English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 20, No. 2 Summer 2014

The Effects of Purposeful Reading on Reading Comprehension and Task Motivation

Youngsu Kim[*]
(Chonnam National University)
Jee Hyun Ma[**]
(Chonnam National University)

Kim, Youngsu & Ma, Jee Hyun. (2014). The effects of purposeful reading on reading comprehension and task motivation. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *20*(2), 101-116.

This study examined the effects of purposeful reading on reading comprehension and task motivation. Specifically, this study investigated whether purposeful reading could increase reading comprehension ability and students' task motivation through the comparison between purpose and no-purpose groups. Fifty eight 3rd-year middle school students participated in the study and were randomly assigned to one of either the purposeful (*N*=26) or the non-purposeful reading groups (*N*=32). The learners' reading comprehension was measured through three posttests, and their general motivation level toward English learning and task-specific motivation were also checked using questionnaires. The results demonstrated that purposeful reading played a positive role in reading comprehension especially when reading texts were more challenging for the learners. The results also revealed that the purpose group students showed a significantly higher level of task motivation than those in the no-purpose group even though the two groups displayed a similar level of general motivation toward English learning initially. The findings provided Korean EFL middle school students' characteristics and task motivation with regard to purposeful reading, and suggested pedagogical implications to pursue reading proficiency and task motivation enhancement.

[purposeful reading/reading comprehension/task motivation]

[*]First author, [**]Corresponding author

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

I. INTRODUCTION

The ability to read well could be considered as one of the most important language skills in modern societies. Reading is done for many different purposes such as getting pleasure, information, or knowledge (Alderson, 2000; Grabe, 2009). Reading is complex since effective reading generally includes a rapid, interactive, strategic, and evaluative cognitive process. Whether students read to get pleasure, information, or knowledge from a given text or not, the purpose of reading affects the way they read. That is, why they read determines the process of reading, which could lead to different outcomes.

It is widely known that a learner reads a text differently depending on different reading purposes (Alderson, 2000; Horiba, 2000; Lorch, Kluzewitz, & Lorch, 1995; Noji, Ford, & Silva, 2009; Swanborn & de Glopper, 2001), which could make much difference in comprehension processing (Linderholm & van den Broek, 2002). Thus, in order for students to attain what they want from a provided text effectively, they need to keep particular purposes for reading in mind by focusing on the question of 'why?' (Alderson, 2014; Grabe, 2009; Noji, Ford, & Silva, 2009).

However, Grabe (2009) and Anderson (2014) pointed out that all too often, learners do not recognize their purpose for reading and consequently are not engaged in the reading process actively. Although some researchers insist having reading purpose in readers' mind has positive effects on reading comprehension, little empirical research has been conducted to explore the relationship between the two. Additionally, there are insufficient second language (L2) studies that investigate how well learners have reading purpose is related to their affective aspects such as motivation, anxiety, and perceived difficulty. Considering the aforementioned situations, we would like to explore the effects of purposeful reading on reading comprehension and task motivation in the current study. The following research questions were raised:

1. Does purposeful reading influence students' reading comprehension ability?
2. Does purposeful reading influence students' task motivation?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Purposeful Reading

Knuston (1997) stated "having a purpose means having a reason to read and approaching a text with a particular goal in mind" (p. 49). In other words, having a purpose while reading texts means that readers have explicit reasons to read a text.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Researchers stressed the importance of reading purpose, insisting that having reading purpose enhances learners' reading ability or comprehension, and fluent readers always recognize reading purposes while they are reading (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Carlisle & Rice, 2002).

