The Adoption of Team-Based Learning to Enhance Reading Motivation in the Teaching of Linguistics

Ratiba KIHEL[1*], Riad BELOUAHEM[2]

1 Department of Letters and English, FrèresMentouri Constantine 1 University (Algeria), ratiba.kihel@umc.edu.dz
2 Department of Letters and English, FrèresMentouri Constantine 1 University (Algeria), riad.belouahem@hotmail.fr

Abstract

This study examines the effect of Team-Based learning on enhancing reading motivation in Linguistics for first year students . A Reading Motivation Questionnaire was administered prior the application of team-Based learning and after it in the teaching of Linguistics, to see whether this novel instructional strategy can effectively foster students' engagement with reading materials. The study included two groups : one experimental with 25 participants and another control with the same number. The findings showed that the majority of students have medium reading motivation, but when applying TBL, there was a significant increase in students' reading efficiency and there was also a major improvement in their intrinsic motivation, whereas a minor increase in their extrinsic motivation was noticed. The results provide insights for instructors about the triangular and changing nature and shape of reading motivation .that enable them to develop student's everlasting love for reading linguistic materials.

اعتماد التعلم القائم على الفريق لتعزيز دافع القراءة في تدريس اللغويات

ملخص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في تأثير التعلم القائم على الفريق على تعزيز دافع القراءة في اللغويات لطلاب السنة الأولى. تم إجراء استبيان تحفيز القراءة قبل تطبيق التعلم القائم على الفريق وبعد ذلك في تدريس اللغويات لمعرفة ما إذا كانت هذه الاستراتيجية التعليمية الجديدة يمكن أن تعزز بشكل فعال مشاركة الطلاب مع مواد القراءة. تضمنت الدراسة مجموعتين: واحدة تجريبية مع 25 مشاركًا والأخرى تحكم بنفس الرقم. أظهرت النتائج أن غالبية الطلاب لديهم دافع للقراءة المتوسطة، ولكن عند تطبيق التعلم القائم على الفريق ، كانت هناك زيادة كبيرة في كفاءة القراءة لدى الطلاب وكان هناك أيضًا تحسن كبير في دافعهم الجوهري، في حين لوحظت زيادة طفيفة في دوافعهم الخارجية. توفر النتائج رؤى للمدربين حول الطبيعة المثلثة والمتغيرة وشكل دافع القراءة، والتي تمكنهم من تطوير حب الطالب الأبدي لقراءة المواد اللغوية.

* Corresponding author. E-mail: ratiba.kihel@umc.edu.dz

I. Introduction

As a Linguistics instructor for more than ten years, I have noticed that the module / course of Linguistics seems to be boring and difficult to many first year learners. Though it is a vital one, but the way it is taught makes them feel demotivated and frightened especially when they are asked to read books about the linguistic concepts. In addition, The module contains dense lectures and is full of technical terminology. Therefore, by the end of the year, students expressed their disappointment by not attending the courses and getting bad marks.. This situation leads to ask many questions:

1- Which instructional method the teachers of Linguistics has to adopt to make first year students feel more motiv ated to read and less frightened?

2-How to make the Linguistics material more accessible and less engaging?

Based on the aforementioned questions, we hypothesize that if Team-Based learning is adopted in the teaching of Linguistics with its main ingredients: reading before class, lively team discussions, application activities, immediate feedback and mini lectures, students' reading motivation will be enhanced.

So, the implementation of Team-Based learning as a novel teaching tool in the teaching of Linguistics is a good solution but a real challenge to boost learners' motivation to read, study this module and recognize its crucial role in language programme, in general and in teaching English, in particular.

