저자)

소속: 동국대학교 파라미타칼리지

주소: (38067) 경상북도 경주시 동대로 123 동국대학교 경주캠퍼스

이메일: kjh8525@naver.com

이름: 전유아 (교신저자)

소속: 한양대학교 사범대학 영어교육과

주소: (04763) 서울특별시 성동구 왕십리로 222 한양대학교 사범대학

이메일: vylee52@hanyang.ac.kr

