EXPLORING MOTIVATIONAL CONSTRUCTS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE READING

YABANCI DİLDE OKUMAYA KARŞI MOTİVASYONEL YAPILARIN İNCELENMESİ

İsmail Hakkı ERTEN*, Ece ZEHİR TOPKAYA**, Müge KARAKAŞ***

ÖZET: Bu makale, öğrencilerin yabancı dilde okumaya karşı motivasyon ve tutumlarını araştırmak için geliştiren bir aracı tanıtmaktadır. Aracı geliştirmek için öncelikle, 123 öğrenciye yabancı dilde okumaya karşı duyuşsal tepkilerini tespit etmeye yönelik bir dizi açık uçlu soru sorulmuştur. Elde edilen nitel verinin içerik analizi, 51 soruluk bir ön ölçeği ortaya çıkartmıştır. Bu ölçek, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesinde yabancı dil öğrenimi gören 443 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır. Yapılan faktör analizi, öğrencilerin yabancı dilde okumaya karşı motivasyon ve tutumlarındaki varyansın %58.70'ini açıklayan dört faktör ortaya çıkartmıştır. Bu faktörler, *okumanın içsel değeri, okumanın dışsal değeri, okuma yeterliği* ve *yabancı dil gelişiminde okumanın yeri* olarak adlandırılmıştır. Ortaya çıkan faktör yapıları genel olarak anadilde okuma motivasyonu teorileriyle örtüşmekle beraber, yabancı dil öğrencilerinin okumayı dil gelişimi için bir araç olarak gördüklerine işaret eden yeni bir öge de ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: yabancı dilde okuma, tutumlar, motivasyon

ABSTRACT: This article introduces an instrument that has been developed to explore motivation and attitudes of students towards reading in a foreign language (FL). To develop the instrument, initially 123 students were asked a set of qualitative questions to determine their affective reactions to reading in a FL. A content analysis of emergent data yielded an initial 51-item scale. This scale was administered to 443 FL students at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University in Turkey. A factor analysis revealed four factors accounting for 58.70 % of variance in students' attitudes and motivation towards reading in a FL. These were named as *intrinsic value of reading, extrinsic utility value of reading, reading efficacy,* and *foreign language linguistic utility*. The factorial constructs generally overlapped with current theories of reading motivation in the mother tongue with an extra element indicating that reading in a FL is viewed as a linguistic resource for developing language proficiency by foreign language learners.

Keywords: reading in a foreign language, attitudes, motivation

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivation and attitudes in language learning have long been considered as important factors and often been shown to be highly related to language learning achievement (Dörnyei, 2005). A well developed literature now exists on what makes learners act comprising several models of language learning motivation (Gardner, 1985; Deci and Ryan, 1985; Eccless and Wigfield, 2002; Dörnyei, 2005). Warnings, however, were also made that motivation can be domain specific, and thus engagement in different language skills may involve a different motivational and attitudinal make up. As such, reading behaviour may in fact entail different psychological constructs both in L1 (Wigfield and Guthrie, 1995, 1997; Gömleksiz, 2004) and in L2 (Mori, 2002; Kondo-Brown, 2006).

* Assist.Prof.Dr., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey, iherten@gmail.com

** Assist.Prof.Dr., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey, ecetopkaya@yahoo.com

*** Lecturer, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey, mgkarakas@gmail.com

Reading has often been considered mainly as a cognitive activity with resultant models of reading explaining cognitive properties of the reading process (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1983; Anderson, 1999; Alderson, 2000; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Nassaji 2002). Recently, however, different affective variables have been proposed to be taken into account in the reading process (Brantmeier, 2006; Kondo-Brown, 2006; Yamashita, 2004).

This study seeks to contribute to our understanding of the affective facet of reading in a foreign language. Therefore, the paper firstly summarizes prominent research into motivation and attitudes in L1 reading. Attempts to explore the same construct in foreign language (FL) reading are then summarized. The paper finally describes the process of developing a foreign language reading attitudes and beliefs scale.

1.1. Reading Motivation & Attitudes in L1

One of the most influential studies on L1 reading attitudes and motivation was by Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997), who emphasized the lack of research into reading motivation. Drawing upon *self-efficacy theory* (Bandura, 1977); *expectancy-value theory* (Eccles et al., 1991; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield, 1994; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992); *achievement goal theory* (Eccles et al., 1983; Eccles and Wigfield, 2002), and *intrinsic motivation theory* (Deci & Ryan, 1985), the authors developed a general model of reading motivation in L1.

Wigfield and Guthrie devised *The Motivation for Reading Questionnaire* (MRQ), which consisted of 11 aspects as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Competence and Reading Efficacy	Achievement Values and Goals	Social Aspects of Reading
reading efficacy	Intrinsic motivation	*social reasons for reading*
reading challenge	*reading curiosity*	*reading compliance*
reading work avoidance	*reading involvement*	
	importance of reading	
	Extrinsic motivation	
	competition in reading	
	reading recognition	
	reading for grades	

Figure 1: Aspects of the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ)

Wigfield and Guthrie report a three factor resolution. The following figure summarizes the results of the factor analysis.