Tovani (2005) mentioned that purposeful reading not only gives readers the power to classify information from texts but also makes them use strategies not to think about something unrelated to the text. More specifically, he made three suggestions to help readers attain a reading purpose: ask yourself how what you read is going to influence you; read differently depending on a particular purpose; and make an attentive effort to connect new facts to known facts. Hudson (2007) also emphasized the need of having reading purposes since readers more easily make a try to accomplish their goals while doing purposeful reading when reading purposes exist. He further insisted that purposes should be included as one of the organizing principles in L2 reading instruction. Similarly, Conner and Farr (2009) mentioned the merits of having purposes while reading and suggested asking "Important for what?" question could be one of the most important and basic strategies for creating a reading purpose (p. 56). Other experts (Brozo & Simpson, 2003; Irvin, Buehl, & Radcliffe, 2007) have advised that guiding students to extract important information from less important information, to read texts using different strategies, and to make an effort to understand texts could be an effective way of raising awareness of students' reading purposes.

Still, few empirical studies on the relationship between reading purposes and comprehension have been carried out over the world. Grabe (1989) investigated the effects of purposeful reading with four elementary school students. He revealed that students with reading purpose more accurately pointed out the place of goal-relevant information and gained higher comprehension scores. However, the findings are hard to be generalizable due to the small number of participants. Schraw and Dennison (1994) found that the texts pertinent to a reader's purpose were better recalled than those were not, suggesting the need to have a particular reading purpose for increasing the retention of reading materials. In order for learners to read successfully, they need to build up the ability to apply different reading processes for different purposes to their reading (Linderholm & van den Broek, 2002). Linderholm and van den Broek (2002) investigated whether L2 college students with different proficiency levels read differently depending on reading purposes. The results demonstrated that most students including lower level of readers could effectively change their reading process according to their reading purposes. On the other hand, Horiba (2000) demonstrated that L1 Japanese students adjusted their process to different purposes for reading while L2 Japanese students could not shift it to different reading purposes like L1 students, implying that L2 readers could have difficulties in changing their reading process

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

considering different purposes of reading.

2. Task Motivation

Motivation has been widely known as the catalyst that causes people to actively engage in diverse language learning processes (Agnesia, 2010; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Julkunen, 2001; Schumann, 1997). Task-related motivation was not an active research area in the L2 field in the past partly because motivation was considered a stable learner trait. However, L2 learning motivation has come to be viewed more dynamic and changing one depending on the tasks learners are engaged in (Dörnyei, 2000, 2002; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998; Kormos & Csizér, 2008; Vandergrift, 2005). Task motivation was first introduced in the L2 field by Julkunen (1989, 2001), who posited that L2 learners' motivation was made up of both generalized (*e.g., learning situations*) and task-specific (*e.g., written vocabulary tasks*) motives. Learners with similar generalized motivation would display different levels of task motivation according to the characteristics of tasks they participated in. Thus, L2 educators need to spend time and effort in figuring out adequate ways of enhancing learners' task-specific motivation in instructional settings.

There has been little research on the relationship between task motivation and L2 learning, especially reading. Nurmi and Aunola (2005) studied the effects of task-specific motivation with six- and seven-year-old children. They found that students who had low subject-related motivation made less progress in learning outcomes of the subject. Agnesia (2010) examined the features affecting task-motivation in English for academic purpose learning contexts. Based on previous research findings, she assumed that students' task motivation could be predicted by the following elements: autonomy, task value, relatedness, and competence. However, the results revealed that only task value and relatedness among the four predictors affected students' motivation, indicating the necessity of recognizing the importance of task and making it relevant to students' future needs.

In L2 reading tasks, Kuntson (1997) asserted that reading texts with a particular purpose plays an important role in enhancing readers' interest and motivation, which could lead to better comprehension. In Noji, Ford, and Silva's (2009) study, which investigated the relationship between purposeful reading and difficulty perception, the participants in the purposeful reading activity group perceived reading passages less difficult. Recently, Ma and Cho (2014) explored the effects of purposeful task presentation on L2 learners' task motivation and grammar acquisition. In their study, L2 learners in the purposeful task presentation group displayed higher grammar knowledge gains, implying that one way of increasing learners' motivation and learning outcomes

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

could be presenting a given task with a clear purpose. Although previous studies may indicate the potential benefits of having reading purposes on learners' motivation and possibly comprehension (Kim, 2008; Ma & Cho, 2014; Noji, Ford, & Silva, 2009; Yang, 2009), they are not still directly linked to the relationship between purposeful reading and task motivation. Thus, it can be worth to conducting empirical research to deliver more practical pedagogical implications in L2 educational settings.

