EFL Young Adolescents' Reading Motivation and Reading Comprehension in Their First and Second Languages

Juhee Lee

(Kyungpook National University)

Lee, Juhee. (2015). EFL young adolescents' reading motivation and reading comprehension in their first and second languages. *English Teaching, 70*(4), 55-80.

The purpose of this study is to examine how reading motivation varies in its prediction of reading comprehension in Korean (L1) and English (L2) (with parental involvement being controlled for), and how reading motivation in each language is associated with language proficiency. Participants consisted of 289 EFL middle school students in South Korea. Three questionnaires and four language tests were employed to measure learners' reading motivation, parental involvement, language proficiency, and reading comprehension in their L1 and L2. Results indicated that L2 reading performance was positively predicted by both intrinsic motivation and grades/utility, whereas the only positive predictor of L1 reading comprehension was intrinsic motivation. Moreover, in both L1 and L2, the high-proficiency group was found to exhibit significantly stronger intrinsic and extrinsic motivation than the low group; the high group's intrinsic motivation was significantly stronger than the middle group; and the middle and low groups differed significantly in extrinsic motivation.

Key words: reading motivation, reading comprehension, language proficiency, EFL middle school students, L1 and L2 comparison, parental involvement

1. INTRODUCTION

Second language reading involves a continual interplay between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2). According to Bernhardt (2005), L2 reading is explained by L2 knowledge (30%), L1 literacy (20%), and other factors (50%). Thus far, a substantial body of reading research has examined associations between L1 and L2 in terms of common underlying linguistic skills that support L1 and L2 reading (Marinova-Todd &

Uchikoshi, 2010; Proctor, August, Snow, & Barr, 2010), transferred coding difficulties (Kahn-Horwitz & Shimron, 2006), and reading strategies (Davis & Bistodeau, 1993; Tsai, Ernst, & Talley, 2010). Despite the endeavor of exploring cognitive or metacognitive aspects between languages, much variance remains that has yet to be specified. The purpose of the present study is to examine some of these other factors, specifically, the affective domains such as reading motivation.

Reading motivation is typically defined as a domain-specific motive that induces individuals to engage in or maintain reading (Wang & Guthrie, 2004; Wigfield, 1997). Scholars have found that reading motivation may enable learners to sustain reading activities (Baker & Wigfield, 1999), and subsequently the amount of reading would enhance reading comprehension (Cox & Guthrie, 2001; Guthrie, Wigfield, Metsala, & Cox, 1999). Thus far, researchers have identified reading motivation constructs (i.e., intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation) in the L1 (Wigfield, 1997; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997) and the L2 (Mori, 2002; Park, 2015). Nevertheless, few studies have investigated how the association between reading motivation and reading comprehension differs between L1 and L2. Such comparative study is particularly significant because reading motivation constructs that positively influence reading comprehension in one language may not hold in another. For example, intrinsic motivation was found to contribute to reading comprehension in an L1 (De Naeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, & Rosseel, 2012; Logan, Medford, & Hughes, 2011; Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wang & Guthrie, 2004), but it did not serve as such in an L2 (Kondo-Brown, 2006; Park, 2015). However, these studies were conducted separately among L1 or L2 readers rather than with the same individual reading in two languages. The question is thus left to further investigation as to how reading motivation varies (within a single individual) between languages and how reading motivation contributes differently to reading comprehension in each language.

Furthermore, relatively little research has delved into young adolescents' reading motivation. Indeed, the majority of the research has been carried out on children's reading motivation in the L1 (Becker, McElvany, & Kortenbruck, 2010; Wang & Guthrie, 2004; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1995, 1997) or university students' reading motivation in the L2 (Park, 2015; Mori, 2002). Adolescence is a critical period in the development of reading literacy, for reading motivation declines from the early grades to the later school years (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000), and it drops dramatically during the middle school years (Unrau & Schlackman, 2006). What is needed is an investigation of middle school students who undergo such dramatic changes. This would help teachers understand young adolescents' unique attributes related to reading and to aid in their customizing of reading instruction for these learners. In examining middle school students, the current study considers as significant factors the possible influence of parental involvement and learners' language proficiencies. Also, the present study focuses on reading motivation toward pleasure-

reading materials, rather than school-assigned reading (i.e., textbooks or workbooks), to examine the sole contribution of reading motivation initiated by students and to compare the results with previous research (Becker et al., 2010; De Naeghel et al., 2012; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Therefore, the current study puts forward the following research questions.

1. How do reading motivation constructs differ between reading in Korean (L1) and in English (L2) among Korean EFL middle school students?
2. What is the unique contribution of reading motivation to reading comprehension in L1 and L2 when parental involvement is controlled?
3. How do students' reading motivations differ according to their language proficiency?

2. BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH

2.1. Reading Motivation and Its Relationship with Reading Comprehension in L1

Over the past decade, many researchers have found that reading motivation is multi-dimensional in its nature and have developed different instruments to assess various aspects of reading motivation (Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wang & Guthrie, 2004; Wigfield, 1997). Among them, the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ), developed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997), has been one of the most thoroughly validated and frequently employed in subsequent studies (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Guthrie et al., 1999; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Wigfield and Guthrie (1995, 1997) developed the MRQ based on several motivation theories, such as self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2002), expectancy-value theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002), and self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997), and identified 11 theoretical aspects of reading motivation for elementary school students. Later, Wang and Guthrie (2004) dropped three dimensions from the MRQ and devised a two-factor (intrinsic and extrinsic motivation) model. For the present study, this intrinsic-extrinsic motivation model was selected because it includes fundamental subscales of reading motivation that have been found to be significantly associated with reading comprehension.

Employing these motivation constructs, researchers have demonstrated that beyond aiding cognitive skills, reading motivation contributes uniquely to reading comprehension (Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wang & Guthrie, 2004; Wigfield, 1997). Guthrie et al. (1999) found that, even after controlling for related variables such as reading amount, past achievement, and socioeconomic status, tenth grade U.S. students' text comprehension was significantly predicted by reading motivation. Subsequently, Wang and Guthrie (2004)

determined that among Chinese and U.S. fourth graders, intrinsic motivation was positively associated with text comprehension, whereas extrinsic motivation negatively predicted text comprehension. Such associations were also found among Asian middle school students studying in the United States, but not among their Hispanic counterparts (Unrau & Schlackman, 2006).

Similar results have been found in studies examining elementary school children in Europe. Logan et al. (2011) found that among English-speaking children in the United Kingdom, intrinsic motivation had a positive effect on reading comprehension for low-ability reading groups, but not for good readers. For German children, Becker et al. (2010) detected no positive association between intrinsic motivation and reading literacy, but they did find that extrinsic motivation had a negative effect on reading literacy. Among Flemish children in Belgium, De Naeghel et al. (2012) administered a reading motivation questionnaire that they had developed based on self-determination theory perspectives. Results indicated that autonomous reading motivation (i.e., intrinsic motivation and identified regulation) in recreational contexts was positively associated with reading comprehension; introjected and external regulation in the same context were negatively related to reading comprehension. Most recently, McGeown, Duncan, Griffiths, and Stothard (2014) and Klauda and Guthrie (2015) found that reading motivation predicted a unique portion of variance in adolescents' reading comprehension.