I.1.An Overview of Team-Based Learning

Dr. Larry Michaelsen was one of the pioneers of this fascinating, challenging and innovative strategy in the 1970's in USA to promote a special form of Collaborative learning. Herreid (2007, p187) states, "Team-Based learning is the brain child of Larry Michaelsen. It is a form of cooperative learning where permanent groups of students are used throughout the semester, there are no lectures, only team work. "The job of the teacher is to announce the learning end results, create tricky problems to figure out and investigate students' rationale in getting conclusions. So, TBL is time-consuming and needs more effort from the instructor (Hawkins, 2014). It is a daunting task to redesign the whole courses or teaching materials, to fit the novel strategy as Sibley and Ostafichuk (2014) explain that TBL isn't a way to apply in a current lecture course, it needs a thorough reconsideration of the whole course aims, a thoughtful rebuilding of course contents, and a determination to take that challenging dive into learner-centred teaching.

The true spirit of Team-Based Learning lies behind two main theories: the Constructivist theory and the Social Learning theory. The Constructivist theory led by Piaget (1970) and Vygotsky (1978) who advocate the idea that culture, as Piaget (1970, p34)points out," knowledge is not a copy of reality but a construction of the mind". So, the learner is a knowledge builder and learning is more successful and fruitful when he / she does most of the job in the learning process.

This exciting pedagogical tool moves the emphasis from traditional teacher- based approach, to a more student-centered approach. Learners are compelled to participate in the whole learning process and take responsibility for their own as well their team members actions and decisions. This TBL process is composed of four main stages:

- Pre-class Preparation

In this stage, learners are expected to learn the reading material before class and come ready. to participate in discussions and activities as Michaelsen, knight and Fink emphasize that, "effective pre-class preparation is essential for TBL, as it equips students with the foundational knowledge to engage in meaningful discussions and problem solving activities(2004, p18). The pre-class materials should be selected carefully, engaging and accessible to all learners. They can include: text book chapters, articles, videos- etc. This stage is the cornerstone of the learning process (Michelsen et al, 2004).

- Readiness Assurance

A series of activities, to be done individually first, then in teams, are given to the learners in this stage to make sure that pre-class material is well understood. Materials should be Carefully selected, engaging and accessible to all learners. This stage is critical in the learning process because it provides immediate feedback and shows problems of learners that require treatment (Michaelsen et al, 2004).

-Application Activities

Application activities are vital at this stage because they deepen learners' understanding and the learning process becomes lively and intense when learners are really capable of applying what they have learnt in different tasks, Michaelsen et al (2004) point out that the core of TBL is the practice phase where students immerse profoundly together in the content.

-Immediate feedback

Feedback is essential in the learning process, as it is given at multiple stages to ensure that learners are really able to capture their errors and correct them as well as their classmates ones. Immediate feedback and peer feedback develop a sense of responsibility among learners and fill in the gaps of the learning process (Falchikov, 2005).

One of the advantages of this method is that it deepens understanding of the content and increases scores of learners over the semester. Thompson et al (2007, p 6) explain, "Students in TBL courses performed better on exams and

demonstrated a deeper understanding of the material". TBL also boosts learners/students' motivation and engagement with team activities and immediate feedback. So, they feel more engaged, highly motivated and interested in course contents (Sibley and Spiridonoff, 2017). Team-Based learning fosters life-long learning as students read the material before class, help their peers, to answer activities and participate in discussions, apply what they have learnt, solve problems, and resolve conflicts(Hawkins, 2014).

At last, learning in teams is a powerful educational way that requires four main ingredients: pre-class preparation, readiness assurance, application activities and immediate feedback. It proves to be very efficient in enhancing learners' motivation, outcomes and collaborative skills. TBL stands out as the best method to follow by instructors who are in a permanent search of innovation and improvement of the quality of learning

1.2 Reading Motivation

Many definitions of reading motivation stress its multidimensional nature. Understanding the dimensions helps instructors find ways to promote learners' potent desire to read. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) define this psychological aspect a the person's own objective, values and opinions toward the themes, procedures, and final results of reading. This definition emphasizes external and internal factors as the first two dimensions to consider, while intrinsic motivation is the internal drive to read for pleasure, and self-satisfaction, the extrinsic one is the external rewards such as: grades, praise, punishment (Guthrie &Wigfield, 2000; Deci& Ryan, 1985).