III. METHODS

1. Participants

Fifty eight 3rd-year middle school students entering a high school in the 2014 school year participated in this study. Their average age was 15.4 years old, ranging from 14 years 1 month old to 15 years 11 months old. They were all from six middle schools in Cholla province, South Korea. They have been studying English for about 7.2 years in public educational settings, most of whom started studying it when they were in the third year of elementary school. They were randomly assigned into two classes. One class was the purposeful reading group (hereafter purpose group) with 26 students and the other was the no reading purpose group (hereafter no-purpose group) with 32 students. All the participants took the 2014 high school entrance exam, and their English reading proficiency showed no statistically significant difference (p=.125), demonstrating that the two groups were initially homogeneous in terms of English reading ability. One of the researchers, who has been teaching English in secondary school settings over 15 years, taught both of the groups over the experimental period.

2. Instruments

1) Questionnaires

Three questionnaires (background questionnaire, general motivation questionnaire, and task motivation questionnaire) were utilized. First, a background questionnaire asked the students' experiences in English-speaking countries, age, gender, and years of studying English. Next, in order to check students' general level of motivation toward English learning, a general motivation questionnaire was used in the current study. The questionnaire was originally developed by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) to measure students' motivational disposition in relation to their L2 (English in this study) course. The questionnaire checked students' general attitudes toward English course (9 items),

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

linguistic self confidence (8 items) and L2 classroom anxiety (3 items). The last one examined students' task motivation with a total of 21 items, extracted from the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI). The IMI was developed by Guay, Vallerand, and Blanchard (2000) to measure learners' task-specific motivation. In this study we used seven categories with three items each to see whether the participants would exhibit different levels of task motivation after engaging in either purposeful or non-purposeful reading tasks. The seven categories of task motivation were as follows: perceived choice (*e.g., I do this activity because I want to.*), perceived competence (*e.g., I am pretty skilled at this task.*), perceived relatedness (*e.g., I feel close to my task partner.*), external regulation (*e.g., I am supposed to do this task.*), identified regulation (*e.g., I do this task for my own good.*), intrinsic motivation (*e.g., I do this task because I feel good when doing this task.*), and intention to persist (*e.g., If I had an opportunity, I would continue doing a similar task.*). All questionnaire items were made up in Korean so as not to make the students confused because of English itself when they completed the questionnaires.

2) Reading materials

As for the texts related to purposeful reading, we extracted three articles from *The Teen Times* (www.teentimes.com), to which five reading comprehension (R/C) questions were attached. The first article was about robot surgery, the second article was about summertime, and the last one was about the reasons to study English. The following is detailed information about the three articles, which was gained by using the program Web VP Classic (www.lextutor.ca/vp/eng/).

a. The first article has 269 words (116+? word families, 150 types, and 268 tokens), consisting of 78.36% of 1K and 2K words. The Flesch-Kincaid Grade (FKG) Level[1] is 12.99.
b. The second article consists of 313 words (147+? word families, 200 types, and 312 tokens), and has 85.25% of 1K and 2K words. The FKG Level is 10.23.
c. The third article is made up of 409 words (149+? Word families, 193 types, and 379 tokens), containing 91.55% of 1K and 2K words. The FKG Level is 12.92.

As for data analyses, the SPSS 18.0 program was used and the significance level was set at .05, nondirectional.