2.2. Reading Motivation and Its Relationship with Reading Comprehension in L2

Compared to research on L1 reading motivation, far fewer studies have explored the nature of L2 reading motivation or its role in reading comprehension. Even the few studies that have been conducted in the L2 field have limited their scope to identifying reading motivation constructs or a simple correlation between reading motivation and reading comprehension. Mori (2002) was among the first to develop an L2 reading motivation questionnaire, drawing on general L1 and L2 motivation theories and the work on L1 reading motivation (e.g., Wigfield & Guthrie, 1995, 1997). Through exploratory factor analysis, she identified several theoretical constructs of L2 reading motivation for Japanese EFL university students, labeling them as intrinsic value, extrinsic utility value, importance of reading, and reading efficacy.

Subsequently, Kondo-Brown (2006) created a questionnaire based on self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2002), and the Language Learning Orientations Scale (Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2000) for U.S. university students learning Japanese as a foreign language, and specified 17 subscales of L2 reading motivation. This study revealed that intrinsic orientation was positively correlated with extrinsic orientation for reading in

Japanese, but neither intrinsic nor extrinsic orientation was significantly correlated with reading comprehension scores. Similarly, using Noels et al.'s (2000) questionnaire, Park (2015) found that none of the reading motivation constructs—intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, or amotivation—were significantly correlated with reading comprehension scores for Korean EFL university students. Although both Kondo-Brown's (2006) and Park's (2015) studies advanced our understanding of the relationship between reading motivation and reading comprehension among university L2 learners, their results were based on simple correlation coefficients. Such a method may be limited in its providing of specific information about complex systems of motivation and performance.

Taking a step further, Kim (2015) investigated, using structural equation modeling, the relative contributions of EFL Korean high school students' reading motivation, reading strategy, reading efficacy, and listening achievement to L2 reading comprehension. This study revealed that L2 reading motivation, a combined construct of intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, was not a significant contributor of L2 reading achievement. Yet considering the possibility that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation may play contradictory roles in reading comprehension as reported in previous work in L1 (e.g., Becker et al., 2010; De Naeghel et al., 2012) and L2 (Lin, Wong, & McBride-Chang, 2012), it seems important to examine functions of each reading motivation construct in L2 reading comprehension, which is one of the foci in the current study.

2.3. Comparing L1 and L2 Reading Motivation in Relation to Reading Comprehension

A handful of studies have attempted to compare L1 and L2 reading motivation constructs and their association with reading performance. For instance, Takase (2007), using two different questionnaires, measured high school students' L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) reading motivation. However, because the researcher conducted one exploratory factor analysis after combining the two questionnaires, L1 and L2 reading motivation items were loaded on the same factor. It was thus impossible to compare L1 and L2 reading motivation. Kim (2011) fixed this problem by identifying the L1 (Korean) and L2 (English) reading motivations of EFL university students through a separate exploratory factor analysis for each questionnaire. This study revealed that the average score of L1 intrinsic motivation was higher than that of L2 intrinsic motivation, whereas extrinsic motivation associated with utility values did not significantly differ across languages.

Recently, Lin et al. (2012) identified, using confirmatory factor analysis, motivational constructs of L1 (Chinese) and L2 (English) among elementary EFL students. They found that most L1 intrinsic motivation constructs were rated significantly higher than the corresponding L2 motivation constructs. They also found that reading comprehension in

each language was significantly predicted by different dimensions of reading motivation, that is, recreation for L1 reading and instrumentalism for L2 reading. Despite the similar study objectives that Lin et al. (2012) and the current study imposed, they differed regarding the participants' ages (elementary children versus middle school students) and reading motivation scales (intrinsic-extrinsic motivation plus self-efficacy versus intrinsic-extrinsic motivation). Another difference between the two studies lies in whether parental involvement was controlled for in examining the role of motivation in reading performance. The reason for including parental involvement in the current study is delineated in the following section.

2.4. Parental Involvement

Parents play an important role in developing not only children's literacy (Baker, 2003; Sénéchal & Young, 2008) but also adolescents' reading ability (Klauda, 2009). Previous research has indicated that some of the significant factors affecting school-aged students' reading abilities and attitudes toward reading include parents' socioeconomic status variables, such as education level, occupation, and income, as well as reading resources (e.g., the number of books in the home; Swalander & Taube, 2007; Yeung, Linver, & Brooks-Gunn, 2002). Moreover, cultural practices in the family, such as reading books with parents, have been found to facilitate children's literacy development (Snow & Beals, 2006). Parents may also influence their children's development with respect to L2 learning motivation. Lamb (2012) found that adolescents' motivation to learn EFL, within a provincial context in Indonesia, was likely to be affected by family values and educational practices in the home. Kyriacou and Zhu (2008) examined the influence of teachers, parents, peers, and others on senior high school students' motivation to learn English in China. They indicated that parents' influence was relatively small compared to instrumental motivations (e.g., career development and employment). Nevertheless, parents' involvement was still perceived as positive concerning students' motivation.

In particular, it has been reported that Korean parents are substantially involved in their children's English education (Park, 2009) as well as L1 literacy development (Lee, 2002) even through their high school years (Morris, Lafontaine, Pichette, & de Serres, 2013). Although parental involvement may decrease over time, supplanted by the influence of peers (Klauda, 2009), it seems that parents still influence adolescents' literacy development and their reading motivation. Hence, parents' involvement was controlled for in the current study to examine the unique contributions of reading motivation to reading comprehension.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The participants consisted of 289 students (162 males, 127 females; ages: 13-14) from ten different classes. They were enrolled in the second year of a middle school located in a large city in South Korea. The investigator used to work at this school and obtained, from the teachers and students, permission to conduct the study. Thus, the participants were selected through convenience sampling. Yet these learners could be considered as representative of the underlying population of interest, that is, general Korean EFL learners who had little direct exposure to English-speaking cultures but were mainly provided with opportunities to learn English through classroom-based instruction (Kang, Choi, Lee, & Nam, 2011). Indeed, the majority of the students (97%) in this study had little or no experience visiting English-speaking countries. Additionally, although this school was located in a relatively low socioeconomic area, 93% of the students had experienced private English lessons, a common phenomenon in a culture where private English education is predominant for secondary level students. The participants were, at the time of data collection, receiving Korean and English school instruction (45-minute sessions) five and four times a week, respectively.

