The Effect of Motivation to Read in English on Reading Strategy Use and Reading Ability in EGP and ESP

Dr. Seyed Hassan Talebi (University of Mazandaran, Iran) & Dr. Mojtaba Maghsoudi
(Assistant Professor of English Department, Farhangian University, Iran)

Abstract
This study attempts to find out if level of motivation to Read in English would affect reading strategy use and reading ability in EGP and ESP, differently. For this purpose, forty university students majoring in basic sciences took a motivation to read questionnaire and were divided into two groups of high and low according to their score obtained above and below the mean. Then, the two groups were given two reading comprehension tests, one in EGP and another in ESP as well as a strategy questionnaire to be answered following the EGP and ESP reading tests. Analysis of data showed level of motivation to read did not affect strategy use in EGP and ESP reading tasks, differently. However, it was shown that motivation to read affected only the EGP reading ability differently, and no significant difference was observed between the two groups in ESP reading ability. It seems though motivation to read as an affective factors is important to be boosted in EGP reading tasks, specific knowledge in a given discipline at an academic setting makes up for low motivation to read effect.
Key words: Motivation to Read; EGP and ESP; Reading Ability; Strategy Use

1. Introduction

Reading is an active cognitive process which operates on printed material for comprehension (Chastain, 1988). It is considered as the most important activity in language classes (Rivers, 1981). Chastain (1988) in his psycholinguistic view of reading states a reader's task is to activate background and linguistic knowledge to recreate the writer's intended meaning by going beyond the printed material. To read effectively, effective readers relate their background experience with the text, summarize information, draw conclusions, and pose questions at the text (McNamara, 2007; Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005; Allen, 2003). Research shows that successful readers make more use of reading comprehension strategies and have a conscious control over the use of a range of different strategies while reading (McNamura, 2007).

In content-based instruction language instruction is integrated with the content areas. In content-based reading courses, reading involves both understanding content and processing strategies in order to understand content. In order to help readers in effective reading, it is very important to understand what specific problems they encounter during their reading process (Lau 2006). According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987) ESP builds on EGP research and if ESP programs are to yield satisfactory results a solid understanding of basic EGP should precede higher-level instruction in ESP. To Chien et al. (2008) the role of EGP teachers is to create the foundation of general English skills such as skimming, scanning, and making predictions through use of different genres of readings. The ESP teachers' role is also to activate the learners' science background knowledge in English, by introducing classifying, comparing, identifying cause and effect, hypothesizing, defining, exemplifying, giving evidence, experimenting, calculating, reporting, describing and predicting. Talebi (2014) investigated the effect of reading product in L1 on EGP and ESP reading product and process. He found no significant relationship between the product of reading in L1 (Persian) and the process of reading in EGP and ESP as well as the product of reading in ESP. But in the product reading in EGP

there was a significant difference in the reading product for high and low groups of L1 reading ability. In an attempt to determine if ESP reading performance can be predicted by EGP reading in university entrance exams for up-to 20 different disciplines in Iran in order to get admission to PhD. Courses, Ahmadi (2003) found a positive correlation coefficient between the scores of candidates in the ESP and EGP tests. He concluded that EGP tests seem to be a good predictor for ESP competency. Contrary to Ahmadi's findings, Ajideh (2011) also investigated the relationship between EGP and ESP tests among students of medicine and found no systematic relationship between the students' scores on EGP and ESP tests and that it was not safe to claim that students who obtained higher scores in EGP test would receive higher scores in ESP test or vice versa.

According to Vandergrift (2003) guiding learners through the process of reading both provides them with the knowledge through which they can become more skilled readers, and motivates them and puts them in control of their learning. Motivation influences how and why people learn and as a result their performances (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). According to Dornyei (1998) researchers have shown that motivation directly influences how often learners use L2 learning strategies, how much input they receive in the language being learned, and how high their general proficiency level becomes. According to Nunan (1999) there is a need to develop the learners' awareness of the process underlying their own learning strategies as this will make them become better readers and more effective and motivated language learners. Gardner and Lambert (1972) emphasize the priority of motivation among learners as it directly affects their active personal involvement in language learning. Therefore, highly motivated learners will take up any learning opportunity offered by the classroom and involve themselves in learning the language.

In the Iranian EFL context, motivation to read as an affective factor is less considered as important as cognitive factors in reading. Therefore, nearly no attempt has been made to boost students' motivation to read. This study attempts to find out if degree of motivation to read affects reading strategy use and reading ability in both branches of ELT, namely EGP and ESP. Therefore, the following questions are formulated:
1. Does motivation to read affect EGP and ESP reading strategy use differently?
2. Does motivation to read affect EGP and ESP reading ability differently?

2. Methodology:

2.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 40 male and female university students majoring in accounting and computer sciences and basic sciences. They agreed to take part in the study after the first researcher explained the purpose and nature of the research to them. Their motivation to read level was controlled. After homogenizing the participants (see the procedure section), 22 students were selected to be in the high motivation to read group and 18 students were selected to be in the low motivation to read group.

2.2. Instrumentation

2.2.1. Test of Reading Comprehension in EGP

From the reading section of books two and three of New Interchange series (Richards 1997) five passages were selected to develop the test of reading comprehension in English. The number of words in the selected five passages ranged from 257 to 295 words. For each passage six items were developed and in all for all the five passages there were thirty items. The nature of the

items in terms of recognizing main ideas, vocabulary knowledge, and inferencing was the same for all of the passages. The reliability of the test of reading in English was also taken care of at the piloting stage using the K-R21 formula which turned out to be .85. The time allowed was 38 minutes as determined at the piloting stage.

2.2.2. *Test of Reading Comprehension in ESP*

The ESP reading comprehension in English contained two passages. The first passage titled '*What is information processing?*' was adopted from the reading section of '*English for Students of Computer*', by Haghani (2001) and the second passage titled '*The Need for Accounting*' from '*English for the Students of Accounting*' by Aghvami (1996). Ten items were developed for each passage. The two passages were nearly of the same length. The number of words in the selected two passages ranged from 560 to 610 words. The reliability of the test calculated according to the K-R21 formula turned out to be 0.88. The time allowed was 40 minutes as determined at the piloting stage.

2.2.3. *Questionnaire of motivation to read*

In the current study, in order to explore participants' motivation to read a questionnaire was used that was a revised version of the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) by Watkins and Coffey (2004). The original questionnaire developed by Watkins and Coffey contained 54 items that were posited to tap 11dimensions of reading motivation. The participants of the study were required to answer the questionnaire items by choosing a number from 1 to 6 ranging from "I strongly disagree" to "I strongly agree".

2.2.4. *Reading Strategy Use Questionnaire*

The instrument to measure the reading strategy use in this study was from Phakiti (2006). This was a five-point Likert scale (never/sometimes/often/ usually/always) questionnaire containing 30 items. The Farsi translation of the questionnaire was employed in this study to maximize ease of administration and ensure higher accuracy of answers. In order to make sure of the internal consistency reliability of the instrument at the piloting stage, it was given to ten students taking part in this study. Based on the data gathered, the reliability alpha was calculated to be 0.91 which seemed acceptable for the aim of this study.

2.3.Procedure

Data were collected by the researchers in the General English classes in the faculty of basic sciences of the University of Mazandaran in four subsequent sessions. In the first session, the participants were given instruction the fill out the motivation to read questionnaire. The participants were divided into two groups (high and Low) based on the mean score obtained. In the second and third sessions, to find out the current reading ability of subjects in EGP and ESP reading comprehension, the EGP and ESP reading tests were administered. Immediately, after reading the passages and answering to its related questions, the participants were asked to complete the Phakiti's strategy use questionnaire. It was announced in advance that there were no right or wrong answers to the questionnaire items and their response would be used only for research purpose, without having any negative impact on their course grades or anyone's idea about them.

3. Results and Discussions

Question 1. Does motivation to read affect EGP and ESP reading strategy use differently?
Analysis of variance (Wilks' Lambda) for unrelated measures revealed a non significant main effect of the manipulation of motivation to read at an alpha of .05, Wilks' Lambda = .08, F (2, ٤٠ =1.44, p = .250. This means that both EGP and ESP reading strategy use is the same in high and low levels of motivation to read, and the relationship between motivation to read and EGP and ESP reading strategy use is non-significant. A measure of effect size, =.074, indicates a relatively low effect (tables 1 and 2).

Table 1
Multivariate test of motivation to read groups (high or low) on EGP/ESP reading strategy use

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Eta
Motivation to read	Wilks' Lambda	.08	1.44	2	40	.250	.074

Table 2
Mean and standard deviation of EGP/ESP reading strategy use with respect to motivation to read groups

Source	Dependent V	Index	M	SD	N
Motivation to read groups	EGP strategy use	High	172.52	26.93	22
		Low	168.68	22.38	18
	ESP strategy use	High	116.00	23.25	22
		Low	23.28	20.80	18

Question 2. Does motivation to read affect EGP and ESP reading ability differently?
Multivariate analysis of variance (Wilks' Lambda) for unrelated measures revealed a significant main effect of the manipulation motivation to read at an alpha of .05, Wilks' Lambda =.80, F (2, ٤٠ = 4.47, p = .018. High motivation to read was exposed to high EGP and ESP reading ability in contrast to low motivation to read. A measure of effect size, = .19, indicated a relatively average effect (table 3).

Table 3
Multivariate test of motivation to read groups (high or low) on EGP/ESP reading ability

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Eta
Motivation to read	Wilks' Lambda	.08	4.47	2	40	.018	.19

To understand in which of the variables the differences lie, test of between subject effects are used. This test indicates that only in EGP reading ability there is a significant difference in motivation to read groups (high or low) and that the ESP reading ability has no significant relationship with motivation to read.(table 4).

Table 4

Between subject test of motivation to read groups (high or low) on EGP/ESP reading ability

source	Dependent variable	df	SS	MS	E-ratio	Sig.	Eta
Model	EGP	1	86.935	86.935	8.675	.006	.190
	ESP	1	5.659	5.659	.55	.461	.015
Error	EGP	37	370.655	10.018			
	ESP	37	377.264	10.196			
Total	EGP	39	4438.000				
	ESP	39	2737.00				

With respect to means differences, EGP reading ability is more in high level of motivation to read group in contrast to low level of motivation to read group (table 5).

Table 5

Mean and standard deviation of EGP/ESP reading ability with respect to motivation to read groups

Source	Dependent V	Index	M	SD	N
Motivation to read groups	EGP reading ability	High	11.34	3.24	22
		Low	8.31	3.04	18
	ESP reading ability	High	8.08	2.59	22
		Low	7.31	3.91	18

4. Conclusions and Implications

This study showed level of motivation to read did not affect strategy use in EGP and ESP reading tasks, differently. However, it was shown that motivation to read affected only the EGP reading ability differently, and no significant difference was observed between the two groups in ESP reading ability. In an attempt to determine if ESP reading performance can be predicted by EGP reading in university entrance exams for up-to 20 different disciplines in Iran in order to get admission to PhD. Courses, Ahmadi (2003) found a positive correlation coefficient between the scores of candidates in the ESP and EGP tests. He concluded that EGP tests seem to be a good predictor for ESP competency. Contrary to Ahmadi's findings, Ajideh (2011) also investigated the relationship between EGP and ESP tests among students of medicine and found no systematic relationship between the students' scores on EGP and ESP tests and that it was not safe to claim that students who obtained higher scores in EGP test would receive higher scores in ESP test or vice versa. However, these studies did not consider the effect of motivation to reading on the relationship between EGP as well as ESP reading abilities.

According to Vandergrift (2003) guiding learners through the process of reading both provides them with the knowledge through which they can become more skilled readers, and motivates them and puts them in control of their learning. Motivation influences how and why people learn and as a result their performances (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). According to Dornyei (1998) researchers have shown that motivation directly influences how often learners use L2 learning strategies, how much input they receive in the language being learned, and how high their general proficiency level becomes. Gardner and Lambert (1972) emphasize the priority of motivation among learners as it directly affects their active personal involvement in language learning. Therefore, highly motivated learners will take up any learning opportunity offered by

the classroom and involve themselves in learning the language. According to the findings of the current study, it seems motivation to read as an affective factor is more important to be boosted in EGP reading tasks, and specific knowledge in a given discipline at an academic setting seems to makes up for low motivation to read effect.

References
Aghvami, D. (1996). *English for the Students of Accounting*. SAMT Publications.
Ahmadi, M. (2003). Can ESP be tested by EGP? *Journal of Medical Education* 3, 7-10.
Ajideh, P. (2009). Autonomous Learning and Metacognitive Strategies Essentials in ESP Class. *English Language Teaching* 2(1), 162-168.
Chastain, K. (1988). Developing *second language skills: theory and practice*. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Chamot, A.U. (1999*).* How children in language immersion programs use learning strategies. In M.A. Kassen (Ed.), *Language learners of tomorrow: Process and Promise!* (pp. 29-59). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company. + 295 pages.
Chien, C., Lee, W. & Kao, L. (2008). Collaborative Teaching in an ESP Program. *Asian EFL Journal.* 10(4), 114-133.
Cohen, A. D. *(1998) Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 31(3),117-135.
Dornyei, Z. (2007*)* Creating a motivating classroom environment. *In J*. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds), *The Handbook of English Language Teaching*. New York: Springer
Fisher, D., Frey, N. & Williams, D. (2002). Seven literacy strategies that work. *Educational Leadership,* 60 (3), 70-73.
Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972*).* Motivational variables in second language acquisition*.* In R.C. Gardner & W. Lambert (Eds.) *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning.* (pp. 119-216). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Haghani, M. (2001). *English for Students of Computer.* SAMT Publications.
Hutchison, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specifi c Purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
Keer, H. V. & Verhaeghe, J. P. (2005) Effects of Explicit Reading Strategies Instruction and Peer Tutoring on Second and Fifth Graders' Reading Comprehension and Self-Efficacy Perceptions, *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 73(4), 291-329, DOI: 10.3200/JEXE.73.4.291-329
Lau, K L. (2006). Reading strategy use between Chinese good and poor readers: A think-aloud study. *Journal of Research in Reading,* 29*,* 383-399.
McNamara, D. S. (2007). *Reading comprehension strategies. Theories, interventions and technologies*. New York-London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates-Taylor & Francis Group.
O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990*). Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Phakiti, A. (2006). *Modeling cognitive and metacognitive strategies and their relationships to EFL reading test performance.* Melbourne Papers in Language Testing, University of Sydney.
Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Pressley, M. (2003). A few things reading educators should know about instructional experiments. *The Reading Teacher, 57*(1), 64-71.

Pressley, M., & Wharton-McDonald, R. (1997). Skilled comprehension and its development through instruction. *School Psychology Review, 26*(3), 448-466.

Talebi, H. S. (2014). An investigation into the effect of L1 (Persian) reading product on the product and process of reading in EGP and ESP. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature.* 6(1), 55-76.

Watkins, M. & Coffey, D.Y. (2004) Reading Motivation: Multidimensional and Indeterminate. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 162-186. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.1.110