[1] The FKG level stands for reading level. The FKG level 1 means that the text fits with first grade students, and the FKG level 10 means that the text is appropriate for tenth grade students.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

3. Procedures

First, we checked the participants' background information such as their experiences in English-speaking countries, age, gender, and years of studying English using a background questionnaire. Shortly after completing the background questionnaire, the participants were required to fill out a general motivation questionnaire to examine their attitudes toward the English course, linguistic self confidence, and L2 classroom anxiety.

During the experiments, the two groups were asked to read three articles extracted from *The Teen Times*. However, the purpose group was given directions and instructions on how to read the texts or on what to read and was asked to understand the whole text, focusing on the following questions (see Table 1), while the no-purpose group was just asked to read the articles and solved the accompanying comprehension questions without receiving any further directions. While the purpose group was reading the articles, the instructor kept reminding them of the reading purposes. Different times were assigned to each article considering the length and difficulty of the articles. Both of the groups were allowed to use an English dictionary when they encountered unfamiliar words while they were reading. After reading, they were asked to solve five reading comprehension (R/C) questions. When they answered R/C questions, they could refer to the texts again. As soon as they finished answering R/C questions, they carried out a task motivation questionnaire. The two groups did all of the above-mentioned process once a week for three weeks.

TABLE 1
Questions Given to the Purpose Group

Title of articles	Questions
Robot surgery	What is the best title of the above text?
	What is the da Vinci?
	What are the advantages and disadvantages of robotic surgery?
	What is the author's position toward the robotic surgery?
Summertime	Summarize the weather on August 12th and August 13th in 2013.
	What is the tropical night?
	When was the *Ipchu* in 2013?
	What was the weather like *on Ipchu*?
	What do students usually do in summer before fall semester?
The reasons to study English	What is the best title of the paragraph above?
	Why should we study English?
	What does the writer think is a better way to master English?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Students' English Proficiency and General Motivational State

As shown in Table 2, the purpose group gained slightly higher scores than the no-purpose group on the 2014 high school entrance English exam. However the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (p=.125, F=.570) and we assumed that the two groups were initially homogeneous in terms of their English reading proficiency.

TABLE 2
Results of 2014 High School Entrance Exam (English)

Group	*N*	M	*SD*	F	*Sig.*
Purpose group	26	21.000	4.100	.570	.125
No-purpose group	32	19.313	4.169		
p<.05					(Max=26)

Table 3 presents the two groups' general motivational state. As for attitudes towards English, which consists of nine items, only one item, "*Learning English at school is a burden for me",* indicated a significant difference (p=.009). This implies the learners in no-purpose group tend to feel more burden when they studied English than the purpose group ones. Although the purpose group showed slightly more positive attitudes towards the English course in eight items out of nine than the no-purpose group, the overall difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (p=.434), confirming a similar level of general motivational state regarding English course attitudes. In light of linguistic confidence, which contains eight items, no significant difference was found between the two groups (p=.874) even though there existed slight mean differences. In the category of the L2 classroom anxiety, the two groups exhibit a similar level of anxiety (p=.562) same as the results of course attitudes and linguistic confidence. The purpose group seemed to be a bit more worried about making mistakes in English class than the no-purpose group while the no-purpose group appeared to feel a bit more nervous and mind their classmates' laughing. However, overall, the numerical mean differences were not significant. To sum up, the two groups displayed about the equivalent level of English proficiency and general motivational state initially.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