According to Komiyama (2013), intrinsic motivation is further subdivided into three other dimensions : curiosity, involvement and challenge. He explains that Intrinsically motivated readers seek to obtain knowledge about, themes, related to their interest,, to encounter the enjoyment of reading interesting materials and to gain pleasure from handling, tricky, ideas from reading (2013). Extrinsic motivation, however, encompasses five other dimensions which are compliance, compliance, recognition for reading, social reasons and grades as he goes on saying, Extrinsically-motivated readers, thus, read to accomplish what is needed, excel classmates, gain good grades and appreciation from others, and show their readings to their peers (2013).Wigfield and Guthrie discuss two other aspects to internal drive to read which are the importance of reading and work avoidance in addition to curiosity, involvement and challenge (1997) .

For Bandura, reading motivation is influenced by another important dimension which is self-efficacy as he points out that students who think they have elevated abilities when they are definitely going to participate in the tasks of reading, they defy difficulties " (1997). So, efficacious students believe that they can read and understand any text even challenging one.

Baker and Wigfield (1999) give a complete view about reading motivation where they combine the three major dimensions in one definition by pointing out "Motivation for reading is multidimensional and includes both the desire to read and the confidence in one's ability, to read effectively(p 453). Therefore, major aspects of this aspect are self-efficiency, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. They are subdivided into minor dimensions as it is previously mentioned.

- Theoretical frameworks of Reading Motivation

Reading motivation is supported and explained by two prominent theories: Self-Determination theory and Expectancy - Value theory, the former assumes that humans have three essential emotional prerequisites: self-rule, competence and affinity. The first requirement relates to the feeling that people have when they act freely and go after their own interests and hobbies. The second is an individual' s evaluation of the effectiveness and success of his/her activity, and the third suggests that an individual must be able to interact with others in such a way that they can provide mutual help. So, when people feel that they can perform well in a reading activity, and they are free to select what they need, their motivation increases (Deci& Ryan, 1985).

The latter suggests that reading motivation is closely linked to the person's prospects to achieve and the importance they put to the reading activity (Wigfield and Eccles, 2002). According to this theory, motivation is the result of a person's hopes of win, and the perceived value of the activity. Expectancies are assessments of an individual's likelihood of successfully compeleting a task. Values refer to the tasks' or activities' worth. Expectancy belief means not only that persons will pass the examination, but also, that they have made steps to prepare for it. Expectations and values are both factors that drive motivation.

Indeed, there is no internal conflict between these theories, each can be viewed as attempting to explain different aspects of Reading Motivation.

-Strategies to Enhance Reaching Motivation

Reading motivation is an intricate psychological concept that needs different strategies to be fostered. Leaving the total freedom for learners to select what they read is the best strategy to boost motivation to read (Guthrie et al, 2004). Integrating the reading skill in different modules, or courses assist learners to give reading its right place and worth (Luke and Pearson, 2002). Encouraging learners to share reading with their peers is another motivational factor to increase their motivation to read (Wentzel, 1999). Implementing tools that encourage reading as a pivotal factor like: Team- Based learning to provide education with engaged and life-long learners (Burgerss, Macgregor, Mellis, 2014). This brief account of strategies can increase learners' reading motivation.

Reading is a crucial skill that should have a place in a curriculum. It is not just about understanding the gist of the text, but it is also about keeping and even increasing motivation to read. It is noteworthy that a well-organized teaching

process can foster learners' motivation in each module by understanding its dimensions and the theories that support such a construct and using different strategies.

II-Methods and Materials

The impact of Team-Based learning on reading motivation was evaluated using the Reading Motivation Questionnaire adapted from Guthrie and Wigfield (1997) original questionnaire. The RMQ is a kind of student's evaluation to gauge his/ her intensity when it comes to his/her desire to read. The original questionnaire contained 53 questions and measured 11 aspects / dimensions of reading motivation.

The adapted questionnaire contains 30 questions and measures 9 dimensions : reading efficiency, reading challenge, reading curiosity, reading involvement, the importance of reading, reading compliance, work avoidance, recognition in reading, social reasons for reading. The RMQ was distributed to two groups before and after of the application of Team-Based learning to assess changes in reading motivation. So, the RMQ was used as both a pre-test and post-test. It is a Likert scale that varies from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) .

