

Gender Based Study of Relationship Between Motivation for Reading and Motivation for Learning in University Students

Asghar Ali Shah¹, Saad Waqas Ahmad² and Muhammad Ali Shah³

International Islamic University Islamabad

The study investigated the relationship between motivation for learning and motivation for reading among university students. A convenient sample of N=300 male and female students was drawn from Punjab University Lahore, Pakistan with age range of 18 to 23 years. Two questionnaires, Motivation for Reading and Motivated strategies for learning were administered on the sample. Results indicates that female students were significantly higher on both, motivation for learning and motivation for reading as compared to male students. Correlational analysis revealed a significant and positive relationship between motivation for learning and motivation for reading. Finally, linear regression analysis revealed that reading motivation is a significantly predictor of learning motivation.

Keywords: gender, reading motivations and learning motivations

Relationship between reading and learning is very general concept and plays very important role in student life. Students who are highly motivated for reading will also be highly motivated for learning the new concept, methods, ways of life, technologies, researchers etc. reading and learning are interrelated and that/s why high motivation for reading may lead towards high motivation for learning. Students who read well may be in a better position to understand and learn as well. It is the curiosity of reading new concepts of leader that will make him/ her successful learner.

Reading is the process of constructing meaning from written text .It is a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad

²MS Scholar, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad

³MS Scholar, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad

sources of information (Anderson, 1985). Reading is the process of constructing meaning through the dynamic interaction among the readers existing knowledge, the information suggested by the text being read and the context of the reading situation (Wixson, Peters, Weber and Roeber, 1987).

Reading and learning are interdependence while reading necessitates linguistic knowledge expansion. Rigney (1978) found reciprocal relationship between reading and learning. Rigney has aptly observed that highly motivated learners use a variety of strategies to assist them with the acquisition, storage and retrieval of information. Techniques that help the learner to remember and retrieve information are referred to as memory strategies. These include creating mental images through grouping and associating semantic mapping, using key words, employing word association and placing new words into a context. Compensation strategies include skills such as inference, guessing while reading or using referral materials such as dictionary. Metacognitive strategies are behaviors undertaken by the learner to plan, arrange and evaluate their own learning. Such strategies include directed attention and self-evaluation, organization, setting goals and objectives, seeking practice opportunities and so forth. In the context of reading, self-monitoring and correction of errors are further examples of metacognitive strategies. Affective strategies such as self-encouraging behaviors to lower anxiety and encouraging learning.

Hosenfeld (1977) has identified a differential pattern of reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful learners which provide a string rationale for the present study. He observed that the successful motivated reader kept the meaning of the passage in mind while reading read in broad phrases, skipped inconsequential or less important words and have a positive self-concept as a reader. The unsuccessful, not motivated reader on the other hand, lost the meaning of the sentences when decoded, read in short phrases, pondered over inconsequential words, seldom skipped words as important and have a negative self-concept.

Block (1986) used a think aloud procedure in her study of no proficient reader from which she was able to obtain information about characteristics, namely integration, recognition of aspects of text structure, use of general knowledge, personal experiences and associations and response in extensive versus reflexive modes which differentiated successful, motivated from less successful not motivated and non-proficient readers. Both high and low scoring readers appeared to be using

the same kind of strategies while answering the comprehension questioned on both measures; however high scoring students seemed to be applying strategies more effectively and appropriately. Anderson (1991) in his study indicated that strategic reading is not only a matter of knowing which strategies to use, but in addition, the reader must know how to apply strategies successfully. Garner, (1987), Waxman and Padron, (1987) found that younger and less motivated proficient students use fewer strategies and use them less effectively in their reading comprehension. Paris and Meyers (1981) found that successful motivated readers know when and how to apply reading strategies on a given task.

Hypotheses

1. There would be a significant relationship between motivation for reading and motivation for learning.
2. Reading motivation would be a significant predictor of learning motivation.
3. Female student would be significantly higher on reading motivation as compared to male students.
4. Female student would be significantly higher on learning motivation as compared to male students.

Method

Sample

A convenient sample of 300 male and female students in equal number is taken from University of the Punjab Lahore Pakistan with age range of 22 to 30 years, the mean age was 25.76 years.