TABLE 3
Participants' General Motivational State Questionnaire

Items	Purpose		No-purpose		*Sig.*	Partial η^2
	M	*SD*	M	*SD*		
1. I wish we had more English lessons at school.	4.154	1.317	3.938	1.076	.494	.008
2. I like English lessons.	4.153	1.287	3.750	.950	.175	.033
3. English is one of my favorite subjects at school.	3.769	1.478	3.313	1.061	.177	.032
4. When the English lesson ends, I often wish it could continue.	3.346	1.198	3.000	1.107	.259	.023
5. I want to work hard in English lessons to make my teacher happy.	4.000	1.549	4.219	1.337	.566	.004
6. I enjoy my English lessons because what we do is neither too hard nor too easy.	3.692	1.258	3.218	1.184	.146	.037
7. I would rather spend time on subjects other than English. (REVERSED)	3.154	1.008	3.656	1.260	.105	.046
8. Learning English at school is a burden for me. (REVERSED)	2.962	1.076	3.750	1.136	.009	.115
9. In English lessons, we are learning things that will be useful in the future.	4.654	1.129	4.250	1.270	.211	.028
Total	**3.765**	**1.346**	**3.677**	**1.214**	**.434**	**.011**
10. I feel I am making progress in English.	4.077	.977	3.875	1.129	.475	.009
11. I believe I will receive good grades in English.	3.385	1.235	3.531	1.107	.636	.004
12. I often experience a feeling of success in my English lessons.	3.923	1.294	3.656	1.285	.436	.011
13. I am sure that one day I will be able to speak English.	4.692	1.350	4.781	1.313	.801	.001
14. In English lessons, I usually understand what to do and how to do it.	3.885	1.243	3.875	.905	.973	.033
15. I think I am good at learning English.	3.385	.852	3.218	.751	.434	.008
16. I am worried about my ability to do well in English. (REVERSED)	4.769	1.177	4.781	1.129	.969	.000
17. I often volunteer to do speaking presentations in English lessons.	2.846	.925	3.094	1.088	.361	.015
Total	**3.870**	**1.284**	**3.851**	**1.240**	**.874**	**.001**
18. I get very worried if I make mistakes during English lesson.	4.192	1.721	4.031	1.713	.724	.002
19. I am afraid that my classmates will laugh at me when I speak in English lessons.	2.808	1.300	3.250	1.481	.237	.025
20. I feel more nervous in English class than in my other classes.	3.615	1.329	3.750	1.459	.718	.002
Total	**3.538**	**1.552**	**3.677**	**1.573**	**.562**	**.006**

Note: 1~9 for course attitudes, 10~17 for linguistic self-confidence, and 18~20 for L2-classroom anxiety

2. Purposeful Reading and Reading Comprehension Ability

The first research question asked the effects of purposeful reading on the students' R/C ability. The participants of the two groups were required to read an article from *The Teen Times* once a week for three weeks, total three articles over the experimental period. Each article included five R/C questions, totally amounting to 15 R/C questions and every question was scored one point each. The comprehension test results were presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4 demonstrates that there existed a significant difference among the three R/C tests (F=35.437 and p=.000), but the interaction effect between reading comprehension and groups was not observed with a p-value of .116. The results also showed a significant difference between the purpose and no-purpose groups with a p-value of .003, implying positive effects of purposeful reading on L2 reading comprehension. Plus, the effect size (i.e., Partial η^2) of the group difference was .148, indicating that purposeful reading substantially affected R/C ability.

TABLE 4
Repeated Measures ANOVA Results of R/C Tests

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	F	*Sig.*	Partial η^2
R/C	59.106	2	29.553	25.437	.000	.312
R/C*Group	5.106	2	2.553	2.198	.116	.038
Group	12.965	1	12.965	9.697	.003	.148

p<.05

In order to check where significant mean differences lie more clearly, each comprehension test score was compared. In the first R/C test, the purpose and the no-purpose groups showed a significant difference with mean scores of 4.077 and 3.188 respectively. Its p-value was .005 and its Partial η^2 was .135, meaning that the effect size was large. The third R/C test also displayed a significant difference between the two groups with the moderate effect size (Partial η^2=.073). However, no significant difference was observed in the second R/C test.