The study was conducted in eight weeks in the department of English at frères Mentouri, Constantine 1 university. It involved 50 first year students randomly selected, distributed equally in two groups that are assigned to the teacher researcher from a population of 12 groups. Both groups received the same courses of Linguistics but taught using different instructional methods. It is noteworthy to say that Linguistics is taught once a week.

The RMQ was used because it is really a "valid and reliable questionnaire" as Guthrie and Wigfield(1999, p200) declare, the dimensions of reading motivations are considered as "facets of students motivation that can effect reading."Pressley(2002, p289). The division of the levels of students reading motivation presented in table 1 was taken from Marsela's research (2017) and adapted to this research according to the number of items. Furthermore; the scoring system followed that of Wigfield, Guthrie and Mcgough (1995).

The application of Team-Based learning followed the following steps. First, students were given the linguistic materials before class to read. Second, individual quizzes were given to teams to be answered again. Each quiz was made up of two activities. One activity was in a form of multiple choice questions and the other one is made up of 3 open-ended questions. Next, these quizzes were followed by immediate feedback and peer feedback. Each session was wrapped by a mini lecture. Prior the implementation of TBL and after it, a RMQ was given to participants prior and after adoption of the new method .

III- Results and Discussions

results have been described and analyzed in what follows :

III.1. Analysis of the Results

In the pre test, the results for the Reading Motivation Questionnaire are summarized, presented and discussed below in table 1

Level	Score Interval	The Control Group		The Experimental Group	
		N°	P	N°	P
• **High Motivation**	92 - 120 (Response 4)	3	12%	4	16%
• **Medium Motivation**	61 - 91 (Response 3)	18	72%	18	72%
• **Low Motivation**	30 - 60 (Response 1 - 2)	4	16%	3	12%
Total		25	100%	25	100%

Table1: Students' Reading Motivation in the Pre-Test

From table 1, 72% of the participants in both groups have medium level of motivation. 12% of the students have high motivation in the control group, 16% of respondents have an increased level in the experimental group. Concerning low motivation, the control group has 16%, whereas the experimental group has 12%.

The initial analysis of the pre-test data shows that the majority of our participants have medium motivation and no remarkable differences in reading motivation between the two groups. This is a call for the adoption of a new

instructional strategy in the teaching of linguistics to raise students' motivation to read due to the fact that teaching linguistics is a real dilemma for instructors as the linguistic materials to be read are long and full of technical terms.

Level	Score Interval	The Control Group		The Experimental Group	
		N°	P	N°	P
• **High Motivation**	92 - 120	4	16%	5	20%
• **Medium Motivation**	61 - 91	19	76%	20	80%
• **Low Motivation**	30 - 60	2	8%	0	0%
Total		25	100%	25	100%

Table 2: Students' Reading Motivation in the Post-Test

Table 2 shows that the most perceived level of motivation in both groups is medium motivation; 80% for the experimental group and 76% for the control group. The results also indicate a major improvement of reading motivation in the experimental group with 20% of the participants who display high level of motivation and no participant has a low level of motivation. Whereas, the control group exhibits a slight improvement with 16% of the students who have high motivation and 8% who have low motivation. So, the findings of the post-test indicate that Team-Based learning is efficient in improving reading motivation, though the sample was not large and the period was not long

Students' Choices	The Control Group		The Experimental Group	
	N°	P	N°	P
• Strongly Disagree	3	12%	2	8%
• Disagree	11	44%	10	40%
• Agree	11	44%	5	20%
• Strongly Agree	0	0%	8	32%
Total	25	100%	25	100%

Table 3: Students' Endorsement of Reading Efficiency in the Pre-Test

Table 3 shows that whereas the control group has low self efficiency with 56% of the participants who disagree with reading efficiency and 44% who support it, the experimental group has medium self-efficiency with 52% of the respondents who endorse reading efficiency and 48% who do not support it. Thus, the traditional Lecture-Based learning is no longer sufficient in teaching Linguistics and boosting the students' views about their capacities in reading, and the instructor finds himself obliged to reconsider the instructional method of teaching linguistic concepts and looks for innovation. Therefore, the students' opinions about their self efficacy are built upon their reading experiences and this cannot be achieved using the traditional method, but rather through using an innovative instructional method that relies on extensive reading of the linguistic materials.

