MOTIVATION CHARACTERISTICS OF USING ARTISTIC LITERATURE SOURCES IN TEACHING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TO PHILOLOGICAL STUDENTS.

Karimova Madina Khusniddinovna
Tashkent State University of Economics
+99897 706 00 96
madinka060896@gmail.com
https://doi.org/ 10.5281/zenodo.7061512

Annotation: In this article, the motivational features of the use of literary sources in teaching English to students of the philological direction are discussed, as well as the reflections in various literatures.

Keywords: book reading, Educational Implications, RAI, national database.

Students' reading amount and breadth contribute substantially to several valued aspects of their achievement and performance, such as reading achievement, world knowledge, and participation in society. Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding (1988) found that the amount of independent out-of-school reading accounted for 16% of the variance in the reading comprehension of fifth graders, after general activity levels were controlled. Similarly, Stanovich and Cunningham (1992) found that amount and breadth of reading predicted reading achievement, as indicated by standardized vocabulary tests, even after previous general intelligence was controlled. Both Anderson et al. and Cipielewski and Stanovich (1992) found that the amount of reading predicted growth of reading achievement during elementary school on different measures of reading comprehension (Cipielewski & Stanovich, 1992). Children's reading amount and breadth contribute to their knowledge of the world, including knowledge of information such as the size of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget, who were allies in World War II, and the distinctions among various religious beliefs (Stanovich & Cunningham, 1993). Individuals who read frequently also Allan Wigfield and John T. Guthrie, Department of Human Development, University of Maryland College Park. Portions of this paper were reported at the 1994 meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana. The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD 117A2007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U. S. Department of Education Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Allan Wigfield, Department of Human Development, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to participate more in their communities. Guthrie Schafer, and Hutchinson (1991), using a national database, found that amount of reading predicted participation in community organizations, after home background and level of schooling were controlled. We thus were interested in developing a theoretical and empirical account of amount and breadth of reading, and focused on

motivation for reading as an important contributor to amount and breadth of reading.

We took a motivational focus because motivation determines why individuals do (ordo not) choose to do different activities (see Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele, in press). Because researchers still do not know a great deal about the nature of motivation specifically for reading, our first task was to conceptualize and then measure reading motivation. We began with the notion that there are a variety of motives relevant to engaging in reading activity (see Baker, Afflerbach, & Reinking, 1996; Guthrie, McGough, Bennett, & Rice, 1996; Oldfather & Wigfield,1996).

The Reading Activity Inventory (RAI). The RAI (Guthrie, McGough, & Wigfield, 1994) is a measure of the breadth andfrequency of students* reading. Questions on the RAI ask students whether they read during the last week different lands of reading material both in and out of school (e.g., different kinds of books, newspapers, comics, as well as books in general). If the child says he or she read a given kind of book in the last week, he or she then is asked to give its title. The child then is asked to indicate how often he or she reads that kind of book, responding on a 1 to 4 scale from almost never to almost every day. The RAI was administered directly after the MRQ, by the same administrators. A shortened version was used in this study, asking children about the following kinds of reading materials: comics, magazines, newspapers, books, mystery books, sports books, adventure books, and nature books. The children were told that they were going to answer some questions about what they read and how often they read for fun. They did one practice question, and then completed the RAI. It took children 5 to 10 min to complete the RAI. To gauge the breadth of children's book reading for fun, we created a composite scale of the five items asking about book reading (books, mystery books, sports books, adventure books, and nature books).2 Although there is no traditional reliability for this measure, the fall and spring administrations of the measure correlated .54 ($p < .001$), suggesting a substantial level of stability in the measure. Out of School Reading Amount. We obtained the number of hours each child in the study read outside of school for the 1991-1992 and 1992-1993 school years. This information was provided by the media specialist in the school. Children at the school participated in a special reading program geared toward increasing how much they read outside of school. When students read 30 hours outside of school over the course of a year their names are placed on a large map displayed prominently in the school. All students reading between 30 and 100 hours get recognized at the end of the year at a school assembly. They also receive a free paperback book. Students reading 100 hours or more outside of school receive additional books and prizes. The 16 top students received a personalized tour of the White House, and the student reading the most received a hard back book valued up to $20. Students at the participating school volunteered to participate in the special reading program; during the year of the study approximately 85% of the students participated. All the students in this study were in the program. All participating students took home logs on which parents recorded the number of minutes (recorded in quarter hour increments) the student read each day outside of school, up to a maximum of 2 hours per day on school nights and 4 hours on Saturday and Sunday. All kinds of reading materials could be included in the reading logs, as could the time parents or siblings read to the child. However, homework time did not count as outside reading time, nor did reading at school. The parents signed the logs to ensure their accuracy. The times were recorded for all 7 days of the week,

beginning in the middle of September and ending in mid-May. Parents returned the logs to the school every 2 weeks, and the media specialist recorded them. A summary of this information provided our measure of the amount of children's reading (we were not given the individual biweekly logs). In the absence of other indicators of measurement reliability, we correlated the diary data from the 2 years. The correlation was .59 ($p < .001$), indicating substantial stability for this indicator.

The average number of hours children spent reading during the 1991-1992 school year (the year before the study) was 58.88 (SD = 54.83), and in the 1992-1993 school year the average was 73.59 (SD = 84.14). We converted the hours per school year figures into minutes per day, using the 8-month time period over which the special reading program occurred (and assuming 30 days per month). For 1991-1992, children's mean minutes read per day was 14.72 min per day (SD = 13.71); the median minutes per day was 11.12. For 1992-1993, children's mean minutes read per day was 18.40 (SD — 21.03); the median minutes read per day was.

Educational Implications

Because one central goal of educators is to optimize children's engagement in learning activities, the findings pertaining to predictors of child engagement are particularly relevant. Two tentative conclusions can be drawn from this study.

First, both teacher contingency and involvement seem to play a role in supporting children's engagement in learning activities. Contingency provides the structure within which children can learn "what it takes" to do well in school. The

experience of highly contingent teacher behavior is associated with positive control beliefs regarding academic outcomes. Teacher noncontingencyis related to beliefs organized around powerful others, luck, or unknown strategies. At the same time, teacher involvement is associated with children's beliefsabout effort as an effective strategy and about the sells capacity to enact the most important strategies.

Second, this study pointed out the limitations of trying to explain engagement in terms of only one variable, in this case, perceived control. Although predicted relations between perceived control and engagement were found, the amount of

variance in engagement explained remains relatively small. The small net effects of the promoting and undermining beliefs are due in part to their moderately negative correlation.

However, other self-system processes may be essential for a full understanding of the dynamics of engagement. Two other processes that have been suggested by the larger model guiding this study are children's perceived autonomy (Connell &

Ryan, 1984; Ryan & Connell, 1989) and their feelings of relatedness to others in the classroom, such as teachers (Connell, in press; Connell & Wellborn, in press). For example, one could postulate that all three sets of self-system processes

References:

1. Abramson, L. Y., & Alloy,L. B. (1980).Judgement of contingency:
Errors and their implications. In A. Baum & J. Singer (Eds.),
Advances in environmental psychology: Vol.
2. Applications of personal control (pp. 111-130).Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978).

3. Learnedhelplessnessin humans:Critique and reformulation.Journal ofAbnormal Psychology, 87, 49-74. Bandura, A. (1977).
4. Self-efficacy:Towarda unifiedtheory of behavioral change.Psychological Review, 84, 191-215. Chapman, M., Skinner, E. A., & Baltes, P. B. (1990).
5. Interpreting correlations between children's perceived control and cognitive performance: Control, agency, or means-ends beliefs? Developmental Psychology, 26, 244-251.