It can be interpreted that the easier the text difficulty level (The FKG Level of article one is 12.99 and the FKG Level of article two is 10.23, but the FKG Level of article three is 12.92.) is, the weaker the effects of the purposeful reading on reading comprehension ability might be. In other words, the second articles' text difficulty level was the lowest among the three articles and according the participants gained relatively high mean scores in the second R/C test and the two groups did not show any significant differences. However, the first and third articles had relatively higher text difficulty levels and the participants displayed considerably lower mean scores in the two R/C tests

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

compared to the second R/C test. In addition, significant group differences were exhibited in the two tests, suggesting that purposeful reading could play a more important role when reading texts are rather challenging for learners.

TABLE 5
Descriptive Statistics of R/C Tests

Test	Group	*N*	M	*SD*	*Sig.*	Partial η^2
R/C Test 1	Purpose	26	4.077	.845	.005	.135
	No-purpose	32	3.188	1.330		
	Total	58	3.586	1.214		
R/C Test 2	Purpose	26	4.577	.902	.755	.002
	No-purpose	32	4.500	.950		
	Total	58	4.534	.922		
R/C Test 3	Purpose	26	3.462	1.029	.040	.073
	No-purpose	32	2.781	1.362		
	Total	58	3.086	1.261		

$p<.05$

3. Purposeful Reading and Task Motivation

As for the second research question, "Does purposeful reading influence students' task motivation?" was raised. In order to answer this question, we surveyed the two groups' task-specific motivation three times by using the same task motivation questionnaire right after each R/C check-up.

TABLE 6
Descriptive Statistics of Task Motivation

Category	Group	*N*	TM-1		TM-2		TM-3	
			M	*SD*	M	*SD*	M	*SD*
PCH	Purpose	26	4.718	1.080	4.551	1.124	4.346	1.017
	No-purpose	32	4.125	1.154	4.052	1.293	4.063	1.272
PCO	Purpose	26	3.551	1.112	3.744	1.189	3.705	1.082
	No-purpose	32	3.292	1.151	3.417	.937	3.271	1.090
PR	Purpose	26	5.141	1.203	4.962	1.222	4.949	1.056
	No-purpose	32	4.417	1.228	4.490	1.066	4.323	1.192
ER	Purpose	26	4.564	1.223	4.615	1.072	4.513	.922
	No-purpose	32	4.292	1.175	4.406	1.175	4.458	1.075
IR	Purpose	26	5.295	1.058	4.962	.973	4.897	.891
	No-purpose	32	4.729	1.128	4.563	1.320	4.563	1.212
IM	Purpose	26	4.641	1.206	4.295	1.046	4.244	1.186
	No-purpose	32	3.594	1.202	3.729	1.071	3.802	1.166
IP	Purpose	26	4.936	.985	4.808	.994	4.744	.932
	No-purpose	32	4.427	1.131	4.240	1.083	4.156	1.208

$p<.05$ **Note**: PCH stands for perceived choice, PCO for perceived competence, PR for perceived relatedness, ER for external regulation, IR for internal regulation, IM for intrinsic motivation, and IP for intention to persist.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Table 6 exhibits the descriptive statistics of each task motivation. Interestingly, the purpose group showed numerically higher mean scores than the no-purpose group in all subcategories of task motivation across every task motivation questionnaire. To see whether or not there was any significant difference between the two groups in terms of subcategories of task motivation, MANOVAs were administrated for the task motivation scales. The results are shown in Tables 7 and 8. The findings showed that the two groups had significantly different levels of task motivation across all the task motivation subcategories except for one, external regulation (*e.g., I am supposed to do this task.; This task is something that I have to do.; I feel that I have to do this task.*). This result makes sense in that completing the given tasks was one of the important course requirements to all the participants whether they belonged to purpose group or no-purpose group. Since the participants in both of the groups were not given a choice to do or not to do the task, the two groups might feel they had to do the task obligatorily, revealing showing no difference between the groups. That is, the students felt the same level of pressure to carry out the tasks partly because of the compulsory characteristics of the tasks. Unlike the external regulation category, the other six categories showed significant differences between the purpose group and no-purpose group, meaning the purpose group was more motivated than the no-purpose group while engaging in the assigned reading tasks. The effect sizes of each category were generally moderate or large.