Students' choices	The Control group		The Experimental group	
	N°	P	N°	P
• Strongly Disagree	2	8%	2	8
• Disagree	12	48%	6	24%
• Agree	11	44%	13	52%
• Strongly Agree	0	0%	4	16%
Total	25	100%	25	100%

Table 4: Students' Endorsement of Reading Efficiency in The Post-Test

Results in table 4 indicate that there is a noticeable improvement in the students' opinions about their abilities to read in the experimental group with 68% of participants who think that they are efficient in reading, whereas, in the control group the ratio is still low of those who endorse reading efficiency. This confirms that the treatment gives its fruitful seeds. Focusing on pre reading the linguistic materials and discussing reading issues in class using different activities prove to be the appropriate way to make learners feel more confident and able to read any text and make challenges with their peers.

Students' choices	The Control group		The Experimental group	
	N°	P	N°	P
• Strongly Disagree	2	8%	2	8%
• Disagree	7	28%	10	40%
• Agree	9	36%	9	36%
• Strongly Agree	7	28%	4	16%
Total	25	100%	25	100%

Table 5: Students' Support of Intrinsic Motivation in the Pre-Test

Table 5 indicates that the students' intrinsic motivation in both groups is the same and medium and they are in need of novel strategies to raise their motivation to read intrinsically. Thus, the most important role of the instructor is to make learners lifelong readers. This cannot be achieved unless they love reading in the best of its own interests. Finding ways for reading high intensity and make students love what they read is a real challenge.

Students' choices	The Control group		The Experimental group	
	N°	P	N°	P
• Strongly Disagree	1	4%	0	0%
• Disagree	9	36%	4	16%
• Agree	11	44%	11	44%
• Strongly Agree	4	16%	10	40%
Total	25	100%	25	100%

Table 6:Students' Support of Intrinsic Motivation in the Post-Test

Table 6 shows that 84% of the participants in the experimental group support/endorse intrinsic motivation and only 16% do not. However, 60% of the respondents in the control group support internal desire to read and 40% do not. So, the students' intrinsic motivation increases in the experimental group because of the application of TBL including team discussions and peer feedback. However, in the control group, it decreases with time and dense lectures, full of technical terms.

Students' choices	The Control group		The Experimental group	
	N°	P	N°	P
• Strongly Disagree	2	*8%*	4	*16%*
• Disagree	10	*40%*	9	*36%*
• Agree	8	*32%*	8	*32%*
• Strongly Agree	3	*12%*	5	*20%*
Total	25	*100%*	25	*100%*

Table 7: Students Endorsement of Extrinsic Motivation in the Pre-Test

Table 7 indicates that the experimental group has medium extrinsic motivation (52 participants), whereas, 44% of the participants in the control group have medium extrinsic motivation. In addition, 48 % of the control group do not support extrinsic motivation and 50% of the experimental group do not endorse it. Therefore, students are in need of an innovative instructional method that boosts their extrinsic motivation. TBL can be more fruitful in fostering extrinsic motivation if it is done for a long time as it encourages them to be not only responsible for their own success but for their classmates as well though it works most on nourishing intrinsic motivation.

Students' choices	The Control group		The Experimental group	
	N°	P	N°	P
• Strongly Disagree	4	*16%*	1	*4%*
• Disagree	7	*28%*	10	*40%*
• Agree	9	*36%*	9	*36%*
• Strongly Agree	5	*20%*	5	*20%*
Total	25	*100%*	25	*100%*

Table 8:Students' Endorsement of Extrinsic Motivation in the Post-Test

After implementation of TBL for the experimenal group, results in table 8 show that there is a minor increase for extrinsic motivation in the experimental group (4%) and for the control group, there is an increase of 12%. In both groups, however, there is a minor decrease in the percentage for those who do not endorse extrinsic motivation. As TBL calls for lifelong and intrinsically-motivated readers, it nourishes intrinsic motivation of readers more than extrinsic one

III.2. Discussion of the Results

Results display that the majority of participants have medium reading motivation in both groups. This is a real call to the instructor to find strategies to maximize and boost reading motivation. TBL stands out as the most powerful novel strategy to increase students reading motivation and learning outcomes as well especially when teaching linguistics. Though the module/course is really interesting, it is difficult to be grasped. So, appropriate instructional strategies have to be adopted.

After the implementation of TBL, a major improvement is noticed in the experimental group with 80% of participants who have medium level of reading motivation.whereas, a slight improvement in reading motivation is viewed in the control group with 16% of participants who have high motivation and 8% who have low motivation. In addition, still approximately the same percentage of respondents who have medium motivation.

Therefore, the initial examination of the pre-test data showed no important disparities in reading motivation between the two groups. However, the final analysis of the post-test data showed a major increase in reading motivation for the experimental group, while the control group exhibited a slight increase.

Concerning the dimension of reading motivation, three main dimensions have been measured self-efficiency, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Initial analysis of self-efficiency indicated that 56% of participants in the control group had medium self-efficiency. This is due to the reason that the students do not experience reading a lot or do not read at all. This explains their feelings about their capacities in reading decreases with time. In the post-test, students' opinions about their abilities to read increase in the experimental group with 68%. This leads to conclude that using TBL as a pedagogical strategy in linguistics encourages reading before class of the material. It also requires students to learn together in the reading assurance process and confront problems in team. Thus, students experience reading a lot and overcome their low self-efficiency or efficiency feelings. In addition, peer feedback and mini lectures lead to boost their reading efficiency further.

Intrinsic motivation is another pivotal dimension to increase reading motivation and results in lifelong learning and good learning outcomes as indicated in the findings prior to the implementation both groups have the same intrinsic motivation level they were medium. However, after the treatment 84% of the participants in the TBL group endorse intrinsic motivation and it becomes high in the control group it is still medium. Thus, TBL works on to boost the students' intrinsic motivation because in teams they share the work load, responsibilities and they help each other to gain more insights about the reading material and overcome problems and this is in fact the true spirit of TBL.

Concerning extrinsic motivation, it has been noticed that only a minor increase is viewed among the participants in the experimental group as the main objective of TBL is going beyond boosting extrinsic motivation of readers but rather working on and fostering their intrinsic motivation for a lifelong reading.

IV-Conclusion

The present study confirms that Team-Based learning is a potent educational strategy to boost students' reading motivation if it is properly applied using different steps: preparation before class, reading assurance process, immediate and peer feedback, and application activities. Team-Based learning is not a lonesome endeavour but rather an enriching collective learning experience that cultivates intrinsic motivation, boosts self-efficacy, encourages deep learning and creates a permanent love for reading through team discussions, peer assistance, constant immediate feedback and shared responsibility. Thus, TBL makes learning and reading in particular a lifelong amazing experience.

Appendix
The Students' Questionnaire (adapted from Guthrie and Wigfield, 1997)

Dear Student,

We are interested in your reading. The sentences in this questionnaire describe how some students feel about reading. Read each sentence and decide on your level of agreement or disagreement. There are no right or wrong answers. We only want to know how you feel about reading. To give your answer, circle **ONE** number on each line. The answer numbers are right next to each statement. Please read each of the statements carefully, and then circle your answer.
If you **strongly disagree** , circle 1.
 If you **disagree**, circle 2.
 If you **agree,** circle 3.
  If you **strongly agree**, circle.

May I thank you for your cooperation and for the time devoted to answer the questionnaire in advance.

1. I am a good reader.	1	2	3	4
2. I learn more from reading than most students in the school.	1	2	3	4
3. I know I can read any book I want.	1	2	3	4
4. I like hard challenging books.	1	2	3	4
5. I usually learn difficult things by reading.	1	2	3	4
6. If the book is interesting, I don't care how hard it is.	1	2	3	4
7. If the teacher discusses something interesting, I might read more about it.	1	2	3	4
8. I enjoy reading books about people in different countries.	1	2	3	4
9. I like to read about new things.	1	2	3	4
10. I have favorite subjects that I like to read about.	1	2	3	4
11. I read about my hobbies to learn more about them.	1	2	3	4
12. If I read interesting topics, I lose track of time.	1	2	3	4
13. I make pictures in my mind when I read.	1	2	3	4
14. I enjoy long detailed works.	1	2	3	4
15. I feel like my books are my friends.	1	2	3	4
16. I buy a lot of books.	1	2	3	4
17. It is important to me to be well read.	1	2	3	4
18. I don't like reading something when the work is too difficult.	1	2	3	4
19. I don't like vocabulary questions.	1	2	3	4
20. I don't like the work when there are too many details.	1	2	3	4
21. I like being a person others think is well read.	1	2	3	4
22. I like to be able to say I have read popular books.	1	2	3	4
23. My friends sometimes tell me I am a good reader.	1	2	3	4
24. In comparison to listening, speaking and writing, I am best at reading.	1	2	3	4

25. I often go to bookstores with my friends.	1	2	3	4
26. I like discussing the latest best seller with my friends.	1	2	3	4
27. I talk to my friends about what I am reading.	1	2	3	4
28. I do as little university work as possible in reading.	1	2	3	4
29. I am willing to work hard to read better than my friends.	1	2	3	4
30. I always do my reading as the teacher wants	1	2	3	4

References

[1]. 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.

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

[3]. Burgess, M., MacGregor, A., &Mellis, C. (2014). *Applying established guidelines to team-based learning programs in medical education*. Academic Medicine, 89(5), 776-781. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000215

[4]. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

[5]. Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. Journal of Education, 189(1-2), 107-122.

[6]. Falchikov, N. (2005). Improving assessment through student involvement: Practical solutions for aiding learning in higher and further education. Routledge.

[7]. 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 (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[8]. Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., &Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Motivating reading comprehension: Concept-oriented reading instruction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[9]. Herreid, C.F. (2007). Start with a Story: The case method of teaching college science. US, Virginia: National Science Teachers Association.

[10]. Hawkins, D. (2014). A Team-Based learning guide for students in health professional schools. Bloomington: Author House.

[11]. Komiyama, R. (2013).Factors underlying second language reading motivation of adult EAP students. Reading in a Foreign Language. N 2 (volume25),pp 149-169.

[12]. Michaelsen, L. K., Knight, A. B., & Fink, L. D. (2004). Team-based learning: A transformative use of small groups in college teaching. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

[13]. Marsela, S. (2017). The Correlation between reading motivation and reading comprehension achievement of the eleventh grade students of man 2 Palembang (Doctoral dissertation). University of Palembang, Indonesia.

[14]. Piaget, J. (1970). Science of education and the psychology of the child. New York: Viking Press.

[15]. Pressley, M. (2002). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

[16]. Sibley, J., & Ostafichuk, P. (2014). Getting started with team-based learning. Stylus Publishing, LLC

[17]. Sibley, J., & Spiridonoff, S. (2017). Getting started with Team-Based Learning. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

[18]. Thompson, B. M., Schneider, V. F., Haidet, P., Levine, R. E., McMahon, K. K., Perkowski, L. C., & Richards, B. F. (2007). Team-based learning at ten medical schools: Two years later. Medical Education, 41(3), 250-257.

[19]. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

[20]. Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Social-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(1), 76-97.

[21]. Wigfield, A., &Eccles, J. (2002). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 68-81.

[22]. Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., &McGough, K. (1995). A questionnaire measure of children's motivations for reading. *Instructional Resource No. 22*. National Reading Research Center.

[23]. Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T. (1997).Relation's of Children's Motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 420.