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. Questionnaires

Three questionnaires gathered data about students' background information and reading motivation. The first one included items on students' gender, duration of private English education, experience visiting English-speaking countries, and parental involvement in students' reading practices. Adapted from Takase's (2007) study, parental involvement items asked about students' perceptions of their parents' encouragement in reading (My parents encourage me to read books), parents' willingness to buy books (My parents would buy me books whenever I ask), and parents' reading practices with their children (My parents used to read books when I was little). The same items requested information about parental involvement in Korean and English reading, separately, on a five-point scale, with 1 indicating 'strongly disagree' and 5 for 'strongly agree.' One must bear in mind that parents' past and present supportive behavior toward their children's reading may have an impact on the students' reading engagement (Klauda, 2009), although parents who once read books with their children may have discontinued the practice. Thus, the present study measured both past and present parental involvement. Moreover, the three items of parental

involvement were used as individual variables in the hierarchical regression model, rather than making a composite score by summing them, not only because they independently assessed different aspects of parental engagement, but also because the correlations between the three items (ranged from .18 to .36) were relatively weak.

In the second and third questionnaires, students were asked to rate items for reading motivation on a five-point Likert scale (1 = very different from me; 5 = a lot like me). Note that reading materials in the current study referred to texts that individuals choose to read for pleasure or for information, such as story books, novels, newspapers, or magazines, but not school-assigned readings (i.e., textbooks or workbooks). A set of brief instructions and examples of reading materials were presented at the beginning of the questionnaires. For Korean reading motivation, 24 items were adopted from Wang and Guthrie's (2004) revised MRQ, and some items were rephrased so as to be relevant to EFL middle school students. Another 24 items were subsequently constructed for English reading motivation based on L1 reading motivation items, and some items were added from studies of L2 reading motivation (Kim, 2011; Mori, 2002; Takase, 2007). The items in the Korean and English reading motivation questionnaires were identical except for the intrinsic motivation scale. Although the items for L1 and L2 intrinsic motivation differed slightly in content, due to independent adaptation from L1 and L2 studies, they contained the same number of items and the same sub-scales (curiosity, involvement, and challenge) for L1 and L2. Two English-Korean teachers reviewed these three questionnaires for clarity, and based on their feedback, the Korean translations were modified.

TABLE 1
Reliability of Korean and English Reading Motivation Scales

Scale	Number of items	Alpha	
		Korean	English
Intrinsic motivation	10	.88	.88
Curiosity	4	.74	.78
Involvement	3	.72	.65
Challenge	3	.70	.69
Extrinsic motivation	14	.75	.80
Grade/Utility	4	.84	.80
Recognition	3	.83	.79
Social reasons	3	.62	.76
Compliance[a]	2	.66	.47
Competition[a]	2	.50	.58

[a]The scale was removed from the analyses due to its low reliability

For understanding features of each motivational construct, Wigfield's (1997) definitions were employed. An intrinsic motivation composite consisted of three-subscales: "*curiosity*, the desire to learn about a particular topic of personal interest; *involvement*, the pleasure

gained from reading a well-written book or article on an interesting topic; and *challenge*, the satisfaction of mastering or assimilating complex ideas in text"; and the extrinsic motivation composite consisted of five subcategories: "*grades*, the desire to be favorably evaluated by the teacher; *recognition*, the pleasure of receiving a tangible form of recognition for success; *social motivation*, the process of sharing the meanings gained from reading with friends and family; *compliance*, reading because of an external goal or requirement; and *competition*, the desire to outperform others in reading" (Wigfield, 1997, pp. 22-23).

Presented in Table 1 are the reliability ratings of each dimension of motivation and the number of items. Most scales, except for those of competition and compliance, had reliability ratings greater than .70 or nearly approaching .70, indicating acceptable internal consistency (Nunnaly & Bernstein, 1994). Poor reliability of subscales tend to reduce the reliability of the questionnaires overall. To ensure a valid and reliable investigation, the scales for competition and compliance were excluded from the analyses. After removing the two subscales, the overall reliability for each reading motivation questionnaire was .89 for Korean and .91 for English.

3.2.2. Language tests

A total of four tests were administered, with 30 multiple-choice questions on each test. Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the reading comprehension and language proficiency tests. Skewness and kurtosis indices between zero and -1.0 indicated that the data were normally distributed.

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics for Korean and English Tests

Tests	Items	Min – Max	Mean	SD	Skewness (SE)	Kurtosis (SE)
Korean reading	30	12 – 100	63.4	20.3	-.69 (.14)	-.11 (.29)
Korean proficiency	30	16 – 100	67.5	17.7	-.50 (.14)	-.58 (.29)
English reading	30	12 – 96.5	66.7	23.9	-.38 (.14)	-.43 (.29)
English proficiency	30	13 – 100	62.5	18.8	-.55 (.14)	-.86 (.29)

Note. $N = 289$; Min: Minimum score; Max: Maximum score; *SD*: Standard deviation; *SE*: Standard error.

The Korean and English language proficiency tests were constructed and distributed by the educational district office as part of a standardized diagnostic evaluation. These language proficiency tests measured the overall linguistic knowledge of Korean and English, including reading comprehension, listening comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary. Access was gained to students' scores after the school granted such permission. Korean and English reading tests were designed for the current study in a parallel format, and the questions were adopted from standardized tests. Specifically, Korean reading

comprehension test items were selected from the reading sections of the Test of Proficiency in Korean—a Korean language test administered nationally and internationally by the National Institute for International Education. English reading comprehension questions were selected from two standardized English tests: high school entrance exams and junior high school graduation exams administered by the Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. These reading comprehension items were chosen to measure participants' reading ability in terms of understanding and identifying the main ideas, details, purposes, inferences, tone and style, and logical structures of the texts. An experienced Korean language teacher and two English teachers reviewed the Korean and English tests, respectively, to ensure whether the items were appropriate for each language and comprehension test, as well as whether the difficulty level was adequate for the students.

3.3. Procedure

At the beginning of the academic year, the four language tests as well as three questionnaires were administered during the five 45-minute regular class times for two weeks. The researcher had provided specific instructions, orally and in print, for the tests and the questionnaires for the teachers who assisted with the administration of the measures. In the first week, each language test was conducted in print under teacher supervision for 45 minutes. The following week, a teacher who was well informed on how to administer the questionnaire distributed two reading motivation questionnaires and a background questionnaire to be completed within the 45-minute class. The teacher gave instructions on how to answer the 5-point Likert scale. Students were allowed to ask questions about the study and the questionnaire items.

3.4. Analyses

The analyses proceeded in four stages using SPSS 21. First, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with Varimax rotation was conducted to specify underlying factors of each Korean and English reading motivation questionnaire. Because the items were adapted from existing questionnaires, EFA was a prerequisite to validate the questionnaire and reduce the items into several factors for subsequent analyses. Paired t-tests were then employed to investigate whether reading motivation constructs were statistically different between L1 and L2. To avoid Type I errors as a result of multiple comparisons, a Bonferroni correction was applied. After confirming that multicollinearity was not violated in the data, hierarchical regressions were conducted (Stevens, 2009). Parental involvement items were entered into the statistical model first and then, as a second step, reading motivation factors followed. Finally, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted

to examine reading motivation at different levels of language proficiency, using proficiency as an independent variable and reading motivation components as dependent variables. As reading motivation factors had low to moderate correlations between .14 and .56, MANOVA was selected instead of separate one-way ANOVAs (Stevens, 2009).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Preliminary Analyses

Exploratory factor analyses using Varimax rotation produced the same four-factor solution for Korean and English, explaining 59.8% and 59.5% of the total variance, respectively. Tables 3 and 4 display the factor loadings, means, and standard deviations for Korean and English reading motivation items.

TABLE 3

Four-Factor Solution for Reading Motivation in Korean

Items Loaded on Each Factor	Loading	M	SD
Factor 1: Intrinsic motivation for L1 reading (α = .88)		3.19	.79
18. If I am reading about an interesting topic, I sometimes lose track of time.	.763	3.34	1.25
9. If a book is interesting, I don't care how hard it is to read.	.709	3.38	1.18
20. I enjoy a long, involved story or fiction book.	.705	2.98	1.27
24. I like to read because I always feel happy when I read things that are of interest to me.	.702	3.24	1.12
5. I like reading books in Korean.	.683	3.48	1.07
3. I like it when the questions in books make me think.	.561	3.18	1.06
7. I make pictures in my mind when I read.	.554	3.46	1.18
12. I like hard, challenging books.	.511	2.72	1.17
14. I read to learn new information about topics that interest me.	.492	3.11	1.08
2. If the teacher discusses something interesting, I might read more about it.	.477	2.96	1.08
Factor 2: Grades/Utility for L1 reading (α = .84)		2.87	.87
4. I read books to succeed on the university entrance examination.	.841	2.93	1.06
11. I read books to improve my grades.	.805	2.84	1.10
6. I am reading because I want to get a better job in the future.	.791	3.09	1.09
13. I read books because I will need to read in college or university.	.766	2.60	1.01
Factor 3: Recognition for L1 reading (α = .83)		2.98	.94
1. I like having my teacher say I am a good reader.	.840	2.98	1.08
10. I like having my friends tell me I am a good reader.	.784	2.90	1.06
19. I like having my family (or parents) tell me I am a good reader.	.771	3.04	1.12
Factor 4: Social motivation for L1 reading (α = .62)		2.50	.83
22. I like to visit the library often with my family.	.768	2.13	1.04
23. I like to read to my family (parents, brother, or sister) in Korean.	.682	2.26	1.04
17. I like to tell my family or friends about what I am reading.	.631	3.10	1.08

Note. Percentage explained: total variance, 59.79; intrinsic, 21.21; grades/utility, 14.09; recognition, 12.51; and social motivation: 11.98.

According to the criteria of a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 and factor loadings of .40 and above (Stevens, 2009), there were no cross-loadings or stand-alone items.

TABLE 4

Four-Factor Solution for Reading Motivation in English

	Loading	*M*	*SD*
Factor 1: Intrinsic motivation for L2 reading (α = .88)		2.82	.75
10. If the content is interesting, I don't care how long it takes to read in English.	.726	2.83	1.17
1. By learning to read in English, I hope to be able to read English novels, newspapers or magazines.	.723	2.77	1.24
9. I get immersed in interesting stories even if they are written in English.	.703	2.87	1.12
2. I like reading English novels/comic books, English newspapers or magazines.	.647	2.28	.98
3. It is worth reading difficult English passages.	.622	3.26	1.09
6. It is fun to read in English.	.606	2.72	1.06
18. I enjoy the challenge of difficult reading passages in English.	.552	2.40	1.04
15. I would learn how to read in English even if it were not required in class.	.535	3.24	1.09
7. I do not like to be interrupted while reading in English.	.496	2.94	1.06
11. I tend to get deeply engaged when I read in English.	.492	2.88	1.00
Factor 2: Grades/Utility for L2 reading (α = .80)		3.20	.86
16. I am learning to read in English because I will need to read English in college or university.	.816	3.24	1.08
12. I am learning to read in English to succeed on the university entrance examination.	.763	3.12	1.11
21. I am learning English reading because I want to get a better job in the future.	.736	3.37	1.12
4. I am learning to read in English only because I would like to get good grades.	.652	3.08	1.08
Factor 3: Recognition for L2 reading (α = .79)		3.01	.93
14. I like having my friends tell me I am a good reader in English.	.809	2.90	1.08
17. I like having the English teacher say I read well in English.	.767	3.10	1.08
26. I like having my family (or parents) tell me I read well in English.	.733	3.03	1.15
Factor 4: Social motivation for L2 reading (α = .76)		2.20	.86
22. I like to visit the library or bookstore to look at English books (such as novels and magazines) with my family.	.775	2.13	1.04
23. I like to tell my family or friends about what I am reading in English.	.765	2.26	1.04
8. I like to read to my family (parents, brother, or sister) in English.	.709	2.19	1.07

Note. Percentage explained: total variance, 59.46; intrinsic, 20.81; grades/utility, 13.41; recognition, 11.86; and social motivation: 13.38.

Note that 20 items were entered into the EFA analysis for each language after dropping four items related to compliance and competition due to their low reliability.

4.2. Differences between L1 and L2 Reading Motivation Constructs

To compare the differences in means of L1 and L2 reading motivation factors, paired *t*-tests were conducted with Bonferroni adjustments. The results showed that all motivational components, aside from recognition, significantly differed between the L1 and L2. As shown in Table 5, EFL young adolescents' intrinsic reading motivation for their L1 was significantly stronger than for the L2, with a moderate effect size value (d = .48). This finding is consistent with previous studies that have examined EFL learners in elementary schools (Lin et al., 2012) and universities (Kim, 2011). One reason for the lower intrinsic motivation in English among EFL learners, regardless of their educational level, is that it is uncommon to read in English for leisure or real-life communicative purposes in EFL contexts. Indeed, actual use of English, far from being a means of pleasure in daily life, is typically restricted to the classroom in Korea. English ability, thus, may be considered a necessary skill deployed solely to succeed in school or to gain career opportunities in society (Hsieh & Kang, 2010). It is also possible that students' insufficient L2 proficiency may interfere with fluent reading and thus lower intrinsic motivation. A large proportion of working memory may be devoted to decoding words, processing syntactic structures, and interpreting L2 texts, leaving little room for enjoying reading; in contrast, linguistic competence in L1 requires less cognitive effort, thus freeing a larger working memory capacity with which to enjoy the act of reading (van den Noort, Bosch, & Hugdahl, 2006). Unless the reader feels comfortable with processing L2 texts with few pauses, underdeveloped L2 proficiency may hinder the reader from a fluent and enjoyable reading process.

TABLE 5
Pairwise Comparisons Between L1 and L2 Motivation Constructs

Korean (L1)	*Mean (SD)*	English (L2)	*Mean (SD)*	*t*	*d*
K1 Intrinsic	3.19 (.79)	E1 Intrinsic	2.82 (.75)	9.46*	.48
K2 Grades/utility	2.87 (.87)	E2 Grades/utility	3.20 (.86)	-6.69*	.38
K3 Recognition	2.98 (.94)	E3 Recognition	3.01 (.93)	-.73	.03
K4 Social	2.40 (.83)	E4 Social	2.20 (.86)	4.60*	.24

Note. SD = Standard deviation; *d* = Cohen's *d*.
*p < .001

In terms of grades/utility, a different picture emerged in this study. EFL young adolescents' desire to attain instrumental outcomes, such as good grades, was significantly stronger for L2 reading than for L1 reading, with a weak to medium effect size (d = .38). This is noteworthy because previous studies found no statistical difference between L1 and L2 for this particular dimension (Kim, 2011; Lin et al., 2012). The inconsistent result may be due to the fact that the participants in the present study were anticipating upcoming

high-stakes exams. These EFL middle school students may feel more intense pressure to achieve good English scores in school and on university entrance exams than elementary school students whose college admissions are relatively far off (Lin et al., 2012), or university students who have already gained admittance to college (Kim, 2011). EFL young adolescents' higher motivation induced by grades and utility values may change if free of such pressure.

Another difference was found in social motivation, with a higher mean score for the L1 than for the L2. Yet, despite the statistical difference, both the mean scores for L1 and L2 social motivation were lower than the mid-point (3.0) of the five-point scale, and the practical significance was relatively weak ($d = .24$). This indicates that the participants did not frequently share their reading experiences with their friends or family members, regardless of whether they read in Korean or in English.

4.3. Contributions of Reading Motivation to Reading Comprehension in L1 and L2

The contributions of reading motivation to reading comprehension were investigated when parental involvement was taken into account through hierarchical regression analyses. As a prerequisite step of regression analyses, correlations were computed among predictor variables, that is, reading motivation factors and parental involvement items, and collinearity statistics were also checked. The low to moderate correlations (from .14 to .56 for Korean and .26 to .58 for English) among predictors as well as tolerance values of more than 0.1 indicated that all independent variables in the equation were in the linear relationship, and thus, multicollinearity was not violated (Stevens, 2009).

As a next step, hierarchical regressions were conducted within each language. For Korean, parental involvement explained 15.5% of the variance in reading comprehension scores (Table 6). Because parental involvement items were used as controlling variables, the variances of reading comprehension explained by parental involvement are beyond the scope of the study and not specifically discussed herein. When such parental involvement was taken into account in the second step, reading motivation as a set of variables accounted for 9.9% of the reading performance ($\Delta F = 9.30$, $p < .05$). Yet, among the motivational constructs, intrinsic motivation was the only significant contributor to reading comprehension scores. All extrinsic motivation factors turned out to be non-significant.

As for English reading, parental involvement explained 9.5% of the variance in reading comprehension scores in the first step (Table 7). When parental involvement was controlled for in the second step, the unique contribution of reading motivation factors was 14.2% of the variance in English reading performance ($\Delta F = 13.13$, $p < .05$). Unlike Korean reading, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation components (except for

recognition) were primary contributors to English reading. Yet intrinsic motivation (β = .34) strongly predicted reading comprehension more than the grades/utility factor (β = .27). Additionally, social motivation negatively predicted English reading comprehension scores. These results merit further discussion.

TABLE 6

Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Korean Reading

	Predictors	B (SE b)	β	t	p	ΔF	ΔR^2
Step 1	Parents' encouragement	3.56 (.85)	.25	4.23	.00*		
	Parents' reading together	.54 (.92)	.04	.59	.56	17.43*	.155*
	Parents' buying books	3.14 (.88)	.21	3.56	.00*		
Step 2	Parents' encouragement	2.34 (.84)	.17	2.80	.01*		
	Parents' reading together	.23 (.89)	.02	.26	.80		
	Parents' buying books	2.24 (.85)	.15	2.64	.01*		
	Intrinsic motivation	8.93(1.59)	.40	5.62	.00*	9.30*	.099*
	Grades/utility	-.33(1.13)	-.02	-.29	.77		
	Recognition	-.36(1.23)	-.02	-.29	.77		
	Social	-2.56(1.35)	-.12	-1.90	.06		

Note. B: Unstandardized regression coefficients; *SE* b: Standard error of B; β = Standardized beta; Δ F = F change; ΔR^2 = R^2 change.
*p < .05

TABLE 7

Hierarchical Regression Analyses for English Reading

	Predictors	B (SE b)	β	t	p	ΔF	ΔR^2
Step 1	Parents' encouragement	2.27 (1.0)	.14	2.27	.02*		
	Parents' reading together	-.50 (.99)	-.03	-.50	.62	10.03*	.095*
	Parents' buying books	3.59 (.92)	.24	3.90	.00*		
Step 2	Parents' encouragement	1.52 (.97)	.10	1.57	.12		
	Parents' reading together	-.29 (.96)	-.02	-.30	.76		
	Parents' buying books	.96 (.96)	.06	1.00	.32		
	Intrinsic motivation	8.58 (1.88)	.34	4.56	.00*	13.13*	.142*
	Grades/utility	5.97 (1.37)	.27	4.36	.00*		
	Recognition	-2.31 (1.29)	-.11	-1.80	.07		
	Social	-3.91 (1.54)	-.18	-2.54	.01*		

Note. B: unstandardized regression coefficients; *SE* b: standard error of B; β = standardized beta; Δ F = F change; ΔR^2 = R^2 change.
*p < .05

First, the facilitation of intrinsic motivation seems critical to both L1 and L2 reading because intrinsic motivation positively predicted reading comprehension even after controlling for parental involvement. This suggests that when middle school students find it interesting to read books, become involved in reading, and continue to read for pleasure, they may be able to improve their reading comprehension. Even if they confront challenging texts, intrinsically motivated readers are likely to deal with the problems persistently by making more effort to comprehend the materials and thereby enhance their

reading performance. That is, the higher the intrinsic motivation, the better reading comprehension scores in L1 and L2. This finding is pedagogically important in EFL contexts because it seems uncommon for teachers or parents to encourage reading in English for entertainment. A pervasive sense in Korean society is that people consider English as the means by which one may enter top-ranked universities or find a good job for career success and thus upgrade their social status (Lee, 2011). Whereas extrinsic motivation probably diminishes once the external rewards are achieved or punishments are avoided, intrinsic motivation can be long lasting because it is driven by internal rewards, such as joy, curiosity, and involvement (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In the long term, an emphasis on intrinsic motivation may have enduring effects on reading performance in L1 and L2.

Thus far, L1 studies have demonstrated a positive association between intrinsic motivation and reading comprehension (De Naeghel et al., 2012; Guthrie et al., 1999; Logan et al., 2011; Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wang & Guthrie, 2004) but not in L2 studies (Kondo-Brown, 2006; Lin et al., 2012). The present study corroborates the extant L1 reading motivation research, while providing new evidence to suggest the contribution of intrinsic motivation to L2 reading comprehension among EFL middle school students. One possible explanation for the inconsistent results in L2 research is that the subscales of intrinsic motivation assessed in the current study are different from the measures used in previous studies. Indeed, Kondo-Brown (2006) adapted items from Noels et al.'s (2000) intrinsic motivation subscales and assessed components of knowledge, achievement, and stimulation, while the current study, adapting from Wang and Guthrie (2004), included intrinsic motivation subscales of curiosity, involvement, and challenge. It is nonetheless interesting that although Lin et al. (2012) measured aspects of intrinsic motivation, including curiosity and involvement, similar to those in the current study, they found no associations between intrinsic motivation and L2 reading comprehension. It is plausible that the EFL learners' L2 proficiency might have had an impact on the result. The current study's participants were EFL middle school students who had learned to read in English for relatively longer than the elementary EFL children in Lin et al.'s study, whose English proficiency may have not yet been sufficiently developed to comprehend L2 texts. Although these middle school students may not be fully established in their English proficiency either, at least they seemed to have managed to comprehend English materials and been entertained by reading. Thus, in order to benefit from intrinsic motivation, students should be equipped with sufficient language proficiency or at least exceed a linguistic threshold, a certain level of the target language proficiency (Clarke, 1980). Given that automatic decoding and making meaning with few pauses are readily available, students may become curious and more involved in reading, and consequently read more frequently and become better readers.

Furthermore, the predictive power of grades/utility differed between L1 and L2.

Grades/utility values associated with Korean reading did not significantly explain variance in reading comprehension. Previous L1 research has reported significantly negative associations between extrinsic motivation and reading comprehension (Becker et al., 2010; De Naeghel et al., 2012; Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wang & Guthrie, 2004). The current study also showed a negative association between grades/utility values and reading comprehension in the L1; the association, however, was non-significant. Given the result of the current study and that of the extant research, promoting grades/utility motives for L1 reading may be redundant, or even undesirable. In L2 reading, however, grades/utility positively predicted reading comprehension scores, indicating its facilitative role in L2 reading. This is consistent with Lin et al. (2012), who found that the only significant predictor of L2 reading comprehension among EFL children was instrumentalism. Considering that both grades/utility in the current study and instrumentalism in Lin et al.'s study are associated with tangible values such as academic success or career path, promoting awareness of observable values may encourage L2 readers to put more effort into reading activities. Put another way, motivated by the instrumental outcomes, L2 readers may intend to practice reading for accuracy, develop their own metacognitive strategies to construct meaning, and ultimately enhance L2 reading comprehension skills. Some scholars point to the possibility that excessive emphasis on extrinsic motives undermines intrinsic motivation (Henderlong & Lepper, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Nevertheless, it is possible that such extrinsic motivation serves as a trigger, at least, for L2 learners to become interested in and engaged in reading.

Another interesting result is that social motivation was found to have significantly negative associations with L2 reading comprehension. This implies that students' stronger motivation for discussing the contents of books with friends or family led to lower scores in reading achievement. Previous L1 studies have indicated weak but significantly negative correlations between social motivation and reading comprehension for both U.S. elementary children (Wang & Guthrie, 2004) and Hispanic middle school students (Unrau & Schlackman, 2006). In contrast, no significant associations have been reported among U.S. (Baker & Wigfield, 1999) and Chinese elementary children (Wang & Guthrie, 2004) or Asian middle school students in an American setting (Unrau & Schlackman, 2006). Given that mixed findings have been reported, the current study offers evidence supporting the negative relationship between social motivation and reading comprehension only for the L2 among EFL middle school students in an Asian context.

It is worth noting that social motivation refers to students' willingness to share reading experiences with others, whereas reading comprehension tests require the ability to read and understand texts independently. It can be speculated that the more frequently students visit the library, talk about books, and read books with family or friends, the less time they spend on independent and individual reading, and thus they achieve lower reading

comprehension scores. Wang and Guthrie (2004) also indicated that highly social students, who are likely to focus on socializing with friends or having fun, may have a low desire to comprehend texts, resulting in low reading performance. Even though some studies have demonstrated that reading books with parents improves language skills for preschool children (Kleeck, Woude, & Hammett, 2006; Price, Kleeck, & Huberty, 2009), it may be necessary for adolescents to have quiet, individual, and separate reading times if they are to enhance their reading skills.

4.4. L1 and L2 Reading Motivation Among Learners at Different Levels of Language Proficiency

In order to see if reading motivation differed among students at different language proficiency levels, the participants were divided into three groups based on their Korean and English language proficiency test scores. It should be noted that these language tests were constructed by the educational district office specifically to measure middle school students' Korean and English language skills. For these tests, no absolute criterion was presented for categorizing low, middle, and high proficiency groups as typically done by such standardized tests as the TOEIC and TOEFL.

TABLE 8

Participants' Groupings by Level of Korean and English Language Proficiency

Group	n	%	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Korean						
High	94	32.5	84.74	5.83	76	100
Middle	95	32.9	66.82	5.26	58	75
Low	100	34.6	40.06	12.17	12	57
Total	289	100.0	63.39	20.31	12	100
English						
High	93	32.5	91.38	3.82	83.5	96.5
Middle	96	33.6	71.94	5.66	57	83
Low	100	33.9	38.61	13.31	12	56.5
Total	289	100.0	66.66	23.90	12	96.5

Note. SD = Standard deviations; Min = Minimum scores; Max = Maximum scores.

Thus, rather than setting up arbitrary scores as cut-off points for each proficiency level, the current study employed a 30 percent ratio, adapting a method often used to divide samples into low (30%), middle (40%), and high (30%) language proficiency groups in educational research (Choi, 2003). That is, for the current study, to assign a relatively equal number of students to each proficiency level, students who scored in the top one-third were categorized as high, those in the bottom one-third were categorized as low, and those in between were categorized as the middle level. Though still arbitrary, this grouping method

seemed to at least accomplish its goal of comparing proficiency levels, each represented as distinct average scores, as shown in Table 8.

The results of a one-way MANOVA revealed a significant main effect for language proficiency: for Korean, F (8, 566) = 5.9, p < .001, partial η^2 = .08; and for English, F (8, 566) = 12.91, p < .001, partial η^2 = .15. Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects of the four dependent variables (i.e., motivation factors) were examined in Table 9.

TABLE 9
L1 and L2 Reading Motivation by Proficiency Levels

Dependent Variables	Levels	Korean			English		
		Mean (*SD*)	*F*	η^2	Mean (*SD*)	*F*	η^2
Intrinsic[ab]	High	3.53(.76)	20.93*	.13	3.19(.76)	20.52*	.13
	Mid	3.22(.75)			2.75(.66)		
	Low	2.84(.71)			2.55(.69)		
Grade/utility[ac]	High	2.97(.85)	4.01*	.03	3.46(.79)	27.13*	.16
	Mid	2.97(.91)			3.45(.77)		
	Low	2.67(.83)			2.73(.82)		
Recognition[ac]	High	3.20(.93)	6.37*	.04	3.01(.94)	9.55*	.06
	Mid	3.06(.92)			3.26(.89)		
	Low	2.72(.91)			2.71(.86)		
Social	High	2.51(.86)	1.61	.01	2.26(.85)	.69	.01
	Mid	2.40(.82)			2.22(.92)		
	Low	2.30(.81)			2.12(.80)		

Note. [a]Significant difference between High and Low in Korean and English; [b]Significant difference between High and Mid in Korean and English; and [c]Significant difference between Mid and Low: intrinsic, grades/utility, and recognition in Korean, and grade/utility and recognition in English.
*p < .05 (Bonferroni adjustments)

Except for social motivation, significant univariate main effects for language proficiency were obtained for the L1 and L2, indicating that students had significantly different degrees of reading motivation, depending on their language proficiency.

Post hoc tests using Bonferroni adjustments showed that the high group's intrinsic motivation, grades/utility, and recognition were significantly higher than the low group in L1 and L2. This finding is consistent in part with Kim (2011), in that the high proficiency group had significantly stronger intrinsic motivation than the low group, but did not differ in terms of utility values among EFL non-English major students. The current study indicates that EFL middle school students with higher language proficiency tend to be intrinsically and extrinsically more motivated to read than their peers with lower language proficiency. This tendency appears both in Korean and English reading. This finding may be relevant to many teachers who attempt to engage low-achieving students in reading instruction. Teachers, thus, may need to stimulate intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in low-achieving students by boosting their curiosity, highlighting the pleasure of reading, offering

practical rewards, and openly recognizing students' reading behavior.

The middle group showed significantly stronger motivation than the low group in terms of intrinsic motivation, grades/utility, and recognition for Korean and grades/utility and recognition for English. The common denominator in the L1 and L2 results was extrinsic motivation; that is, the middle group was more stimulated than the low group by tangible rewards such as grades and recognition, suggesting that extrinsic motivation may serve as a driving force to engage the middle group in reading. Yet intrinsic motivation toward English reading did not statistically differ between the middle and low levels. It is assumed that because middle and low groups do not reach a linguistic threshold of English proficiency, neither group is able to derive pleasure from English reading, and both result in low intrinsic motivation.

The high and middle groups' extrinsic motivation did not differ, but the high group's intrinsic motivation was significantly stronger than the middle group in both Korean and English. This is consistent in part with Kim (2011), who found no differences between high and middle groups in all scales of English reading motivation. Although young adolescents' reading performance may be partly motivated by extrinsic rewards, it is the very reason that the emphasis should be placed on the pleasure of reading. Thus, teachers and parents may need to promote middle school students' intrinsic motivation by stimulating curiosity in reading, giving them opportunities to feel the joy of reading, and challenging them with more advanced reading texts not only in the L1 but also in the L2.

5. CONCLUSION

The current study was intended to investigate L1 and L2 reading motivation and their association with reading comprehension. This study found that Korean middle school students' intrinsic motivation toward L1 reading was significantly higher than it was toward L2 reading, whereas motivation to attain grades/utility values was stronger for L2 reading than for the L1. After controlling for parental involvement, intrinsic motivation played a positive role both in L1 and L2 reading comprehension. Yet fostering grades/utility values may be only facilitative for L2 reading comprehension. Furthermore, for L1 and L2 reading, the high proficiency group's extrinsic and intrinsic motivations were significantly stronger than those of the low group; the middle group had higher extrinsic motivation (i.e., grades/utility and recognition) than the low group; and the high and middle groups differed significantly only in intrinsic motivation.

Several limitations related to the present study should be acknowledged. The parental involvement was measured via students' perceptions, rather than collecting data from the parents. It is thus important in future work to include voices from parents as well as from

students to measure parental involvement. Another caution to consider when interpreting the results is that the current study is based on self-reported data. It should be noted that self-reporting has risks in over- or under-estimation of individuals' behavior, errors in self-observation, and social desirability bias. Moreover, although the present study divided the sample into three proficiency groups using a 30 percent ratio, a method used in previous research, this grouping method is still arbitrary. Further research could suggest more reasonable criteria for proficiency grouping.

Despite these limitations, the current study offers several implications. In terms of research perspectives, this study suggests that intrinsic motivation may be more significant in reading comprehension than has been previously reported. The result, that intrinsic motivation plays a supportive role in reading comprehension in the L1 and L2, not only substantiates L1 reading literature (De Naeghel et al., 2012; Unrau & Schlackman, 2006; Wang & Guthrie, 2004) but adds new empirical evidence to existing L2 studies that have reported non-significant association between reading motivation and reading comprehension (Kim, 2015; Park, 2015) or have pointed to extrinsic motivation as a sole contributor to reading comprehension (Lin et al., 2012). Although previous research has consistently demonstrated the importance of intrinsic motivation in L2 learning (e.g., Noels et al., 2000; Pae, 2008), there has been surprisingly little data-driven evidence that verifies the facilitative role of intrinsic motivation in L2 reading comprehension. This finding may offer empirical support for this assumption and open up a new avenue of L2 reading research that needs to be validated in different contexts.

From pedagogical perspectives, this study provides a rationale for promoting intrinsic motivation toward L2 reading that might have been neglected in EFL contexts. In fact, EFL learners tend to show higher extrinsic motivation but lower intrinsic motivation toward reading (Kim, 2015; Lin et al., 2012), because English reading is typically considered a means of access to college education or career opportunities, rather than a leisure activity (Kyriacou & Zhu, 2008). Thus, it seems crucial for EFL teachers to increase intrinsic reading motivation intentionally and consistently by fostering students' interest in English books through encouragement (Lee & Schallert, 2014) or providing reasonably demanding tasks along with appropriate support (Wu, 2003). Furthermore, this study recommends that EFL teachers need to use appropriate motivational techniques depending on learners' language proficiency levels. That is, promoting intrinsic motivation may appeal to high proficiency learners but not to middle- or low-level students. It would therefore be beneficial to provide tailored support and assistance for L2 reading motivation according to language proficiency.

REFERENCES

Baker, L. (2003). The role of parents in motivating struggling readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*(1), 87-106.

Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(4), 452-477.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Becker, M., McElvany, N., & Kortenbruck, M. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation as predictors of reading literacy: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(4), 773-785.

Bernhardt, E. B. (2005). Progress and procrastination in second language reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 133-150.

Choi, P. K. (2003). The best students will learn English: Ultra-utilitarianism and linguistic imperialism in education in post-1997 Hong Kong. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(6), 673-694.

Clarke, M. (1980). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading: Or when language competence interferes with reading performance. *The Modern Language Journal, 64*(2), 203-209.

Cox, K. E., & Guthrie, J. T. (2001). Motivational and cognitive contributions to students' amount of reading. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*, 116-131.

Davis, J. N. & Bistodeau, L. (1993). How do L1 and L2 reading differ? Evidence from think-aloud protocols. *The Modern Language Journal, 77*(4), 459-472.

De Naeghel, J., Van Keer, H., Vansteenkiste, M., & Rosseel, Y. (2012). The relation between elementary students' recreational and academic reading motivation, reading frequency, engagement, and comprehension: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 1006-1021.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Volume III, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

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*(3), 231-256.

Henderlong, J., & Lepper, M. R. (2002). The effects of praise on children's intrinsic motivation: A review and synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(5), 774-795.

Hsieh, P. P. H., & Kang, H. S. (2010). Attribution and self-efficacy and their interrelationship in the Korean EFL context. *Language Learning, 60*(3), 606-627.

Kahn-Horwitz, J., & Shimron, J. (2006). Weak and strong novice readers of English as a

foreign language: Effects of first language and socioeconomic status. *Annals of Dyslexia, 56*(1), 161-185.

Kang, Y., Choi, Y., Lee, B., & Nam, K. (2011). Prediction of Korean EFL learners' English reading comprehension abilities: An examination of the simple view of reading. *English Teaching, 66*(1), 23-38.

Kim, K. J. (2011). Reading motivation in two languages: An examination of EFL college students in Korea. *Reading and Writing, 24*(8), 861-881.

Kim, K. J. (2015). Developing a structural model of EFL reading achievement for Korean high school students. *English Teaching, 70*(3), 3-21.

Klauda, S. L. (2009). The role of parents in adolescents' reading motivation and activity. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*(4), 325-363.

Klauda, S. L., & Guthrie, J. T. (2015). Comparing relations of motivation, engagement, and achievement among struggling and advanced adolescent readers. *Reading and Writing, 28*(2), 239-269.

Kleeck, A. V., Woude, J. V., & Hammett, L. (2006). Fostering literal and inferential language skills in head start preschoolers with language impairment using scripted book-sharing discussions. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 15*(1), 85-95.

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

Kyriacou, C., & Zhu, D. (2008). Shanghai pupils' motivation towards learning English and the perceived influence of important others. *Educational Studies, 34*(2), 97-104.

Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning, 62*(4), 997-1023.

Lee, G. (2002). The role of Korean parents in the literacy development of their children. *International Journal of Early Childhood, 34*(1), 1-8.

Lee, J., & Schallert, D. L. (2014). Literate actions, reading attitudes, and reading achievement: Interconnections across languages for adolescent learners of English in Korea. *The Modern Language Journal, 98* (2), 553-573.

Lee, W. (2011). Views and experiences of English language education for young learners in South Korea: Has Korea government achieved its goal in introducing English language to public primary school? *Asian EFL Journal, 56*(4), 16-29.

Lin, D., Wong, K., & McBride-Chang, C. (2012). Reading motivation and reading comprehension in Chinese and English among bilingual students. *Reading and Writing, 25*(3), 717-737.

Logan, S., Medford, E., & Hughes, N. (2011). The importance of intrinsic motivation for high and low ability readers' reading comprehension performance. *Learning and Individual Differences, 21*(1), 124-128.

Marinova-Todd, S. H., & Uchikoshi, Y. (2010). The role of first language in oral language development in English: The case of both alphabetic and nonalphabetic languages. In A.Y. Durgunoglu & C. Goldenberg (Eds.), *Language and literacy development in bilingual settings* (pp. 29-60). New York: The Guilford Press.

McGeown, S. P., Duncan, L. G., Griffiths, Y. M., & Stothard, S. E. (2014). Exploring the relationship between adolescent's reading skills, reading motivation and reading habits. *Reading and Writing, 28*(4), 545-569.

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

Morris, A., Lafontaine, M., Pichette, F., & de Serres, L. (2013). Affective variables, parental involvement and competence among South Korean high school learners of English. *Studies in Second Language Learning & Teaching, 3*(1), 13-45.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 50*(1), 57-85.

Nunnaly, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pae, T.-I. (2008). Second language orientation and self-determination theory: A structural analysis of the factors affecting second language achievement. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 27*, 3-27.

Park, J. (2015). Insights into Korean EFL students' reading motivation, proficiency, and strategy use. *English Teaching, 70*(1), 57-74.

Park, J. K. (2009). English fever in South Korea: Its history and symptoms. *English Today, 25*(1), 50-57.

Price, L. H., Kleeck, A. V., & Huberty, C. J. (2009). Talk during book sharing between parents and preschool children: A comparison between storybook and expository book conditions. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(2), 171-194.

Proctor, C. P., August, D., Snow, C., & Barr, C. D. (2010). The interdependence continuum: A perspective on the nature of Spanish-English bilingual reading comprehension. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33*, 5-20.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 55*(1), 68-78.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). An overview of self-determination theory: An organismic-dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3-33). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Sénéchal, M., & Young, L. (2008). The effect of family literacy interventions on children's

acquisition of reading from kindergarten to grade 3: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(4), 880-907.

Snow, C. E., & Beals, D. E. (2006). Mealtime talk that supports literacy development. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 111*, 51-66.

Stevens, J. P. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Swalander, L., & Taube, K. (2007). Influences of family based prerequistes, reading attitude, and self-regulation on reading ability. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 32*(2), 206-230.

Takase, A. (2007). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 19*(1), 1-18.

Tsai, Y. R., Ernst, C., & Talley, P. C. (2010). L1 and L2 strategy use in reading comprehension of Chinese EFL readers. *Reading Psychology, 31*, 1-29.

Unrau, N., & Schlackman, J. (2006). Motivation and its relationship with reading achievement in an urban middle school. *Journal of Educational Research, 100*(2), 81-101.

van den Noort, M., Bosch, P., & Hugdahl, K. (2006). Foreign language proficiency and working memory capacity. *European Psychologist, 11*(4), 289-296.

Wang, J. H.-Y., & Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Modeling the effects of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amount of reading, and past reading achievement on text comprehension between U.S. and Chinese students. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*(2), 162-186.

Wigfield, A. (1997). Children's motivations for reading and reading engagement. In J. Guthrie & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Reading engagement* (pp. 14-33). Newark, DE: Reading Association.

Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1995). Dimensions of children's motivations for reading: An initial study. *Reading Research Report, 34*, 1-25.

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

Wu, X. (2003). Intrinsic motivation and young language learners: The impact of the classroom environment. *System, 31*(4), 501-517.

Yeung, W. J., Linver, M. R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for young children's development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child Development, 73*(6), 1861-1879.

Applicable levels: Secondary

Juhee Lee
Department of English Education
Kyungpook National University
80 Daehakro, Bukgu
Daegu 41566, South Korea
Phone: 053-950-7816
Email: juheelee.carpediem@gmail.com