Overall, the results of task motivation questionnaire tell us the benefits of purposeful reading in educational settings. Students' task motivation is likely to be enhanced when they have rather clear reading purposes since the reading purposes give L2 learners a direction on why and how they read. Even though the two groups displayed very similar level of general motivation toward English learning initially, their level of task motivation was very different in the current study. This implies that L2 educators need to provide students reading purposes or opportunities of thinking about reading purposes in order to enhance students' tasks-specific motivation.

TABLE 7
MANOVA Results of Task Motivation

			Value	F	Hypo. *df*	*Error df*	*Sig*	Partial η^2
TM-1	Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.029	790.894	7	166	.000	.971
	Group	Wilks' Lambda	.089	5.611	7	166	.000	.191
TM-2	Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.027	846.233	7	166	.000	.973
	Group	Wilks' Lambda	.902	2.568	7	166	.015	.098
TM-3	Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.026	899.373	7	166	.000	.974
	Group	Wilks' Lambda	.878	3.283	7	166	.003	.122

$p<.05$

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

TABLE 8
Results of Group Comparison on Task Motivation Questionnaire

Category	Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	F	*Sig*	Partial η^2
PCH	Between groups	27.152	1	27.152	19.849	.000	.037
	Within groups	711.317	56	1.368			
	Total	738.469	57				
PCO	Between groups	14.949	1	14.949	12.551	.000	.024
	Within groups	619.319	56	1.191			
	Total	634.268	57				
PR	Between groups	47.626	1	47.626	35.300	.000	.064
	Within groups	701.584	56	1.349			
	Total	749.211	57				
ER	Between groups	4.122	1	4.122	3.330	.069	.006
	Within groups	643.757	56	1.238			
	Total	647.879	57				
IR	Between groups	24.231	1	24.231	19.226	.000	.034
	Within groups	655.371	56	1.260			
	Total	679.602	57				
IM	Between groups	60.548	1	60.548	45.675	.000	.081
	Within groups	689.329	56	1.326			
	Total	749.877	57				
IP	Between groups	39.732	1	39.732	34.753	.000	.063
	Within groups	594.492	56	1.143			
	Total	634.224	57				

$p<.05$

V. CONCLUSION

We examined the effects of purposeful reading on students' reading comprehension (R/C) ability and task motivation. To do this, we first investigated whether purposeful reading affects students' R/C ability through the use of three sets of R/C tests after purposeful and no-purposeful reading respectively. The results indicated that the purpose and the no-purpose group did exhibit significant differences, revealing positive effects of purposeful reading, especially in reading materials with higher text difficulty. It could be inferred that students tended to pay more attention to understanding the assigned texts when they read with a special purpose in mind than when they did not.

With regard to the effects of purposeful reading on the students' task motivation, the purpose group students showed higher level of task motivation than the no-purpose group ones in most of the subcategories except for the category of external regulation. These results are particularly interesting considering that the two group learners had the equivalent level of general motivation toward English learning initially. In other words, the participants demonstrated different levels of task-specific motivation depending on the types of reading (purposeful vs. non-purposeful reading) they engaged in. These results suggested that students' motivation level could be changed depending on

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

different tasks conditions, and providing clear (reading) purposes could be one of the simple but effective ways of increasing students' motivation.

Based on the findings of the current research, we could say that purposeful reading has a positive influence on R/C ability and task motivation especially in dealing with challenging reading tasks. To get a clearer picture whether or not having reading purpose has effects on reading comprehension and task motivation, further experimental studies with larger sample sizes would be needed. However, this study is meaningful in that it provides teachers and learners with one of the possible ways of improving reading comprehension ability and enhancing task-specific motivation in educational settings.

REFERENCES

Agnesia, R. H. (2010). Features affecting task-motivation in English for academic purposes online learning. *Second Language Studies, 29*(1), 1-34.