Factor one	Factor two	Factor three
Social	Compliance	Competition
Efficacy	Grades	Work avoidance
Curiosity	Recognition	Involvement (negative)
Involvement	Importance	
Recognition		
Challenge		

Figure 2: Factor Analytic Resolution of Aspects of MRQ

Wigfield and Guthrie argue that reading motivation is a multifaceted concept and yet individual subscales group nicely into intrinsic and extrinsic clusters. They suggest further research to be done to investigate such multidimensionality.

Schutte and Malouff (2007) tested Wingfield and Guthrie's elements of motivation with adult readers in Australia. They found four different factor groupings, pertaining to adult expectations. They were labelled as "reading as part of the self", "reading efficacy", "reading for recognition," and

"reading to do well in other realms." Different factor groupings are understandable as Wigfield and Guthrie targeted young readers while Schutte and Malouff investigated adult readers. With different societal and personality properties, different age groups in different cultural contexts can be expected to have different motivational and attitudinal make up.

1.2. Reading Motivation and Attitudes in Second Language (L2)/FL

Research into attitudes and motivation regarding L2/FL reading is a relatively new area. This is probably because earlier motivation research assumed motivation and attitude to be overarching constructs for all language skills (Wigfield and Guthrie, 1995; 1997). Further, earlier models of reading comprehension mainly focused on cognitive aspects and appeared to overlook affective variables such as interest (Brantmeier, 2006) and attitudes (Yamashita, 2004), and motivation (Mori, 2002; Kondo-Brown, 2006). Such neglect has also been pointed out by Dörnyei (2003) and Grabe (2004).

Following Wigfield and Guthrie's work, Mori (2002) developed a new instrument to fit a FL environment to explore what constitutes FL reading motivation in Japan. She found four meaningful factors that were labelled as *intrinsic value of reading, extrinsic value of reading, importance of reading,* and *reading efficacy*. Mori reports that some of the components suggested by Wigfield and Guthrie (1995; 1997) loaded together, maintaining that reading motivation can be explained by more general norms of motivation. She points out the multidimensionality of reading motivation. More recently, Kondo-Brown (2006) found factors like *lack of motivation* for reading Japanese (as opposed to importance of reading in Mori's work), *intrinsic orientation* for reading Japanese, *extrinsic orientation* for reading Japanese, and *self-perception* of reading Japanese. Yamashita (2004) investigated the construct of L1 and L2 reading attitudes and whether attitudes are transferable from L1 to L2. With 59 students, she conducted a factor analysis on a 14-item attitude scale, which yielded two affective factors and two cognitive factors. She labels affective factors as *comfort*, *anxiety* while the cognitive factors are named *value*, and *self-perception*.

The situation in understanding attitudes and motivation towards reading in a foreign language is that the studies in L2 draw mainly on L1 reading research and are conducted to confirm existing theories within FL environments. They are usually small in sample/item size and have a very narrow cultural point of reference, namely Japanese (Mori, 2002; Yamashita, 2004; Kondo-Brown, 2006). These studies usually report similar or overlapping constructs with L1 research. This is probably because they aim to confirm an existing theoretical construct. However, L1 reading and L2 reading may involve different purposes and different cognitive and psychological constructs.

This is, of course, not to discredit well established theories. Rather, we believe that a different route can be taken to explore attitudes and motivation to read in a foreign language. This path can start from research to build a theory rather than testing existing theories. That different age groups may have different attitudinal make up (Schutte and Malouff, 2007) and attitudes towards reading in a foreign language may differ from reading in one's L1 warrant further exploration. Thus, exploring people's attitudes without any preconceived theoretical engagement can yield new aspects of attitude and motivation to read. This is what the current study aims to do.

1.3 Aim of the Study

This study aimed to understand what constitutes students' attitudes and motivation in FL reading and to develop a scale to explore motivational and attitudinal constructs in L2 reading.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Setting and Participants

The study was carried out at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. A total of 443 undergraduate participants were randomly selected from different programs at the university: English Language Teaching Department, Japanese Language Teaching Department, German Language Teaching Department (henceforth "language major students"), and those students who were enrolled in the departments of physics, archaeology, tourism and vocational colleges but were attending one-year preparatory English classes, (henceforth "non-language major students"). The distribution of the participants according to the programs is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of the Participants to Departments

Departments	f	%
English Language Teaching	275	62.1
Japanese Language Teaching.	47	10.6
German Language Teaching	30	6.8
Preparatory Classes	91	21.5
Total	**443**	**100**

Of these 443 students, 331 (75.4 %) were females and 108 (24.6 %) were males; while 4 learners did not indicate their gender.

2.2 Instruments and Procedures

2.2.1 Development of the Scale

The Foreign Language Reading Attitudes and Motivation Scale (FLRAMS) was developed by the researchers to explore constructs in L2 reading attitudes and motivation. The scale was constructed in 4 steps:

Item pooling stage: 123 students from language major departments and non-language major preparatory classes that were excluded in the main study were asked five open-ended questions about their opinions on reading materials written in a foreign language. The questions were designed to reflect the theories of attitude (e.g. Wigfield and Guthrie, 1995; Mori, 2002; Reeves, 2002; Yamashita, 2004; Kondo-Brown, 2006). The questions also sought reasons for reading in a foreign language (see Gardner, 1985). After the responses were gathered, scale statements were produced from the participants' written responses. Then, recurring themes were identified. After each researcher pooled their items, the degree of agreement in their interpretations of the qualitative data was calculated and found out to be 93%. Finally, the researchers selected 60 items for the reading attitudes-motivation scale while eliminating repetitive and similar ones.

Content validity and reduction stage: At this stage, 3 experts from the Foreign Languages Teaching Department were consulted for content validity. Based on their suggestions, 11 items were left out due to repetition and 3 were reframed. Finally, the first version of a 49-item reading attitude scale was formed.

Testing the comprehensibility of the scale: The scale was piloted with 24 learners. Their feedback was incorporated into the scale and finally the 49-item FLRAMS was formed. At this point, 2 extra items were added as care check items. One of these items was basically the opposite of the statement "I love reading." The other one was "I have never seen a material written in a foreign language." Since all the students were familiar with the reading materials in a foreign language, this item was expected to generate the same positive response. A negative answer would indicate a lack of care taken during filling in the form, thus leading to the exclusion of the case from the analysis.

The scale had a 5-point Likert scale with the anchors at *5-very appropriate for me*, *4-appropriate for me*, *3-indecisive, 2-not appropriate for me, 1-not appropriate for me at all*. This first version of the instrument consisted of 20 negative and 29 positive items.

The administration of the scale and data analyses for validity and reliability: The FLRAMS was administered to 580 participants**.** An initial examination of the care-check items reduced the number of participants to 443 due to inconsistent responses. Afterwards, the validity and reliability analyses were carried out and the final version of the FLRAMS scale with 31 items appeared. The final version includes 7 negative items and 24 positive items.

2.2.2 Data Analysis

The procedures undertaken for the validity and reliability of the FLRAMS are as follows:

To determine the construct validity of the instrument, several techniques were used: *(a)* principal component analysis and varimax rotation and *(b)* contrasted groups. Principal component analysis was utilized to determine "components that underlie performance on a group of variables" (Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991 :491). While principal component analysis help reduce a large number of variables to a few components or factors, they need to be rotated to determine maximum parsimony (Şencan, 2005). In this study the orthogonal Varimax rotation was preferred. As known, orthogonal varimax rotation is frequently utilized in attitude studies (Tavşancıl, 2001) when researchers aim to find independent constructs. In this current study it was preffered primarily because the researchers believed the dimensions of attitudes towards reading in a foreign language, namely cognitive, affective, behavioral, and personal utility constructs are conceptually distinct (Mori, 2002), and secondarily because it could yield a more complex set of arrangements.

For the principle component analysis, two criteria were adopted to select the items in the scale: firstly, the items should be only in one factor with a factor loading of .40 or above, and next, if an item is in more than one factor, the difference between the two loadings should be at least 0.10 (Şencan, 2005). Contrasted groups or differential-group experiment (Brown, 1988) is another method used to demonstrate the construct validity of an instrument. To do this, the performance of different groups on a given instrument is compared, the expectation being that a valid instrument will yield significant inter-group differences (Shechtman, 2002). In this study, non-language major students' FL reading attitude scores were compared with those of language major students. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between the scores in favour of language major students.

To estimate the reliability of the instrument Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Findings related to the Validity of the Instrument

3.1.2 Principal Component Analysis and Varimax Rotation to Validate the Instrument

Initially, a principal components analysis was conducted on the data. As a loading of .40 was taken as the criterion for interpretation, 18 items which loaded less than .40 were eliminated. The 31 items remaining were then reanalyzed and 4 factors with eigen-values greater than 1 were identified (see Table 2).

31 items were neatly loaded on one of the four factors after the varimax rotation, which accounted for 58.705% of the total variance. The first factor with 16 item was the largest factor, which accounted for 28.050% of the variance. The items in this factor mainly referred to reading as a nice, entertaining, engaging, and preferable activity and thus were labeled as *intrinsic value of reading.* The second factor with 6 items explained 12,383 % of the variance and was named as *reading efficacy*. The items in this factor mainly reflected how students evaluated their foreign language reading ability. The third factor with 5 items accounted for 10,101 % of the variance. The items in this factor, though some of them were intrinsic in nature, treated reading as an instrumental entity for better future, education,

and self-development, and were thus labeled as *extrinsic utility value of reading*. The fourth factor with 4 items explained 8.171 % of the variance and was named as *foreign language linguistic utility*, as the items considered reading as a source of language development.

Table 2 : Results of the Factor Analysis of FLRAMS and Factor Loadings

	Factor Loading After Varimax Rotation			
Item No	**Factor 1**	**Factor 2**	**Factor 3**	**Factor 4**
21	**.804**	.157	.091	.153
22	**.789**	.193	.183	.119
2	**.772**	.158	.069	.118
15	**.758**	.023	.114	.147
23	**.753**	.173	.101	.128
19	**.752**	.073	.076	.157
20	**.748**	.025	.029	.040
1	**.724**	.124	.128	.098
11	**.705**	.126	.159	.234
18	**.701**	.082	.148	.151
16	**.698**	.185	.124	.096
13	**.680**	.102	.101	.183
12	**.655**	.122	.096	.185
17	**.652**	.120	.170	.156
3	**.650**	.102	.016	.037
4	**.524**	.090	.226	.114
51	.215	**.835**	.021	-.017
50	.151	**.831**	.055	-.012
47	.099	**.795**	.025	.015
43	.061	**.735**	.019	.056
48	.175	**.711**	-.016	.100
45	.202	**.683**	.022	.223
39	.165	-.006	**.846**	.125
38	.026	-.031	**.794**	.041
41	.210	.022	**.752**	.189
40	.290	.044	**.702**	.216
37	.208	.122	**.583**	.368
36	.205	.113	.159	**.797**
35	.197	.080	.189	**.738**
33	.296	-.031	.119	**.659**
27	.175	.122	.228	**.550**
% of variance	**28.050**	**12.383**	**10.101**	**8.171**
Total variance explained: 58.705 %				

Although this study did not originally aim to verify the existing theories of reading attitudes and motivation, interestingly similar patterns emerged in line with contemporary trends in theories of motivation and reading attitudes. As Eccles et al. (1983) stated one of the components of motivation is interest value, which can be placed within the framework of intrinsic motivation. This component includes a sense of liking or how much the individual likes the activity. Thus, the items 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 21, and 22 that loaded under the first factor, *intrinsic value of reading,* refer to how much FL learners like reading in a foreign language. On the other hand, items 12, 13, 16, 17, and 20 are tied to compliance, which refers to reading because of an external goal or requirement (Wigfield and Guthrie, 1997). Thus, when the reversing procedure of those negative items (12, 13, 17 and 20) into positive ones during computing is taken into account, the items such as *"I would never read in a foreign language if it were not compulsory for my courses"* can be said to be pointing out a willingness to read just for its own sake rather than compliance. From this point of view, the loading of these items under the first factor seems to be justified since lack of compliance can be taken as an indicator of intrinsic value. The third component (items 11, 23 and 18) under the first factor can be named as personal involvement or engagement. Placed within the theories of interest, these items explain feeling–related

individual valences that involve feelings such as involvement, stimulation, or flow (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002: 114). Although the sources of these personal valences can be both external and internal, in our scale they loaded under the intrinsic values, which indicates an intrinsic orientation.

Table 3: Items in Factors

FACTORS/ITEMS	M	SD
FACTOR ONE: *INTRINSIC VALUE OF READING*		
1. Reading in a foreign language is enjoyable.	4.12	.87
2. I like reading in a foreign language.	4.11	.88
3. Reading in a foreign language is boring.*	3.97	1.02
4. I feel peaceful while reading in a foreign language.	3.71	1.04
11. I have a great desire to read in a foreign language.	3.64	1.01
12. I would never read in a foreign language if it were not compulsory for my courses. *	4.17	.92
13. I never read in a foreign language unless I have to *	3.99	1.01
15. I hate reading in a foreign language. *	4.57	.77
16. I read in a foreign language even if I do not have to.	3.55	1.01
17. I'd rather do something else than reading in a foreign language.*	3.92	.98
18. I spend time to read in a foreign language.	3.91	.88
19. Reading in a foreign language feels like torture.*	4.29	.92
20. I do not read in a foreign language even if I have time.*	4.31	.89
21. I love reading in a foreign language.	4.12	.90
22. Reading in a foreign language makes me happy.	4.03	.91
23. The more I read in a foreign language, the more I want to read.	3.69	1.07
FACTOR TWO: *READING EFFICACY*		
43. I can read in a foreign language fluently.	3.71	1.04
45. I can comprehend most of what I read in a foreign language.	4.07	.83
47. I comprehend the texts in a foreign language at first reading.	3.50	.95
48. I have no problems with comprehending a foreign language text.	3.61	.99
50. My reading skill in a foreign language is at an advanced level.	3.51	.98
51. I am successful at reading in a foreign language.	3.76	.89
FACTOR THREE: *EXTRINSIC UTILITY VALUE OF READING*		
37. Reading in a foreign language is beneficial for self development.	4.10	.94
38. Reading in a foreign language helps to find a better job.	3.70	.95
39. Reading in a foreign language helps to prepare a better future for ourselves.	3.97	.90
40. Reading in a foreign language helps us to become better individuals.	4.00	.97
41. Reading in a foreign language provides us with better education.	4.04	.96
FACTOR FOUR: *FOREIGN LANGUAGE LINGUISTIC UTILITY*		
27. Reading in a foreign language helps fluency in speech in a foreign language.	4.40	.81
33. Reading in a foreign language is the essential instrument to enlarge our vocabulary.	4.47	.67
35. Reading in a foreign language contributes to the development of the writing skill in a foreign language.	4.39	.74
36. Reading in a foreign language contributes to the development of grammar in a foreign language.	4.42	.72

* Negative /reversed items

The second factor named as *reading efficacy* has already been researched and found to be a major component both in the L1 and L2/FL reading attitudes (see Schunk, 1991; Mori, 2002; Yamashita, 2004; Kondo-Brown, 2006). As studied in relation to the social cognitive model of motivation, the theory of efficacy refers to "people's [self-constructed] beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over events that affect their lives" (Bandura, 1989: 1175). When adapted to reading

efficacy, this construct can be interpreted as the more learners feel efficacious at reading and the more they believe they will be successful in reading, the more they read. Thus, the items 43, 45, 47, 48, 50, and 51 on FLRAMS are concerned with learners' self-efficacy beliefs.

The next factor including items 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 is referred to as *extrinsic utility value of reading*, the roots of which can be traced back to the expectancy-value theory. This theory is defined as "beliefs about the consequences of performing a given behaviour and with the evaluation associated with the different outcomes" (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975: 30). According to this theory, individuals perform the behaviour that they expect to lead to the most favourable outcomes. In this sense, this factor carries similarities to what Eccles et al. (1983) outline as *utility value* of an activity or what Gardner (1985) labels as *instrumental motivation* in language learning. This factor is also congruent with the extrinsic utility value of reading in a foreign language, identified by Mori (2002).

Different from the previous work and models tested by other researchers, the last factor this study revealed seems to be a self-contained instrumental factor: *foreign language linguistic utility*. It appears to be an extension of extrinsic aspects of attitudes and motivation towards reading in a foreign language. The items 27, 33, 35, 36 that fell under this factor were in fact produced by the participants and thus reflect the instrumental value they attribute to reading in a foreign language. The items generally measured how students feel that reading may contribute to language development. This factor can be explained by referring to general expectancy value theories as outlined in factor three above. However, there seems to be a difference between the two factors, which lies in the domain specificity of extrinsic utility. Wigfield and Guthrie (1995; 1997) pointed out the multidimensionality of reading motivation and warned that reading motivation can be domain specific. Congruent with this view, in this particular case, a skill-specific extrinsic utility feature appeared to emerge as an independent factor. This is probably particular to foreign language contexts where reading is seen as a main source of language development by language learners, thus distinguishing linguistic utility from a general extrinsic/instrumental utility value of an activity. This may reflect the nature of foreign language contexts where opportunities for exposure to linguistic input other than printed materials are often scarce and reading texts constitute the main source of linguistic input for language development.

3.1.2. Contrasted-group Analysis to Validate the Instrument

Two contrasting groups (language major students vs. non-language major students) were compared. The language major students who were enrolled in foreign language teaching departments were hypothesized to have higher attitude and motivation scores than the non-language major students. The independent samples t-test analyses confirmed this expectation (See Table 4).

Table 4: Sub-factors in relation to Group Differences

Factors	Groups	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig.
Intrinsic	*Non-Language Major*	80	3.7109	.8221	-4.419	396	**.000**
	Language Major	318	4.0833	.6314			
Efficacy	*Non-Language Major*	86	3.2674	.7054	-6.27	421	**.000**
	Language Major	337	3.8051	.7100			
Extrinsic	*Non-Language Major*	88	3.7977	.7704	-2.434	433	**.015**
	Language Major	347	4.0098	.7195			
Linguistic Utility	*Non-Language Major*	73	4.2333	.6391	-3.606	435	**.000**
	Language Major	298	4.4647	.5146			

As the table illustrates, for all sub-scales the non-language major students scored significantly lower than the language-major students (p< .001). The effect size was also measured to be quite large (Cohen's *d*: .710) which can be considered as big enough a difference to assume that these two groups do in fact differ from each other (Cohen, 1988). However, there are some variations in scores. For example, while the scores on the *Intrinsic Value of Reading* (Non-Language Major= 3.7109 and Language Major= 4.0833) and *Extrinsic Value of Reading* (Non-Language Major= 3.7977 and

Language Major= 4.0098) sub-scales revealed a similar trend for both groups with those on the whole scale (see Table 6), on the *Reading Efficacy* sub-scale both groups scored lower. However, as expected the non-language major students' efficacy score was lower than that of the language-major students (Mean= 3.3674 and Mean= 3.8051 respectively). As for the *Foreign Language Linguistic Utility* sub-scale, the scores indicated a statistically significant difference between groups ($p < .001$). Both groups scored higher on this particular sub-scale, which indicates that both groups of students hold the belief that reading in a foreign language is beneficial for the development of the language skills (Mean= 4.2333 for Non-Language Major students and Mean= 4.4647 for Language-Major students).

In conclusion, the FLRAMS in the four sub-scales differentiated between the groups as expected. These results may account for the construct validity of the instrument.

3.2 Findings related to the Reliability of theInstrument

The internal consistency estimate of reliability for the 4 subscales of the instrument was calculated and Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were found as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Results of the Reliability Analysis

Factors		Alpha
Factor 1 Intrinsic Value of Reading	(N=398)	.9408
Factor 2 Reading Efficacy	(N=423)	.8702
Factor 3 Extrinsic Value of Reading	(N=435)	.8389
Factor 4 Foreign Language Linguistic Utility (N=437)		.7343

As a result, 0.94 was calculated for the first subscale with 16 items; 0.87 for the second with 6 items; 0.84 for the third with 5 items; 0.75 for the fourth with 4 items and finally 0.81 for the 5th with 3 items, all estimated values indicating a high level of reliability.

4. IMPLICATIONS/CONCLUSIONS

This study had two main aims: first, to explore what constitutes attitudes and motivation towards reading in a foreign language in a FL context and second to develop a scale that can be used to measure language learners' attitudes and motivation to read in a FL. While such were the aims of this study, it took a different route from those studies that drew upon current theories of motivation. It started by listening to the participants to elucidate their opinions regarding reading in a foreign language. Further, the study did not intend to test the validity of any theoretical approach, rather, to explore what there is to understand. The underlying tenets for such a decision were Wigfield and Guthrie's assertion about domain specificity in reading motivation and the potentially different nature of both reasons and contexts for reading in L1 and FL. Fairly large scale in size, the study also endeavoured to contribute from a Turkish speaking context.

The results of the study regarding the exploration of the motivational construct were congruent with current discussions of what is involved in attitudes and motivation in reading in L1 and FL, giving support to current endeavours to understand the phenomena. It can, therefore, be concluded that reading attitudes and motivation can be explained by referring to broader theories of Extrinsic vs. Intrinsic motivation (see Deci and Ryan, 1985), Expectancy Value Theory (see Rotter, 1954; Rossenberg, 1956; Wigfield, 1994), and Self-efficacy (see Bandura, 1977, 1989). However, there may be domain specific extensions of various aspects of these theories. In this particular study, extrinsic utility seemed to expand to create an independent factor pertaining to the specific nature of language learning, which has been labeled as linguistic utility value. This issue deserves further attention.

For the second aim of the study, qualitative and quantitative analysis conducted indicate that the scale developed for research purposes seems to have both construct validity and high reliability figures. Both factor analysis and contrasting group analysis indicate that the items nicely nest under comprehensible factors and can be used to explore group differences. The scale can therefore be suggested for use in future research for further validation.

However, a word of warning here: This study focused on exploring what was initially reported by learners regarding reading in a foreign language. Important aspects may have not been verbalized by the participants during the item pooling stage. Thus, the dimensions identified in this study should not be treated as a complete list of factors and aspects in these factors. Further research that initially seeks participants' opinions regarding potentially underlying constructs in order to write a richer array of items can be beneficial to broaden our understanding.

Finally, the findings generated by the use of such an instrument will certainly shed light upon the already formed attitudes, beliefs and motivations of learners towards reading foreign language materials, providing curriculum designers, material developers and classroom teachers with the opportunity to map out strategies that lead positive attitude modification in learners.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, N. J. (1999). *Exploring second language reading*: *Issues and strategies*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Pschological Review,* 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1989). Human Agency in Social Cognitive Theory. *American Psychologist.* Vol. 44, No:9, 1175-1184.

Brantmeier, C. (2006). Toward a multicomponent model of interest and L2 reading: sources of interest, perceived situational interest, and comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language,* 18 (2), 89-115.

Brown, J. D. (1988). Understanding research in second language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.

Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly,* 17,553-573.

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

Dornyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research and applications. *Language Learning*, *53*(1), 3-32.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Ealbaum.

Eccles, J.S., Lord, S., Midgley, C. (1991) What are we doing to early adolescents? The impact of educational contexts on early adolescents. *American Journal of Education.* 99, 521-542.

Eccles, J. S. & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: the structure of adolescents achievement task values and expectancy-related believes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 215-225.

Eccles, J.S., Adler, T,F., Futterman, R., Goff, S.B., Kaczala, C.M., Meece, J., and Midley, C. (1983) Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J.T. Spence (Ed.) *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp 75-146). San Francisco: Freeman.

Eccles, J. S. & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109-132.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention. And Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Gömleksiz, M. N. (2004). Validity and reliability of an attitude scale towards reading habit. Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences, 14 (2), 185-195.

Grabe, W. & Stoller, L. F. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 24, 44-699.

Hatch, E. and Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The Research Manual. Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Kondo-Brown, K. (2006). Affective variables and Japanese L2 reading ability. Reading in a Foreign Language, 18 (1), 55-71.

Mori. S. (2002). Redefining motivation to read in a foreign language. *Reading in a Foreign Language,* 14(2), 91-110.

Nassaji, H. (2002). Schema theory and knowledge-based processes in second language reading comprehension: a need for alternative perspectives. *Language Learning,* 52, 439-481.

Reeves, C. (2002). Literacy attitudes: theoretical perspectives. Paper presented at the 19th World Congress on Reading, Edinburg, Scotland.

Rosenberg, M.J. (1956). Cognitive structure and attitudinal affect. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53, 367-372.

Rotter, J.B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Shechtman, Z. (2002). Validation of the Democratic Teacher Belief Scale (DTBS). *Assessment in Education*, Vol. 9, No. 3., 364-377.

Schutte, N. S. & Malouff, J. M. (2007). Dimensions of reading motivation: development of an adult reading motivation scale. *Reading Psychology*, 28 (5), 469 – 489.

Şencan, G. (2005). Sosyal ve davranışsal ölçümlerde güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik (Reliability and validity in social and behavioural measurements). Ankara: Seçkin.

Tavşancıl, E. (2001). *Tutumların Ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık

Tezbaşaran, A. (1997) Validity issues of a likert type scale: a case study. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 41-45.

Thurstone, L.L. (1946). Comment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 52, 39-40.

Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: a developmental perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*. 6, 49-78.

Wigfield, A. & Eccles, J.S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: a theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*. 12, 265-310.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J. T. (1995). *Dimensions of children's motivations for reading: An initial study* (Research Rep. No. 34). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89 (3), 420-432.

Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy value theory of achievement motivation: A theoretical perspective. *Educational Psychological Review*, 6, 49-78.

Yamashita, J. (2004). Reading attitudes in L1 and L2, and their influence on L2 extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language,* 16(1), 1-19).

Geniş Özet

Motivasyon ve tutum, son yıllarda dil öğrenme başarısını etkileyen en önemli faktörler arasında gösterilmekle birlikte (Gardner, 1985; Deci and Ryan, 1985; Eccless and Wigfield, 2002; Dörnyei, 2005) son dönemlerde dil öğreniminde tek tip motivasyonun olamayacağından, diğer bir deyişle farklı dil becerilerine karşı değişik tutum ve motivasyon boyutlarının olabileceğinden bahsedilmektedir (Wigfield and Guthrie, 1995, 1997; Mori, 2002; Gömleksiz, 2004, Kondo-Brown, 2006). Sözgelimi aynı öğrenciler, dinleme etkinlikleri ile okuma etkinliklerine karşı farklı tutumlar sergileyebilirler.

Burada bahsedilmesi gereken bir diğer husus ise; son dönemlerde hem anadil ortamında hem de yabancı dil öğrenme ortamlarında okuma sürecindeki duyuşsal elementlerin neler olabileceğine yönelik bazı çalışmalar başlatılmış olmakla birlikte (Brantmeier, 2006; Kondo-Brown, 2006; Yamashita, 2004) okumanın genelde bilişsel bir süreç olarak görüldüğü (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1983; Anderson, 1999; Alderson, 2000; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Nassaji 2002) ve bu süreçte duyuşsal boyuta çok fazla vurgu yapılmadığıdır.

Anadilde okuma üzerine yapılan önemli çalışmaların başında Wigfield ve Guthrie'ninkiler (1995, 1997) sayılabilir. Bu yazarlar, anadilde okuma motivasyonunu, alanda geçerliliği kabul görmüş kuramlara dayandırmaktadırlar (Bandura, 1977; Eccles vd. 1983; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Eccles vd., 1991; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield, 1994; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). İkinci/yabancı dil öğrenme ortamlarında yapılan çalışmalar ise genelde anadilde okumaya ilişkin tutum ve motivason çalışmalarını model almış; bu modellerde ortaya konulan motivasyon ve tutum boyutlarını yabancı dilde okumaya uyarlamaya çalışmışlardır (Mori, 2002; Yamashita, 2004; Kondo-Brown, 2006). Diğer yandan bu çalışmalar, genelde küçük ölçeklidir ve daha çok Japon öğrenciler üzerinde yoğunlaşmaktadır. Ayrıca, motivasyonun hem ikinci ve yabancı dil ortamlarında hem de farklı dil becerileri açısından değişkenlik gösterebileceği de unutulmamalıdır.

Bu bilgiler ışığında bu çalışmanın amacı, mevcut motivasyon modellerini test etmek yerine, ilk önce öğrencileri dinlemekle başlayan bir süreçte yabancı bir dilde okuma motivasyon-tutum ölçeği geliştirmek ve yabancı dilde okumanın arkasında yatan motivasyon ve tutumun teorik yapısını incelemektir.

Bu amaç doğrultusunda ilk olarak 123 öğrenciye yabancı dilde okumaya karşı duygu ve düşüncelerini yazmalarının istendiği bir dizi açık uçlu soru sorulmuştur. Araştırmacılar, öğrencilerin cevaplarından yola çıkarak bir içerik analizi yapmış ve ölçek maddelerini geliştirmişlerdir. Bu süreçte araştırmacılar arası tutarlılık %93 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Bu aşamada toplam 60 madde üretilmiş ve uzman görüşüne bağlı olarak 11 tekrar madde çıkartılmış ve 3 madde de yeniden yazılmıştır. Böylelikle, 49 maddelik bir deneme ölçeği geliştirilmiştir. Daha sonra bu ölçeğin anlaşılabilirlik açısından 24 öğrenci ile pilot uygulaması yapılmış ve öğrenci görüşleri ölçeğe yansıtılmıştır. Ölçeğe

dikkatsiz doldurulan anketlerin ölçeğin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik hesaplamalarını etkilememesi için 2 adet kontrol maddesi yerleştirilmiştir. Bunlardan ilki zıt anlamlı bir madde, diğeri ise cevabı belli olan bir cümledir.

Anket, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesinin farklı bölümlerinde öğrenim gören 580 öğrenciye uygulanmış, daha sonra bu sayı kontrol maddelerinin yardımıyla 443'e düşürülmüştür. Elde edilen veri, ölçeğin yapı geçerliliğini test etmek için önce a) temel bileşenler çözümlemesine, sonra da b) farklı gruplar karşılaştırmasına tabi tutulmuştur. Ölçeğin güvenilirlik hesaplaması için ise Cronbach Alpha değeri hesaplanmıştır.

Faktör analizi sonunda 18 madde, .40'ın altında faktör yüküne sahip olması nedeniyle değerlendirme dışı bırakılmıştır. Kalan 31 maddenin yeniden analiz edilmesi sonucunda 4 belirgin faktör tespit edilmiştir. Tespit edilen faktörlerin, toplam varyansın %58.705'ini açıkladığı görülmüştür. Faktörlerin içindeki maddelerin içeriğine bakıldığında bu faktörlerin anlamlı yapısal farklılıklara sahip olduğu ve (1) okumanın içsel değeri; (2) okuma yeterliliği; (3) okumanın dışsal değeri ve (4) yabancı dil öğrenmede okumanın yeri olarak adlandırılabileceği görülmüştür. Bu çalışmada ilk üç faktör anadilde okumaya karşı tutum ve motivasyon çalışmalarındaki bulgularla örtüşmekle birlikte, 4. faktör her ne kadar dışsal motivasyon özellikleri gösterse de daha çok yabancı dil öğrenme ortamlarına özgü bir uzantı izlenimi vermektedir.

Faktör çözümlemesinin ortaya çıkardığı bu dört faktörün, farklı olması düşünülen grupları birbirinden ayırt edip etmediği kontrol edilmiştir. Yabancı diller eğitimi bölümü öğrencileri ile yabancı diller eğitimi dışındaki öğrenciler arasında -beklendik şekilde- yabancı diller eğitimi bölümü öğrencilerinin lehine anlamlı bir fark ortaya çıkmıştır (p<.000). Bu da ortaya çıkan faktör yapısının farklı grupları ayrıştırabildiğine ve sağlam bir yapıya sahip olduğuna işaret etmektedir. Bu farklılıklar toplamda olduğu kadar her bir faktör için de geçerlidir (p<.01).

Faktör çözümlemesinin ardından ortaya çıkan 31 maddelik nihai ölçeğin Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik katsayısı hesaplanmış ve .9336 olarak belirlenmiştir. Güvenilirlik analizi 4 altölçeğe de uygulanmış ve (1) okumanın içsel değeri altölçeği için .9408; (2) okuma yeterliği altölçeği için .8702; (3) okumanın dışsal değeri altölçeği için .8389 ve (4) yabancı dil öğrenmede okumanın yeri alt ölçeği için .9339 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Bulgular hem ölçeğin bütününün ve hem de altölçeklerinin son derece güvenilir olduğunu kanıtlamaktadır.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmanın birincil amacı olan yabancı dilde okuma motivasyon-tutum ölçeği geliştirme gerçekleştirilmiştir. Yapılan analizler, ölçeğin hem yapı geçerliği olduğunu hem de güvenilir olduğunu göstermektedir. Faktör analizi ve farklı grupların karşılaştırması, ölçek maddelerinin anlamlı faktörler altında toplandığını kanıtlar niteliktedir.

Öte yandan, çalışmanın ikinci amacı olan yabancı dilde okumanın arkasında yatan motivasyon ve tutumun teorik yapısını irdeleme bağlamında ise ortaya çıkan bulgular, alanyazında yer alan anadil ve yabancı dilde okumaya yönelik tutum ve motivasyonun neleri içerdiğine ilişkin tartışmaları desteklemektedir. Bu çalışmada ortaya konan bulgular; yabancı dilde okumaya ilişkin tutum ve motivasyonun, genel motivasyon teorileri (Bkz. Deci and Ryan, 1985), Değer Beklenti Teorisi (Bkz. Rotter, 1954; Rossenberg, 1956; Wigfield, 1994) ve Öz-yeterlilik teorisi (Bkz. Bandura, 1977, 1989) ile örtüştüğünü göstermekle birlikte, yabancı dilde okuma alanına özgü farklı duyuşsal uzantıların olabileceğini de ortaya koymuştur. Nitekim çalışmanın en önemli sonuçlarından biri de yabancı dil öğrenmenin kendine özgü doğası gereği, yabancı dilde okumaya ilişkin tutum ve motivasyonun bu çalışmada "yabancı dilde okumanın yeri" olarak adlandırılan spesifik bir olgunun varlığına işaret etmesi olmuştur.