Tools

The Motivation for Reading Questionnaire developed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) containing 44 items with 7-point scale having test retest reliability of 0.69 to 0.97 was administered on the present sample. Motivated Strategies for learning Questionnaire by Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) containing two sections, measuring the student's goals and value beliefs, and meta cognitive strategies was also administered.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics the Study Variables (N=300)

Variables	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
MSLQ	217.06	24.60	124.00	286
MRQ	154.31	17.01	104.00	210

Note: MSLQ = Motivation for Learning Questionnaire, MRQ = Motivation for Reading Questionnaire

Table 2

Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the Questionnaires (N= 300)

Variables	No of Items	Alpha
MSLQ	44	.83
MRQ	54	.75

Note: MSLQ = Motivation for Learning Questionnaire, MRQ = Motivation for Reading Questionnaire

Table 3

Pearson Correlation between Learning and Reading Motivation

	Variables	1	2
1	MSLQ	-	0.76
2	MRQ		

Note: MSLQ = Motivation for Learning Questionnaire, MRQ = Motivation for Reading Questionnaire

Table 4

Linear Regression for Motivation for Learning

Predictors	B	SE(B)	B	R ²	F
Constant	45.56	.41			
MSLQ	1.55	.46	0.31	0.55	12.73

Note: MSLQ = Motivation for Learning Questionnaire, MRQ = Motivation for Reading Questionnaire

Table 5

Gender Differences in Motivation for Learning and Motivation for Reading (N=300)

Variables	Males (n=150)		Females (n=150)		t(296)	p	Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			
MSLQ	222.53	9.64	203.55	8.93	17.69	.001	2.04
MRQ	160.85	7.62	141.33	8.17	17.72	.001	2.47

Note: MSLQ = Motivation for Learning Questionnaire, MRQ = Motivation for Reading Questionnaire

Table 5 shows mean difference and standard deviation on the scores of motivation for learning and motivation for reading. The results reveals that males scored higher on motivation for learning and motivation for reading. The result shows highly significant $p < .001$ difference in the scores of males and females on motivation for learning and motivation for reading.

Discussion

The first hypothesis of the study stated that there would be a significant relationship between motivation for reading and motivation for learning. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient revealed a significant positive relationship between both the motivation, thus the hypothesis is supported by findings. Second hypothesis is suggested that reading motivation would be a significant predictor of learning motivation. Results of linear regression analysis again supported that reading motivation turned out to be the positive predictor of learning motivation. These findings suggest that students who are motivated for reading are also motivated for learning. Similar findings have been reported in literature where positive relationship between learning and reading achievement has been established (Block, 1986; Hosenfeld, 1977; Paris and Meyers, 1981).

The third and fourth hypotheses suggested that girls would be significantly higher on learning and reading motivation as compared to the boys. Findings from independent sample t- tests revealed that both of the hypotheses were supported. Girls were found to be more motivated for reading than the boys. These findings of the present study were also in line with the findings of McGeown, Goodwin, Henderson and Wright (2011) who reported that feminine identity was more closely related with many

different aspects of reading motivation than a masculine identity. They have further found that girls were significantly higher in intrinsic aspects of reading motivation than the boys.

The significant gender differences in motivation to learn and read can be attributed to gender related expectations and beliefs parents and teachers hold which become assimilated into student's own thoughts of self-competence, appropriates and the value they place in tasks. One's own sense of self competence can affect motivation. Which affect choice, behavior and effort. Children, who feel competent in a subject, are more motivated, try harder and are more cognitively engaged in the material. With high motivation and effort there also comes greater time on task and greater persistence of achievement, oriented behavior in the event of difficulty or failure.

References

- Anderson, N. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 460-472.
- Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*. 20(3), 463_494.
- Gaener, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. Norwood, NJ; Ablex.
- Jenile Blackstock.(1981) *Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test*. New York: Harcourt. Brace and World.
- McGeown. S., Goodwin, H., Henderson, N., and Wright, P. (2011). Gender differences in reading motivation: does sex or gender identity provide a better account. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 34 (4) 111-123.
- Oxford, R., and Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods findings and Instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73. 404_419.strategies of good and poor readers. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 13, 5-22.
- Rigeney, J.W. (1978). Learning strategies a theoretical prospective. In H.F. O;Neil (ed.),
- Paris, S. G. and Myers, M. (1981). Comprehension monitoring, memory and study *Learning Strategies*. New York Academic Press.
- Waxman. H. C and Padron, Y. (1987). *The effect of ESL students perceptions of their cognitive strategies on reading achievement*

.Presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational research Association, Dallas.

Williams, (1995) Verbal reports as data. Psychological Review, 87, 215-251.