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

Anderson, N. J. (2014). Developing Engaged Second Language Readers. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 170-188). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning

Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. (1991). *Secondary school reading*. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.) Handbook of reading research 2 (pp. 951-983). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Brozo, W., & Simpson, M. (2003). *Readers, teachers, learners*: *Expanding literacy across the content areas* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle Reive, NJ: Merrill.

Carlisle, J., & Rice, M. (2002). *Improving reading comprehension*: *Research-based principles and practices*. Baltimore: York Press.

Conner, J. M., & Farr, R. (2009). Purposeful reading at the middle level. *Principal*, *88*(4), 56-57.

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation in action: Towards a process-oriented conceptualization of student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*, 519-538.

Dörnyei, Z. (2002). The motivational basis of language learning tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 137-158). Philadelphia, PA: John Bengamins.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandment for motivating language students: results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, *2*, 203-229.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics (Thames Valley University, London), 4*, 43-69.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Grabe, M. (1989). Evaluation of purposeful reading skills in elementary-age students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(4), 628-630.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. (2000). On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The situational motivation scale (SIMS). *Motivation and Emotion*, *24*, 175-213.

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dornyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*, 55-77.

Horiba, Y. (2000). Reader control in reading: Effects of language competence, text type, and task. *Discourse Processes*, *29*, 223-267.

Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching Second Language Reading*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Irvin, J., Buehl, D., & Klemp, R. (2007). *Strategies to enhance literacy and learning in middle school content area classrooms*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Julkunen, K. (1989). *Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign language learning and teaching*. Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu Publications in Education.

Julkunen, K. (2001). Situation-and task-specific motivation in foreign language learning. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 29-41). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Kim, K. J. (2008). Motivation to read in EFL college classrooms. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(3), 95-113.

Knutson, E. M. (1997). Reading with a purpose: Communicative reading tasks for the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(1), 49-57.

Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language Learning, 58*, 327-355.

Linderholm, T., & van den Broek, P. (2002). The effects of reading purpose and working memory capacity on the processing of expository text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*, 778-784.

Lorch, J., Kluzewitz, M., & Lorch, E. (1995). Distinctions among reading situations. In R. Lorch & E. O'Brien (Eds.), *Sources of coherence in reading* (pp. 375-398). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Ma, J. H., & Cho, Y. A. (2014). The role of task presentation in L2 college students' task motivation and English grammar acquisition, *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 13*, 21-40.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Noji, F., Ford, S., & Silva, A. (2009). Purposeful reading. In R. Cohen (Ed.), *Explorations in second language reading* (pp. 7-24). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to speakers of Other Languages.

Nurmi, J., & Aunola, K. (2005). Task-motivation during the first school years: A person-oriented approach to longitudinal data. *Language and Instruction*, *15*, 103-122.

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). The effect of reader purpose on interest and recall. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *26*, 1-17.

Schumann, J. H. (1997). *The neurobiology of affect in language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Swanborn, M., & de Glopper, K. (2001). Impact of reading purpose on incidental word learning from context. *Language Learning*, *52*, 95-117.

Tovani, C. (2005). The power of purposeful reading. *Educational Leadership*, *63*(2), 48-51.

Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics, 26*, 70-89.

Yang, E-M. (2009). Korean EFL learners' reading motivation and their L2 reading behavior. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(4), 217-235.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary

Youngsu Kim
145-6 Uibyeong-ro, Changpyeong-myeon, Damyang-gun, Chonnam 517-883
Tel: (061) 380-5243
Email: kimys606@hanmail.net

Jee Hyun Ma
Department of English Education, Chonnam National University
77 Yongbong-ro, Buk-gu, Gwangju 500-757, Korea
Tel: (062) 530-2445
Email: jeehyun@jnu.ac.kr

Received in April 15th, 2014
Reviewed in May 26th, 2014
Revised version received in June 5th, 2014

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre