The Reading Matrix
Vol. 1, No. 2, September 2001

THE NATURE OF TURKISH STUDENTS' MOTIVATION FOR READING AND ITS RELATION TO THEIR READING FREQUENCY

Leyla Tercanlioglu
E-mail: leylat@usa.net

Abstract

This exploratory study examined the nature of Turkish students' motivation to read. The objectives of the study were three fold: (1) to explore the mean level of Turkish students' reading motivations; (2) to identify students' reading frequencies; (3) to understand the relation between their reading motivations and their reading frequencies. One hundred and fifty one students completed the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) and Reading Activity Inventory (RAI) designed to assess dimensions of students' reading motivations and to measure the amount and breadth of students' reading in and out of school.

It is accepted that motivation is one of the main causes of reading and accordingly, the last several years have seen research that investigates the nature and role of motivation in the reading process. Much of this research has been started and inspired by Wigfield and Guthrie, who together grounded motivation research in a domain specific framework. Wigfield and his associates also established scientific research procedures and introduced standardized assessment techniques to set high reading motivation research standards and to bring motivational components specific to the reading domain issue to the attention of the field.

Guthrie & Wigfield (1999), who defined reading motivation as "the individual's goals and beliefs regarding reading" (p. 199), claimed that what influences reading engagement is different from what influences engagement in other fields. It must be noted that Wigfield and his associates' Reading Motivation Theory includes a general dimension that similar motivational factors such as beliefs, values and goals also influence reading engagement. However, the main emphasis in their view is on the factors which are unique to the reading domain.

To assess specific dimensions of reading, Wigfield, Guthrie and McGough (1996) developed a set of possible dimensions that could comprise reading motivations. From their studies, they proposed three major learner factors that affect reading comprehension: (1) Individual's beliefs that they are competent and efficacious at reading; (2) achievement values and goals; (3) social reasons for reading. Table 1 summarizes their aspects.

Table 1

Proposed Aspects of Reading Motivation

		(1) Competence and Efficacy Beliefs	(2) Achievement Values and Goals	(3) Social Aspects
Intrinsic		Reading efficacy	Reading curiosity	Social reasons
		Reading challenge	Reading involvement	Reading compliance

Avoidance	Extrinsic	Importance
		Competition
		Reading recognition
		Reading for grades

The first aspect of reading motivations is based on the efficacy belief constructs, and also includes the notion that reading is often something that requires hard work to achieve. Within the field of motivation, self-efficacy has been widely researched. Bandura (1986: 391) defined it as "people's judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances". As to Reading challenge, it is the satisfaction of mastering or assimilating complex ideas in text. The last dimension in this group is Avoidance, which refers to what children do not like about reading. Beginning with research in the 1950s (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953), motivation researchers generally assumed that avoidance motivation can influence behavior in achievement settings. In various theories of motivation, avoidance is represented as test anxiety, fear of success, cost of success, or fear of failure. Early research on achievement goals measured these avoidance tendencies in terms of students' work-avoidant goals, defined as a tendency to feel successful when work is easy (Nicholls, Cheung, Lauer, & Patashnick, 1989).

The second set of dimensions is based on work on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to being motivated and curious enough to be engaged in an activity for its own sake (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Harter, 1981). Intrinsic motivation is considered to be highly self-determinant in the sense that the reason for reading is linked solely to the individual's positive feelings while reading. The findings of some important studies have led some researchers to hypothesize that the intrinsic motivation described above is related to reading involvement, reading curiosity, reading frequency and reading amount. Increased intrinsic motivation has been related to greater interest in the reading material, higher reading performance, higher amount (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), higher frequency, higher achievement in text-comprehension tasks (Benware & Deci, 1984; Gottfried, 1990) and higher sense of competence (Miller, Behrens, Greene & Newman 1993). The dimensions based on intrinsic motivations are reading curiosity, reading involvement and importance of reading. Reading curiosity is the individual's desire to learn about a particular topic of interest. Reading involvement is the enjoyment of experiencing different kinds of literary or informal texts. Importance of reading is the individual's valuing of different tasks or activities.

Different dimensions of extrinsic motivation are also highlighted. Extrinsic motivation refers to efforts directed toward obtaining external recognition, rewards, or incentives (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier , & Ryan, 1991).

Extrinsic motivation reflects the fact that children do much of their reading when their reading performance is evaluated and compared to others' performance. The dimensions based on extrinsic motivations include reading recognition, reading for grades and reading competition. Reading recognition is the gratification in receiving a tangible form of recognition for success in reading. Reading for grades is the desire to be favorably evaluated by the teacher. Reading competition is the desire to outperform others in reading.

The third dimension is social aspects of reading. Reading is often a social activity and often takes place in social settings. The first of these aspects is social reasons for reading which refers to the process of sharing meanings gained from reading with friends and family. The second is reading compliance that is reading because of an external requirement. Wigfield, Baker, Fernandez-Fein, & Scher (1996) note that with the exception of Wentzel's (1991) study in the general motivation literature, social goals for achievement have not been discussed.

THE STUDY

Method

Research Questions

Because prior research had not examined Turkish students' motivations for reading, the first objective was simply to describe the relative strength of different motivations for reading in partially English-medium high schools. In this

preliminary study, FL reading is regarded as more a reading than a language problem. Based on the works "reading universals" hypothesis (Goodman, 1973), whereby "reading is reading", the study focuses on students' motivation for reading in general. Second objective was to describe the mean level of students' reading frequencies. The relation between their reading motivations and their reading frequencies was the third objective of the study.

Since it is a descriptive study, it must be viewed as a preliminary investigation of the degree of motivation to read and its results cannot necessarily be generalized. In addition, inferential statistics are used to reach the generalizations in the conclusion.

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. What is the mean level of students' reading motivations?
2. What is the mean level of students' reading frequencies?
3. What is the relation between their reading motivations and their reading frequencies?

Participants

The participants consisted of 151 students enrolled in the 7^{th}, 8^{th} and 9^{th} grade of an Anatolian High School. There were 48 seventh (F=23, M=25), 55 eighth (F=29, M=26)and 48 ninth graders(F=28, M=20); 80 of the students were

girls and 71 were boys. With few exceptions, participants were between the ages of 12 and 15. Each student in the sample agreed to participate. All students are EFL learners and speak Turkish as their first language. The subjects are an intact group, encompassing all of the students in grades 7, 8 and 9. As to the selection of the school, Erzurum Anatolian High School was chosen because Anatolian High Schools are selective institutions which were established to prepare students for higher education programs which correspond to their interests, abilities and level of achievement; to provide more effective foreign language teaching; and to ensure more efficient education through use of a foreign language as the medium of instruction. The demand for places in Anatolian High Schools is high and admission is through a very competitive entrance examination. These schools offer a four-year program (English preparatory program prior to the three-year high school education) using English as the language of instruction in certain subjects (such as science and mathematics). The students' overall success at school is directly linked to their success in reading especially in English.

Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study: the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) and the Reading Activity Inventory (RAI). Students completed the MRQ and RAI in the spring of the 1999-2000 school year.

The Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (Wigfield, Guthrie, & McGough, 1996) is a 54-item questionnaire which is designed to assess 11 possible dimensions of reading motivations including reading efficacy, several intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, social aspects of reading, and the desire to avoid reading.

Table 2

Sample Items from MRQ

Dimension	Number	Sample Item
Reading Efficacy	4	I am a good reader
Reading Challenge	5	I like hard, challenging books
Reading Curiosity	6	I like to read about new things
Reading Involvement	6	I make pictures in my mind when I read
Importance of Reading	2	It is very important for me to be a good reader
Reading Recognition	5	I like having the teacher say I read well
Reading for Grades	4	I read to improve my grades
Social Reasons	7	I sometimes read to my parents
Reading Competition	6	I like being the best at reading
Reading Work Avoidance	4	I don't like vocabulary questions
Compliance	5	I read because I have to

Each item was scored on a 1 to 4 scale; higher scores mean stronger endorsement of the item. A total score can be derived by summing the scores of all items (with the exception of Work Avoidance items). However, in this research, to gain information about the pattern of students' responses and how they rate different aspects of their reading motivations, separate scores for each of the proposed dimensions of reading motivations were derived. The scores in this research were interpreted as groups, and group differences (grade/sex) were examined. Wigfield et al. (1996) computed internal consistency reliability for each of the 11 motivation scales to determine the degree to which items formed coherent scales. Reliabilities greater than .70 indicate reasonably good internal consistency. Five of the scales had internal consistency reliabilities greater than .70: Social, Challenge, Recognition, Competition and Importance. The reliability for the other three scales approached .70: Reading Efficacy, Curiosity, and Aesthetic Enjoyment. Two scales (compliance and reading work avoidance) had lower reliabilities.

The Reading Activity Inventory (Guthrie, McGough, & Wigfield, 1994) is a 26-item questionnaire which is designed to assess the amount and breadth of students' reading in and out of school. This questionnaire was applied to get a self-report measure of student's reading frequency. The RAI covers three areas; social activities, personal reading and school reading. It asks subjects about the kinds of books they read, and how often they read them. The kinds of reading

materials asked about included magazines, books in general, adventure books, mystery books, sports books, nature books, and comic books. It also asks if subjects have read each of these kinds of materials within the previous week and to list a title of the material if they have read one. The students also were asked how frequently they read each of the kinds of materials. Questions about books read in the previous week were scored: 1=No, 2=yes. Questions about frequency were scored 1=Almost never; 2=About once a month; 3=About once a week; 4= Almost every day. Before using the instruments, a need to examine them was felt for three reasons. The primary purpose of the examination was to understand if the instruments which were originally designed for upper elementary to middle school students would need adaptation of some questions for differing upper grades. The second reason was about the language of the instrument. Since the instruments were originally designed for native speakers of English not for young learners of English as a foreign language, it was decided to check whether students would have any problem with the language if the instruments were administered in English. Thirdly, it was decided to understand whether all items were significant to Turkish students. The questionnaires were delivered to 45 students (16 grade seven, 20 grade eight, 9 grade nine and 20 female, 25 male) and discussed the questionnaires with them. Following an analysis of the data gathered, the MRQ and the RAI items underwent minor revisions: The word "story" was changed to "novel" for all groups as pilot subjects believed that only

children read stories and they were not children any more. Also, since there is no Good Readers List in the school, the 22nd MRQ item was changed to "It would be important for me to see my name on a list of good readers". The 26th RAI item (How often do you read written instructions?) was omitted, since students said they read written instructions whenever they need to read them. No student expressed a need to simplify the language and no other adaptation for differing grades was needed.. Cronbach's alpha for he RAI was .59.

Procedure

During the 3rd week of the spring semester, participants were asked to complete both the MRQ and RAI. Since just before or after examinations might have an effect on the responses given by the subjects, the timeframe was planned with the school teachers to find the most suitable time. Both questionnaires were given on one day. All the students completed the MRQ and the RAI in the same order. Before distributing the MRQ and RAI forms, as suggested, the students were told that the researcher was interested in finding out what they think and feel about reading as an activity. The students were told that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions. The students were encouraged to answer the questions honestly. The students were asked if they preferred the questionnaire was read aloud. They said they preferred to complete it on their own. The

researcher was available to answer any questions the students had about the wording of the items.

Data Analyses

The data analysis was conducted with the SPSS 9.01. Basic descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were computed for all data. The research questions of this study primarily required the use of Non parametric and two independent samples- the Mann Whitney U Test, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Bivariate Correlations.

Results and Discussion

Results are organized around three research questions: (1) What is the mean level of students' reading motivations? (2) What is the mean level of students' reading frequencies? (3) What is the relation between students reading motivations and their reading frequencies? All research questions were considered according to sex and grade differences.

(1) The Mean Level of Students Reading Motivations

Table 3 shows the mean level of students' reading motivations. The highest means give information about which of the reading motivations students endorse

most and lowest mean scores show what they endorse least. The highest possible score is 4.00, the lowest is 1.00.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlations Among Scales

Correlation coefficient=r

Variable	Statistics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Efficacy	R											
	P											
2 Challenge	R	0.47										
	P	0.00**										
3 Curiosity	r	0.45	0.47									
	P	0.00**	0.00**									
4 Involvement	r	0.35	0.35	0.40								
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**								
5 Importance	r	0.61	0.49	0.46	0.37							
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	.						
6 Recognition	r	0.43	0.32	0.49	0.31	0.49						
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**						
7 Grades	r	0.24	0.24	0.42	0.25	0.30	0.45					
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**					
8 Competition	r	0.50	0.41	0.63	0.29	0.56	0.60	0.53				
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**				
9 Social	r	0.45	0.33	0.34	0.33	0.47	0.48	0.17	0.38			
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.04*	0.00**			
10 Compliance	r	0.44	0.37	0.39	0.25	0.54		0.26				

							0.35		0.40	0.45		
	P	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**		
11 Avoidance	r	- 0.08	- 0.01	0.06	- 0.22	- 0.03	0.02	0.12	0.11	- 0.01	-.02	
	P	0.31	0.94	0.44	0.01**	0.71	0.85	0.14	0.17	0.92	0.77	
	M	2.60	2.77	3.00	2.56	2.76	2.76	2.88	2.88	2.34	2.62	2.50
	SD	0.61	0.67	0.58	0.43	0.84	0.66	0.63	0.69	0.50	0.60	0.59

** p= < 0.01, 2-tailed *p= <0.05, 2-tailed

As can be seen from the table, both more intrinsic motivation like Curiosity (M=3.00) and Challenge (M=2.77) and more extrinsic motivation like Grades (M=2.88) and Competition (M=2.88) have the highest mean scores. Whereas Social Reasons (M=2.34) for reading and Reading Work Avoidance (M=2.50)have the lowest scores. Actually, the negative finding on Work Avoidance is really a positive finding. It means that students do not care if reading activities are difficult and they do not avoid reading. The low score of Social Reasons means that students do not seem to be highly motivated to read for social reasons, such as reading with friends and family. Instead, they rated the more "individualistic" dimensions more highly.

To assess the relative distinctiveness of the motivational dimensions, correlations of the scales with one another were computed. Looking at Table 3, it can be seen that Efficacy, Challenge, Curiosity, Importance, Recognition, Competition, Compliance are all positively and significantly correlated with

each other at $p = < 0.01$. Work avoidance scale relates only and negatively to Involvement. Grades and Social scales are correlated with each other positively at $p = < 0.05$, but with others at $p = < 0.01$. Correlations for scales are largely consistent with those of Wigfield, Wilde, Baker, Fernandez-Fein, & Scher (1996).

Sex Differences

Motivation to read is a complicated process and many factors influence it. The students' sex is accepted as an important factor that educators believe to have important effects on students' reading motivation. Many studies (e.g., Eccles et al., 1993; Gambrell et al., 1993; Marsh, 1989) showed that girls are more positive in their ability beliefs and attitudes about reading than are boys. Therefore, sex differences in students' reading motivation were examined to see whether there were gender differences. To assess sex differences, two Independent Samples - Mann Whitney U Test was used (Table 4).

Table 4

Two Independent Samples of Sex Differences of Students Reading Motivations

Scale	Sex	M	SD	MR	SR	U	P
Efficacy	F	2.62	0.59	77.81	6224.50	2695.50	0.59
	M	2.57	0.64	73.96	5251.50		
Challenge	F	2.73	0.71	73.28	5862.00	2622.00	0.41
	M	2.82	0.62	79.07	5614.00		
Curiosity	F	3.03	0.61	78.68	6294.50	2625.50	0.42
	M	2.98	0.55	72.98	5181.50		
Involvement	F	2.58	0.43	78.34	6267.50	2652.50	0.48
	M	2.54	0.44	73.36	5208.50		
Importance	F	2.79	0.85	76.94	6155.50	2764.50	0.77
	M	2.73	0.84	74.94	5320.50		
Recognition	F	2.82	0.68	80.34	6427.50	2492.50	0.19
	M	2.70	0.64	71.11	5048.50		
Grades	F	2.80	0.64	70.69	5655.50	2415.50	0.11
	M	2.96	0.61	81.98	5820.50		
Competition	F	2.85	0.75	74.78	5982.00	2742.00	0.71
	M	2.91	0.61	77.38	5494.00		
Social	F	2.38	0.51	79.25	6340.00	2580.00	0.33

	M	2.29	0.49	72.34	5136.00		
Compliance	F	2.70	0.63	81.43	6514.00	2406.00	0.10
	M	2.54	0.55	69.89	4962.00		
Avoidance	F	2.50	0.62	75.91	6073.00	2833.00	0.98
	M	2.50	0.56	76,10	5403,00		

Note 1. MR= Mean Rank; SR=Sum of Ranks U= Mann-Whitney U

Note 2. F, N=80; M, N= 71

As can be seen, there are no significant sex differences on any of the scales. It means that boys and girls do not differ in their motivations for reading. However, the descriptive analysis of the means for girls' reading motivation shows that theirs is most strongly related to Curiosity (M=3.03), Competition (M=2.85) and Recognition (M=2.82). Boys read most for Grades (M=2.97). Grades are followed by Curiosity (M=2.82) and Competition (M=2.91).

Grade Differences

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that most studies of younger subjects show that, in general, younger students have more positive ability beliefs and attitudes toward reading than older students. Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, and Blumenfeld (1993) and Marsh (1989) assessed children's ability beliefs about reading and found that older elementary school-aged children have less positive ability beliefs in reading than do younger elementary school children. Eccles et al.

(1993) also found that older elementary school-aged children value reading less than the younger children. Therefore, the assessment of grade difference has also been included in the study and one-way ANOVA has been preferred to assess grade differences.

Table 5

One-way ANOVA for Grade Differences in Students Reading Motivations

Scale	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Efficacy	53.74	148.00	0.36	3.60	0.03
Challenge	64.07	148.00	0.43	3.24	0.04
Curiosity	48.65	148.00	0.33	2.68	0.07
Involvement	27.44	148.00	0.19	2.32	0.10
Importance	102.89	148.00	0.70	2.90	0.06
Recognition	63.42	148.00	0.43	2.67	0.07
Grades	60.15	148.00	0.41	0.10	0.91
Competition	65.99	148.00	0.45	5.07	0.01
Social	37.45	148.00	0.25	0.30	0.74
Compliance	52.17	148.00	0.35	2.16	0.12
Avoidance	52.17	148.00	0.35	0.82	0.44

Note. SS=Sum of Squares; DF=Degree of Freedom; MS=Mean Square

The analysis determined that differences exist among the means on three of the scales: Reading Efficacy, p, 0.03; Challenge, p. 0.04; and Competition, p. 0.01. Furthermore, to determine which means differ, a LSD post hoc comparison test was conducted. The multi comparisons for significant grade differences are presented in Table 6. The results reveal that on all three scales, the significant difference is between the 7^{th} and 9^{th} grades.

Table 6

LSD Post-hoc Multi Comparison for Grade Differences in Students Reading Motivations

Variable	Grade I	Grade J	MD	SE	P
Efficacy	7	8	- 0.13	0.12	0.26
	7	9	- 0.33	0.12	0.01
	8	9	- 0.19	0.12	0.11
Challenge	7	8	- 0.19	0.13	0.15
	7	9	- 0.34	0.13	0.01
	8	9	- 0.16	0.13	0.23
Competition	7	8	- 0.18	0.13	0.16
	7	9	- 0.43	0.14	0.00
	8	9	- 0.25	0.13	0.06

Note. MD= Mean Difference; SE=Standard Error.

(2) What is the mean level of Turkish students' reading frequencies?

Another important substantive issue is understanding students' reading frequencies and grade/sex influences on students' reading frequency. Table 7 shows the mean level of students' reading frequencies. These means give information about whether students read most for school or for personal pleasure.

"Often" refers to how often subjects read books and "last week" refers to if they read within the previous week. The highest possible score for "often" is 4 and the lowest is 1. "Last week" is a yes/no type question and the highest possible score is 2, the lowest 1.

Table 7

Mean Level of Students' Reading Frequency

Variable	Frequency	M	SD
Personal reading	Often	1.84	0.45
	Last week	1.24	0.20
School Reading	Often	1.99	0.59
	Last Week	1.22	0.27

The table shows that students seem to do reading for school requirements.

To understand if there are sex differences, Non-parametric Two Independent Samples, for grade differences one-way ANOVA were found to be appropriate

Sex Differences

Table 8

Two Independent Samples for Sex Differences in Students' Reading Frequencies

Type of reading	Frequency	Sex	M	SD	MR	SR	U	P
Personal Reading	Last week	F	1.248	0.202	77.51	6200.50	2719.50	0.6444
		M	1.235	0.202	74.30	5275.50		
	Often	F	1.945	0.423	86.67	6933.50	1986.50	0,0014
		M	1.718	0.453	63.98	4542.50		
School Reading	Last week	F	1.142	0.224	65.37	5229.50	1989.50	0,0004
		M	1.305	0.302	87.98	6246.50		
	Often	F	1.904	0.515	70.06	5604.50	2364.50	0,0712
		M	2.089	0.650	82.70	5871.50		

A significant sex difference was found on reading for personal interest frequency and school reading last week. Girls and boys differ on their personal reading frequencies, and school reading last week. To determine the difference, a descriptive analysis of means was conducted. The means show that boys do more school reading (F, M=1.142, SD=0.224; M=1.305, SD=0,302) whereas girls do

more reading for personal pleasure (F, M=1.945, SD= 0,423; M=1.718, SD=0.453)

Grade Differences

As to the grade difference, one-way ANOVA revealed a significant difference between groups who read a book for personal pleasure last week and those who do reading often for school.

Table 9

One-way ANOVA for Grade Differences in Students' Reading Frequencies

Reading	Frequency	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Personal	Last week	5.73	148.00	0.04	4.50	0.01*
	Often	30.26	148.00	0.20	0.44	0.64
School	Last week	11.10	148.00	0.07	1.65	0.19
	Often	48.41	148.00	0.33	5.13	0.01*

* p= < .05

Results of the LSD (least square difference) analysis are shown on Table 10, in which the 8th and 9th grade students who read a book for personal pleasure last

week differed. School reading frequency reveals significant difference between 7 and 8, and 7 and 9 graders.

Table 10

LSD Post-hoc Multi Comparison for Grade Differences in Students' Reading Frequencies

Variable	Grade I	Grade J	MD	SE	P
Personal	7	8	0,057	0,039	0,144
Last Week		9	- 0,060	0,040	0,141
	8	9	- 0,117	0,039	0,003**
School	7	8	0,336	0,113	0,003**
Often		9	0,299	0,117	0,012*
	8	9	- 0,037	0,113	0,744

** p= < 0.01, 2-tailed *p= <0.05, 2-tailed

Note. MD= Mean Difference; SE= Standard Error

(3) Relation between reading motivations and frequency of reading

Another important issue is how the different dimensions of reading motivations are related to the frequency with which students read. The

correlations of students' reports of their reading frequency to their reading motivation is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Relations of Students' Reading Motivations to their Reading Frequencies

Correlation coefficient=r

		School reading		Personal reading	
Variable	Statistics	Often	Last week	Often	Last week
Efficacy	r	0,184	0,112	0,098	0,239
	p	0,023*	0,171	0,231	0,003**
Challenge	r	0,152	0,120	- 0,027	0,283
	p	0,062	0,141	0,741	0,000**
Curiosity	r	0,242	0,058	0,131	0,126
	p	0,00**	0,480	0,108	0,123
Involvement	r	0,193	0,031	0,131	0,142
	p	0,018*	0,708	0,108	0,081
Importance	r	0,150	0,062	0,087	0,128
	p	0,066	0,453	0,289	0,117
Recognition	r	0,172	0,062	0,054	0,102
	p	0,035*	0,450	0,506	0,212
Grades	r	0,290	0,075	0,086	- 0,046

	p	0,000**	0,360	0,293	0,577
Competition	r	0,190	0,112	0,010	0,135
	p	0,019*	0,169	0,901	0,097
Social	r	0,133	0,104	0,104	0,082
	p	0,104	0,202	0,202	0,319
Compliance	r	0,150	- 0,007	0,082	0,005
	p	0,066	0,935	0,316	0,956
Avoidance	r	- 0,073	- 0,110	- 0,041	- 0,228
	P	0,371	0,178	0,619	0,005**

** p= < 0.01, 2-tailed *p= <0.05, 2-tailed

The school reading frequency is positively correlated with both individual beliefs that they are efficacious readers, and more intrinsic motivations like curiosity and involvement and more extrinsic motivations like recognition and grades. It appears that both the more intrinsic and extrinsic reasons for reading and children's sense that they read efficaciously are the strongest correlates of reading frequency. The only negative correlation is with work avoidance, which is actually positive. The students say they do not avoid reading. Reading for personal interest last week has correlations on Efficacy and challenge.

CONCLUSION

Reading motivation researchers and theorists have defined and studied several different motivational constructs, including beliefs about competence and ability, self-efficacy, valuing of achievement tasks, goals for achievement, and intrinsic motivation to learn. They propose that these constructs mediate individuals' choice of different tasks, participation in those tasks, and persistence at them. In this study, different aspects of Turkish students' reading motivation, sex and grade differences of their motivations to read, and the relation between reading motivations and reading frequency, have been explored empirically.
Conclusions are organized around three issues: Students' reading motivations, their reading frequency and the relation between students' reading motivations and their reading frequencies.

Students' reading motivations:

The analysis of mean scores on different scales showed students' motivations are very strong in areas such as curiosity, grades, competition and challenge, and encouragingly, very low on the work avoidance scale. These findings suggest students read for both extrinsic and intrinsic reasons, and do not avoid difficult reading activities. Social reasons, as a motivation for reading, had one of the lowest scores on any scale. Students apparently are not motivated to read with friends and family. The reasons for this weakness are not clear and suggest further

study. An interesting issue uncovered by these results is that students rate involvement reasons low as a motivation to read. This suggests students are lacking the experiential and emotional aspects of reading. If so, this study suggests teachers focus more on this aspect of reading and encourage students to experience and enjoy different kinds of literary or informational texts. The low ranking given to involvement reasons as a motivation to read points to an area for further investigation. Students' reading motivations change according to grade but not according to sex. As a student progresses from grade 7 to 9, their extrinsic motivations decrease, while more intrinsic ones increase. It is seen that as students move up grades, they become more intrinsically motivated to read and find personal meaning in their reading.

The relations among scales are of particular interest. The study revealed that in general the correlations among the different scales are positive and in the moderate range, with all of the positive correlations significant. The major exception to this pattern is the Work Avoidance scale, which relates only Involvement negatively. Although this result needs to be verified in future researchers, it indicates that preoccupation with involvement may reduce work avoidance.

Reading frequency:

Students read most frequently for schoolwork. This is not a surprising finding since they attend highly competent and competitive schools. Reading frequency showed grade and sex difference. Significant sex difference was found on personal reading frequency and reading for schoolwork last week . Clearly, girls and boys differed on their personal reading frequencies, and school reading last week. The means show that boys do more reading for school whereas girls do more reading for personal pleasure.

The relation between students' reading motivations and their reading frequencies:

The study uncovered an important issue regarding different dimensions of reading motivations as they relate to reading frequency. Correlational analysis showed that Efficacy was related to school reading frequency and personal reading last week. Curiosity, involvement, recognition and grades are other reading motivations related to school reading frequency. Wigfield and Guthrie (1995) also found that both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations related to reading frequency. As expected, work avoidance was found negative in its relation to school reading frequency. Grades as reading motivation was negative relative to personal reading last week. Compliance was also negatively correlated with school reading.

In conclusion, although reading plays a substantial role in the curriculum of English medium schools, there has been relatively little discussion of motivation, second language reading and the relation between L1 and FL reading. With the current emphasis on authentic texts, and their inherently unfamiliar cultural content, one would expect reading to be problematic for many students in these schools. This points to a number of research questions that need to be explored: Does FL reading motivation exist as a phenomenon distinguishable from general FL motivation? How does the foreign language reading process differ from the language learning process in general? What makes FL learners tend to think they cannot accomplish reading tasks successfully? Researchers interested in FL reading motivation should focus on particular ways FL learners may be motivated to pursue activities in these domains. By doing so, we may be able to develop more domain-specific conceptions and measures of motivation in the FL reading field.

Dr Leyla Tercanlioglu is an assistant professor at Ataturk University, Turkey. Her interests include reading in a foreign language and computer assisted language learning. Email: leylat@usa.net

NOTES

1. This work was supported by a research grant from Ataturk University, Turkiye. The researcher gratefully acknowledge this support.

2. Due to the length, the instruments used for data collection could not be included in this article. To obtain a copy, please contact Dr. Leyla Tercanlioglu, Ataturk University, at Leylatercanlioglu@hotmail.com

References

Baker, L., Scher, D., & Mackler, K. (1997). Home and family influences on motivations for reading. *Educational Psychologist, 32*, 69-82.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Benware, C. A., & Deci, E. L. (1984). Quality of learning with an active versus passive motivational set. *American Educational Research Journal, 21*, 755-765.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 325-346.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., Harold, R., & Blumenfeld, P. B. (1993). Age and gender differences in children's self-and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development, 64*, 830-847.

Gambrell, L. B., Codling, R. M., & Palmer, B. M. (1996). *Elementary students' motivation to read* (Reading Research Rep. No 52). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.

Goodman, K. (1973). Psycholinguistic universals in the reading process. In F. Smith (Ed.) *Psycholinguistics and reading* (pp. 21-27). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Gottfried, A. E. (1990). Academic intrinsic motivation in young elementary school children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 525-538.

Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (1999). How motivation fits into a science of reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3,* 199-205.

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Metsala, J. L. & Cox, K.E. (1999). Motivational and cognitive predictors of text comprehension and reading amount. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3,* 231-280.

Guthrie, J., McGough, K., & Wigfield, A. (1994). *Measuring reading activity: An inventory*. (Instructional Resource No. 4). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland.

Harter, S. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom: Motivational and informational components. *Developmental Psychology, 17,* 300-312.

Marsh, H. W. (1989). Age and sex effects in multiple dimensions of self-concept: Preadolescence to early adulthood. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81,* 417-430.

McClelland, D., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E.L., (1953). The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Meece, J. L., Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1990). Predictors of math anxiety and its consequences for young adolescents' course enrollment intentions and performances in mathematics. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 60-70.

Miller, R. B., Behrens, J. T., Greene, B., & Newman, D. (1993). Goals and perceived ability: Impact on student valuing, self-regulation and persistence. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18,* 2-14.

Nicholls, J. G., Cheung, P., Lauer, J., & Patashnick, M. (1989). Individual differences in academic motivation: Perceived ability, goals, beliefs, and values. *Learning and Individual Differences, 1,* 63-84.

Taillefer, G. F. (1996) FL reading ability: Further insights into the short-circuit hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal, 80,* 461-477.

Wentzel, K. R. (1991). Social and academic goals at school: Motivations and achievement in contact. In Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.). *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 7, pp.185-212). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Wigfield, A., Guthrie, T. J. & McGough, K. (1996). *A questionnaire measure of reading motivations* (Instructional Resource No. 22). Athens, GA. National Reading Research Center.

Wigfield, A., Wilde, K., Baker, L., Fernandez-Fein, S., & Scher, D. (1996). *The nature of children's reading motivations, and their relations to reading frequency and reading performance*. Reading Research Rep. No. 63. Athens, GA. National Reading Research Center.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Motivation for reading: An overview. *Educational Psychologist, 32*, 57-58.