

Research Article

**The Impact of Integrating Think-Pair-Share with Reading Strategy
Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners' Reading Motivation**

Zahra Kouhi¹, Hossein Siahpoosh^{2*}, Mehran Davaribina³

^{1,2,3}*Department of English Language, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran*

*Corresponding author: Siahpoosh_h@iauardabil.ac.ir

(Received: 2023/11/18; Accepted: 2025/01/26)

Online publication: 2025/02/01

Abstract

The current study adopted a mixed-method design to investigate the impact of integrating the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy into reading lessons on EFL learners' motivation to read. One hundred twenty Iranian intermediate EFL students (60 males, 60 females; aged 13-40) were randomly assigned to two experimental and control groups, each with 60 students. The experimental group received ten sessions of reading instruction based on the TPS-integrated strategy by Baker and Westrup (2000), where students individually reflected on a passage, discussed their thoughts in pairs, and shared insights with the class. The control group received equivalent instruction using traditional direct methods. Both groups completed the revised Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). The participant students' attitudes toward the TPS strategy were also assessed through a semi-structured interview. The quantitative analysis showed no significant difference in reading motivation between the experimental and control groups, indicating that the TPS strategy did not impact intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. In contrast, qualitative findings revealed that most participants developed positive attitudes toward TPS, though the results regarding motivation for reading were mixed, suggesting that appreciation did not translate into measurable improvements. This discrepancy underscores the complexity of motivation, influenced by subjective experiences not captured quantitatively. Overall, TPS has been relatively successful in enhancing reading comprehension skills among intermediate EFL learners, highlighting the need for FL teachers, syllabus designers, and policymakers to consider students' perspectives to better understand their learning needs and preferences, leading to more effective FL reading instruction that improves both comprehension and motivation.

Keywords: Reading, reading motivation, reading strategy, think-pair-share, TPS integrated reading

Introduction

Among the essential skills for developing a proficiency in a language, reading is one the most fundamental (Alfassi, 2004; Wei, 2005). As a basic and receptive language skill, reading is considered as a medium to learn and develop other necessary language skills (Chastain, 1988). In Iran, where English is taught as a foreign language (FL) in classrooms, students have limited opportunities to be exposed to comprehensible input through listening. Hence, reading should be viewed as a great source of language input and a skill that serves as the basis of FL development. Despite the importance of reading comprehension, it is observed that many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners fail to read and comprehend FL written texts. Failure in comprehending L2 materials can negatively affects students' motivation to read. One way to remedy the flaws is to equip EFL learners with time-tested reading strategies that foster their comprehension and boost their autonomy in the classroom (Dole et al., 1991; Paris, et al., 1991). In past decades, a number of studies have focused on the effect of teaching reading strategies in the classroom on FL reading comprehension. Although the findings of these studies often support the role of reading strategies in enhancing reading comprehension, many FL teachers complain that their students' reading comprehension skills are still far from satisfactory because most of them fail to comprehend FL written texts (Sukyadi & Hasanah, 2010). This problem can be attributed to several factors. Lack of motivation to read is one of the possible reasons for poor reading comprehension. The idea behind the current study was to test a weather the integration of reading strategies sparks a passion for reading and also to provide empirical evidence to this less-explored area.

Motivation

Motivation is defined as a powerful psychological construct that affects individuals' activity and energy level (Pintrich, et al., 1993), arouses them to action (Elliot, et al., 2000), pushes them toward certain goals, (Eccles & Wigfield, 1985), influences their choices, and encourages them to keep doing special sorts of activities (Stipek, 1998). Motivation is basic for mastering any skill and reading is no exception to this statement. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) defined reading motivation as one's personal beliefs, values, and goals with regard to topics, processes, and outcomes of reading. Grabe and Stoller (2002) suggested that to achieve literacy in an FL, one has to be able to understand written texts. They believed that motivation to read is a powerful driving force that can enhance students' reading comprehension by keeping them doing reading activities and doing their best to become fluent readers. Research generally supports the role of

motivation in L2 learning. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) also stressed the importance of reading motivation, suggesting that it makes students develop positive or negative attitudes toward reading in an FL. They believed that highly motivated students who read for pleasure usually pay more attention to reading and make special time to read. Hairul, Ahmadi, and Pourhosein (2012) supported this view, stressing the need for motivating students to engage actively in the process of learning. Some empirical evidence showed a positive correlation between motivation and reading comprehension (e.g., Knoll, 2000; Lin et al., 2012; Manan, 2017; Rey et al., 2016). However, the effectiveness of reading interventions for enhancing reading motivation is still unknown. Teaching reading comprehension strategies in the classroom have proven to improve FL reading comprehension. However, there is little evidence on the positive or the negative effect of reading strategies on students' motivation to read. The finding of a study by Guthrie, Laurel, Wigfield, Tonks, Humenick, and Littles (2007) revealed that reading intervention enhances reading comprehension but it does not grow reading motivation. However, Fridkin (2018) reported an improvement in both reading comprehension and reading motivation as a result of the reading intervention presented in the classroom.

Think-Pair-Share

Think-Pair-Share (TPS), proposed by Lyman (1981), is a three-step technique that incorporates individual work, pair work, and whole-class discussions. In this technique, first, students are given a question or topic and asked to work on a task individually, then they share or describe what they have learned with their pairs, and finally, they discuss the topic in the classroom and share the learnings with the whole class. Lyman claimed that the first step (Think) provides students with an opportunity to organize their thoughts, generate new ideas, and get questions answered. The second step (Pair) allows students to find out what they already know and what they need to know. The last step (Share) is where students share and discuss their answers, solutions, or ideas with the whole class, allowing students to actively reflect their own thoughts.

Research often supports the effectiveness of TPS in developing FL reading skills (e.g., Carss, 2007; Hudri & Irwand, 2018; Nejad & Keshavarzi, 2015; Shih & Reynolds, 2015; Sugiarto & Sumarsono, 2014; Sumekto, 2018; Wichadee, 2005). However, to the best of our knowledge, it is still unclear whether TPS can foster motivation to read among FL learners. Also, little is known about students' attitudes toward the effectiveness of the TPS-integrated reading instruction. In

order to fill the gaps in the literature, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Does the TPS-integrated reading strategy instruction affect Iranian EFL learners' reading motivation toward English language learning?
2. Does the TPS-integrated reading strategy instruction affect Iranian EFL learners' intrinsic reading motivation toward English language learning?
3. Does the TPS-integrated reading strategy instruction affect Iranian EFL learners' extrinsic reading motivation toward English language learning?
4. Do Iranian EFL learners accept the TPS-integrated reading strategy approach to the teaching of English reading?

Method

Design and Context of the Study

The study was conducted in Ardabil, Iran. In order to yield more complete evidence and strengthen the conclusions, a mixed-method research design was adopted. To collect the quantitative data, we employed a posttest-only control group design with two experimental conditions, i.e., the TPS-integrated reading instruction and a reading instruction based on the direct instruction method of language teaching. The whole process of data collection lasted 7 weeks. The study had the TPS-integrated reading strategy instruction as the independent variable, reading comprehension as the dependent variable, and English language proficiency as the control variable.

Participants

At first, one hundred sixty-seven Iranian students who were studying EFL in a language institute in Ardebil were selected based on random sampling. Next, to ensure the homogeneity of the sample, the Preliminary English Test (PET) version 2004 was administered to all students. Based on the scoring scale proposed for the PET, one hundred twenty intermediate EFL students (60 male ad 60 female) aged 13-40 were selected to participate the study. Table 1 represents the demographic background of the participants.

Table 1

Demographic Background of the Participants

No. of Students	120
Gender & Nationality	60 Female & 60 Male – Iranian
Age	13-40

Native Language	Azari
Subject of Study	English as a Foreign Language
Educational level	Middle School (31), High School (16), Graduate Education (13)
Occupation	Student (47), Employee (11), Self-employed (2)

Instruments

Ten reading tasks were selected from *Thoughts and Notions 2* (2nd edition) (Ackert & Lee, 2005), a widely taught book in Iranian EFL classrooms, to be taught in the treatment sessions. As the authors note, each task includes an intermediate-level passage discussing a certain topic, which is followed by 8-10 true-false and multiple-choice reading comprehension questions. The selection of tasks was based on their prevalence and relevance to the Iranian educational context. To ensure that the passages suit the learners' levels, we consulted a couple of ELT experts. The tasks were then piloted with a small sample of EFL students who had the same demographic background as the participants through a test-retest procedure, yielding a reliability index of 0.85. Immediate feedback was gathered through a brief survey focusing on clarity and engagement. The feedback was analyzed to identify any necessary adjustments, ensuring the tasks were valid and reliable for classroom use.

The revised version of the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) designed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) was used to measure the students' reading motivation. The questionnaire consists of 79 items on a 4-point Likert Scale with the following answer choices: 1= Almost never, 2= Sometimes, 3= Very often, and 4= Almost every day. Items 1-40 measure intrinsic motivation whereas items 41-79 address extrinsic motivation. The internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire ($\alpha = .73$), calculated using SPSS, was acceptable.

Based on an extensive review of the literature on teacher education, a semi-structured interview including five open-ended questions was developed by the researchers. To assure the content validity of the questions, the initial list of questions was reviewed and revised by two Ph.D. holders in the field of TEFL. The first question (*To what extent do you think this course was beneficial to your reading comprehension?*) assessed the effectiveness of TPS from the students' points of view. The second question (*To what extent did this course increase your motivation to read?*) was developed to see to what extent the TPS could motivate the students to practice reading. The third question (*What did you dislike about the instruction given?*) gave the researchers an idea about the probable

shortcomings or disadvantages of the TPS from the students' points of view. The fourth question (*Compared to regular EFL reading classes, how do you evaluate the effectiveness of the TPS integrated reading instruction?*) required the students to compare traditional reading instruction with the TPS-enhanced reading instruction. Finally, the fifth question (*Do you recommend the TPS integrated reading instruction to your friends? Why/Why not?*) sought the students' overall attitudes toward the TPS-integrated reading instruction.

Procedure

Before the treatment was presented, the participants were randomly assigned into an experimental (TPS) group and a control group with 60 students in each. Next, the treatment was presented. The two groups of the study received the same hours of instruction (10 sessions of reading instruction each lasting 60-90 minutes) on the same materials. However, the methods of instruction were different. The TPS group was given a reading instruction according to the steps of the TPS strategy proposed by Baker and Westrup (2000), whereas the control group was taught based on the direct instruction method (Cruikshank et al., 1995). At the end of the last session, the students completed the MRQ. Besides, 15 students from the TPS group were randomly selected and interviewed.

The quantitative data collected through the MRQ were fed into and analyzed with SPSS version 26. Several descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to analyze the data. First, the internal consistency reliability of the MRQ was calculated using a Cronbach's alpha test. Second, the groups' statistics including the means and standard deviations of the groups were calculated. Third, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Levene's test were used to check the assumption of normal distribution of scores and equality of variances respectively. At last, the groups' levels of reading motivation after receiving the instruction were compared by conducting an independent samples *t*-test. Given the fact that the intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivations are related to each other, we run a MANOVA to investigate the possible differences between the groups. MANOVA is appropriate for this analysis because it allows for the simultaneous examination of multiple dependent variables (in this case, intrinsic and extrinsic motivations) while controlling for potential correlations between them. This method helps to determine whether group differences exist across these related motivations, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the effects of the intervention. In addition, the students' responses to the interview questions were recorded, transcribe, and reported in the result section.

Results

Results of the MRQ

Initially, the reliability of the MRQ was calculated which showed an acceptable value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient, $\alpha = .73$ (Table 2).

Table 2

The Internal Consistency Reliability of the MRQ

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.73	79

As displayed in Table 3, the mean scores obtained were 158.60 ($SD = 21.72$) for the control group and 155.28 ($SD = 12.50$) for the TPS group. Notably, the standard deviation for the control group is substantially higher than that of the TPS group. This discrepancy in variability suggests that there may be greater differences in performance among the participants in the control group compared to the more consistent performance observed in the TPS group.

Table 3

Group Statistics

	Methodology	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
MRQ	Control Group	60	158.60	21.72
	TPS Group	60	155.28	12.50

According to the result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality for the MRQ (Table 4), neither of the p -values obtained for the groups (.09 and .20) was statistically significant. As a result, the assumption of normal distribution of scores was met.

Table 4

Normality Test for the MRQ

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control Group	.10	60	.09
TPS Group	.09	60	.20

The result of the independent samples t -test (Table 5) indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met, $F = 11.83$, $p = .06$. Besides, no

statistically significant difference was found in reading motivation between the TPS and control groups, $t(118) = 1.02$, $MD = 3.3$, $p = .30$.

Table 5
Independent Samples t-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Reading Motivation	Equal variances assumed	11.83	.06	1.02	118	.30	3.3	3.23
	Equal variances not assumed			1.02	94.21	.30	3.31	3.23

Table 6 represents the descriptive statistics of the groups for the intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivations. The standard deviation for intrinsic motivation is notably higher in the control group (17.68) than in the TPS group (8.65). This significant difference in variability indicates that the control group exhibited a wider range of intrinsic motivation levels among participants, suggesting that some students may have been much more motivated than others. In contrast, the lower standard deviation in the TPS group implies a more uniform level of intrinsic motivation, reflecting a more consistent response to the TPS strategy.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics (Dependent Variables: Intrinsic and Extrinsic Reading Motivations)

	Methodology	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	Control Group	60	82.90	17.68
	TPS Group	60	80.25	8.65
Extrinsic Motivation	Control Group	60	75.70	10.84
	TPS Group	60	75.03	10.32

The result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (Table 7) suggested that the distribution of scores was normal across the groups (all p -values larger than .05).

Table 7
Normality Test for the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations

	Methodology	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Sig.
		Statistic	df	
Intrinsic Motivation	Control Group	.13	60	.08
	Experimental Group	.10	60	.17
Extrinsic Motivation	Control Group	.09	60	.20
	Experimental Group	.11	60	.06

To investigate the possible difference between the groups, a one-way MANOVA was run. As represented in Table 8, the maximum value obtained for Mahal's distance was 13.60 which was smaller than the critical value (i.e., 13.82). The critical value was determined based on a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of groups minus one (in this case, the appropriate degrees of freedom were calculated based on the study design). Therefore, it was assumed that there were no substantial multivariate outliers, indicating that the data met the assumptions necessary for conducting the MANOVA.

Table 8
Residuals Statistics for Variable of Methodology

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.32	1.59	1.50	.05	120
Std. Predicted Value	-3.68	1.84	.00	1.00	120
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.046	.17	.07	.02	120
Adjusted Predicted Value	1.36	1.62	1.5	.04	120
Residual	-.59	.56	.00	.50	120
Std. Residual	-1.17	1.11	.00	.99	120
Stud. Residual	-1.20	1.13	-.00	1.00	120
Deleted Residual	-.62	.58	-.00	.51	120
Stud. Deleted Residual	-1.20	1.13	-.00	1.00	120
Mahal. Distance	.00	13.60	1.98	2.37	120
Cook's Distance	.00	.04	.00	.00	120
Centered Leverage Value	.00	.11	.01	.02	120

The result of Box's test for equality of covariance matrices (Table 9) indicated that the assumption of the equality of covariance matrices has been violated, $F = .9.75$, $p = .00$.

Table 9

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Box's M	29.81
F	9.75
df1	3
df2	2506320.00
Sig.	.00

Table 10 displays the result of Levene's test of equality of error variances, indicating that the assumption of the equality of variances was satisfied ($p > .05$).

Table 10

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Intrinsic Motivation	17.23	1	118	.06
Extrinsic Motivation	.03	1	118	.86

As represented in Table 11, no statistically significant difference was found in intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivations between the TPS group and the control group, $F(2, 117) = .58$, $p = .55$, Wilk's $\Lambda = .99$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$.

Table 11

Multivariate Test

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.98	4924.73	2.00	117.00	.00	.98
	Wilks' Lambda	.01	4924.73	2.00	117.00	.00	.98
	Hotelling's Trace	84.18	4924.73	2.00	117.00	.00	.98
	Roy's Largest Root	84.18	4924.73	2.00	117.00	.00	.98
Methodology	Pillai's Trace	.01	.58	2.00	117.00	.55	.01
	Wilks' Lambda	.99	.58	2.00	117.00	.55	.01
	Hotelling's Trace	.01	.58	2.00	117.00	.55	.01
	Roy's Largest Root	.01	.58	2.00	117.00	.55	.01

As illustrated in Table 11, no statistically significant difference was found in intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivations between the TPS group and the control group, $F(2, 117) = .58, p = .55$, Wilk's $\Lambda = .99$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. The value of partial η^2 indicates a very low effect size, suggesting that the intervention had minimal impact on the reading motivations of the participants.

Table 12.
Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Intrinsic Motivation	210.67	1	210.67	1.08	.29	.00
	Extrinsic Motivation	13.33	1	13.33	.11	.73	.00
Intercept	Intrinsic Motivation	798537.67	1	798537.67	4118.57	.00	.97
	Extrinsic Motivation	681616.13	1	681616.13	6081.93	.00	.98
Methodology	Intrinsic Motivation	210.67	1	210.67	1.08	.29	.00
	Extrinsic Motivation	13.33	1	13.33	.11	.73	.00
Error	Intrinsic Motivation	22878.65	118	193.88			
	Extrinsic Motivation	13224.53	118	112.07			
Total	Intrinsic Motivation	821627.00	120				
	Extrinsic Motivation	694854.00	120				
Corrected Total	Intrinsic Motivation	23089.32	119				
	Extrinsic Motivation	13237.86	119				

Findings of the Interview

Q1: To what extent do you think this course was beneficial to your reading comprehension? The majority of the interviewees said that reading in English is easier, more enjoyable, and less boring when cooperating with other students. However, there were different attitudes on the benefits of the strategy. More than half of the respondents believed that their reading comprehension skills had improved as a result of the intervention:

“I think I have been improving since attending the course. It’s very helpful when we do ‘mind mapping’ and share thoughts.”

“I think I better understand what I’m reading when thoughts are shared with teammates.”

“It is much better to read cooperatively than reading alone. When we share our thoughts, I can notice the details much better. Especially, the mind maps we draw helped me a lot.”

More opportunities to interact with other learners, brainstorming between pairs, self-confidence, more reflection time, and optimal use of class time were other benefits of the TPS-integrated reading instruction mentioned by the interviewees.

Some interviewees, on the other hand, hold different attitudes. Though they found the TPS-integrated reading instruction more enjoyable than the regular reading instruction, they found no use in the TPS:

“It is still hard for me to comprehend stories or passages. I think I am not a good reader.”

“I really enjoy sharing ideas. It’s good to work with other students but I can’t be sure if it [the TPS] improved my reading comprehension in English.”

“I need more practice to find ways to understand English passages and books.”

“I really don’t like reading because I don’t really understand what the passage is going to say.”

The main reason mentioned for such a perspective was the limited number of intervention sessions. Some said that they would better assess the effect of the instruction if the course was longer.

Q2: To what extent did this course increase your motivation to read? More than half of the interviewees said that the instruction motivated them to read.

“I’ve started enjoying reading. I prefer to brainstorm than listen to the teacher. That makes me enjoy reading more”,

“I’m going to read more books and improve my comprehension.”

“Now, I’m enjoying reading. It feels good when you understand what the text says. I want to do it more often.”

Though almost all interviewees admitted that the TPS integrated reading instruction positively affected their reading comprehension, not all of them really got motivated to read by application of the TPS.

“Yes, my reading has improved. But it is not better because I am not reading books every day.”

“To be honest, I don’t take the reading routines seriously because I basically don’t like reading.”

Some interviewees said that gradually felt motivated to read more:

“I started to feel reluctant just because of the sight of materials. Since I was encouraged to read and demonstrate my comprehension, I started enjoying reading.”

Q3: What did you dislike about the instruction given? While the majority had positive attitudes towards the instruction, about half of the interviewees replied that they preferred to ask the teacher for help than to ask their partners, especially if the problems were rather difficult to solve. This group of interviewees believed that the teacher’s knowledge is more reliable than the students’ knowledge.

Q4: Compared to regular EFL reading classes, how do you evaluate the effectiveness of the TPS-integrated reading instruction? The majority of the interviewees said that the TPS integrated reading course gave them more autonomy and confidence, decrease their reading anxiety, and provided them with more opportunities to interact, learn, and enjoy the class time while the regular EFL reading classes often do not.

“I learn better when working with my classmates, I believed in more group-work sessions.”

“In other EFL classes, we are not allowed to talk to each other when the teacher is teaching. It’s so boring to listen all the time.”

“When reading alone, I just can’t keep up with the teacher’s explanation. I lose my concentration and can’t understand the text.”

Besides, some reported that the higher amount of interaction between the learners as a result of the TPS strategy had improved their communication skills.

Q5: Do you recommend the TPS integrated reading instruction to your friends? Why/Why not? Although there were mixed attitudes on the effectiveness of the TPS integrated reading instruction, all interviewees said that they would recommend the instruction to their friends:

“I would recommend [the TPS] to my friends because I enjoyed it.”

“I’ve got a new idea for reading”

“[The TPS] increased my reading skills. I hope I can attend another similar course.”

“[The TPS] would be useful after all”.

Discussion

The first research question of the study asked whether the TPS-integrated reading strategy instruction affects Iranian EFL learners' reading motivation toward English language learning. The second and third research questions respectively asked the same question about intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivations. The answer to the first question is ‘NO’. The finding indicated that the TPS-integrated reading strategy did not motivate EFL students to read. The same result was obtained for both intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation. Though the findings take support from Guthrie et al. (2007), they are in disagreement with the finding by Fridkin (2018). The findings also rejected the findings by Knoll (2000), Lin et al. (2012) Manan (2017), and Rey et al. (2016) who found a strong relationship between motivation and reading comprehension.

Regarding the fourth research question (Do Iranian EFL learners accept the TPS-integrated reading strategy approach to the teaching of English reading?), the findings of the interview indicated that the learners found the TPS-integrated reading instruction more useful, enjoyable, and effective than regular reading instruction methods like Direct Instruction Method. Regarding the effect of the TPS on reading motivation, however, the attitudes were mixed. It seems that the lack of motivation on the part of the students was mainly due to factors other than the method of instruction (e.g., low proficiency level, individual characteristics, willingness to communicate, willingness to cooperate with other learners, and willingness to solve problems through brainstorming). The assessment of the impact of these factors, however, is beyond the scope of the present study. Another justification for these findings is that it may take time for some students to feel motivated to read more. Besides, it should be noted that not all students are open to new methods of instruction like TPS. Lack of motivation to read can be attributed to students’ unwillingness to comply with the guidelines provided by the instructor.

The findings have some pedagogical implications for FL classrooms. The quantitative findings concluded that TPS failed to increase students' motivation to read more. However, the evaluation of the responses to the interview indicated that the students developed positive attitudes toward the integration of the TPS in reading tasks. It seems that, unlike traditional teaching methods, TPS as a new

way of teaching reading was relatively successful in improving reading comprehension skills of intermediate EFL learners. Therefore, it would be beneficial for FL teachers, syllabus designers, and educational policy-makers to look at the issue from students' perspectives. Achieving a deeper understanding of FL students' learning needs, preferences, and values helps discover effective methods of teaching FL reading that improve reading comprehension and reading motivation simultaneously.

It should be noted that due to the limitations in place, the findings of the study should be generalized cautiously. The study was conducted in Iran, with a limited number of intermediate EFL students. The replication of the study across other cultural and educational contexts or with other proficiency levels may result in different findings. Besides, the study focused on reading comprehension only. Further research is needed to replicate the findings with other language skills. It is worth mentioning that individual differences among students were not taken into consideration by the researchers. Hence, it is recommended that EFL researchers consider replicating the study to investigate how individual differences affect the outcomes.

Declaration of interest: none

References

- Ackert, P., & Lee, L. (2005). *Thoughts and notions (2nd Ed.)*. Heinle ELT.
- Alfassi, M. (2004). Reading to learn: Effects of combined strategy instruction on high school students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(4), 171-184.
- Baker, J. & Westrup, H. (2000). *The English language teacher's handbook: How to teach large classes with few resources*. Continuum.
- Carss, W. D. (2007). The effects of using think-pair-share during guided reading lessons. Retrieved June 14, 2020, from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz>
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice*. Harcourt Brace.
- Cruikshank, D. R., Bainer Jenkins, D., & Metcalf, K. K. (1995). *The act of teaching*. McGraw Hill.
- Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, D. P. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 239-264.
- Eccles, S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivation beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Reviews*, 23, 109-132.

- Elliot, S., Kratochwill, T., Littlefield-Cook, J., & Travers, J. (2000). *Educational psychology: Effective teaching, effective learning*. McGraw Hill.
- Fridkin, L. (2018). *The impact of motivation on children's reading comprehension: Differential effects of gender and ability*. UCL, Institute of Education.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, L. F. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Pearson Education.
- 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*, (pp. 403-422). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guthrie, J. T., Laurel, A. W. H., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32, 282-313.
- Hairul, N. I., Ahmadi, M. R., & Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. (2012). The role of reciprocal teaching strategy as an important factor of improving reading motivation. *Elixir Edu. Tec*, 53(3), 11836-11841.
- Hudri, M., & Irwand, H. (2018). Improving students' reading skill through Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique. *International Conference on Halal Tourism, Products, and Services Proceeding*, 1-9.
- Knoll, C. L. (2000). The relationship between motivation and reading comprehension. *Graduate Research and Creative Practice*, 1-67.
- Lin, D., Wong, K. K., & McBride-Chang, C. (2012). Reading motivation and reading comprehension in Chinese and English among bilingual students. *Reading and Writing*, 25(3), 717-737.
- Lyman, F. (1981). Strategies for reading comprehension. Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <http://www.teachervision.fen.com/groupwork/cooperativelearning/48547.html>
- Manan, M. K. (2017). The correlation between students' motivation in reading English textbooks and their achievement in reading comprehension [Unpublished bachelor thesis]. Walisongo State Institute for Islamic Studies.
- Nejad, S. G., & Keshavarzi, A. (2015). The effect of cooperative learning on reading comprehension and reading anxiety of pre-university students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(8), 169-180.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategies of readers. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.),

- Handbook of Reading Research* (pp. 609-640). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pintrich, R., Marx, W., & Boyle, A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(2), 167-199.
- Rey, A., Villaverde, S., Irene, R., & Lucas, G. (2016). Second language learning and intrinsic motivation of multilingual Chinese learners in the Philippines. *International Journal of Language and Lingual*, 7(2), 110-121.
- Shih, Y. C., & Reynold, B. L. (2015). Teaching adolescents EFL by integrating think-pair-share and reading strategy instruction: A quasi-experimental study. *RELC Journal*, 8(3), 1-15.
- Stipek, D. (1998). Can a teacher intervention improve classroom practices and student motivation in mathematics? *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 66(4), 319-337.
- Sugiarto, D., & Sumarsono, P. (2014). The implementation of Think-Pair-Share model to improve students' ability in reading narrative text. *International Journal of English and Education*, 3(3), 145-159.
- Sumekto, D. R. (2018). Investigating the influence of think-pair-share approach toward students' reading achievement. *Lingua Cultural*, 12(2), 195-202.
- Sukyadi, D., & Hasanah, E. U. (2010). *Scaffolding students' reading comprehension with think-aloud strategy*. The language center, Indonesia University Education.
- Wichadee, S. (2005). The effects of cooperative learning on English reading skills and attitudes of the first-year students at Bangkok University. *BU Academic Review*, 4(2), 22-31.
- Wei, L. (2005). "How can you tell?" Towards a common-sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 375-389.
- Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, T. J. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 420-432.

Biodata

Hossein Siahpoosh is an assistant professor in ELT at Islamic Azad University of Ardebil. He has been teaching English for more than 20 years in different universities and institutions in Iran. He has published more than twenty papers and attended several international conferences. His areas in research include language skills, individual differences, CALL, etc.

Mehran Davaribina is an assistant professor in English language teaching and is teaching numerous undergraduate and postgraduate courses in ELT. He has published many articles in national and international journals. His areas of interest include collaborative writing and positive psychology in English language teaching.

Zahra Kouhi is a PhD candidate in English Language Teaching (ELT) with extensive experience in teaching and academic leadership. She has been the founder and director of the Ganjineh English Language Institute for seven years and has 16 years of teaching experience. Zahra has taught at various well-known institutions, and has collaborated with Jihad Daneshgahi. Her research interests include innovative pedagogical methods and advancements in English language education.

تأثیر ادغام روش تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک گذاری با استراتژی های آموزشی خواندن بر انگیزه خواندن زبان آموزان ایرانی در زبان انگلیسی

مطالعه حاضر از رویکرد روش ترکیبی استفاده کرده است تا تأثیر استراتژی آموزشی تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک گذاری (Think-Pair-Share) در دروس خواندن بر انگیزه خواندن دانش آموزان زبان آموز انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجی را بررسی کند. یکصد و بیست دانش آموز ایرانی در سطح متوسط (۶۰ پسر، ۶۰ دختر؛ در سنین ۱۳ تا ۴۰، میانگین = ۲۳٫۶) به صورت تصادفی به دو گروه آزمایشی و کنترل، هر کدام شامل ۶۰ نفر، تقسیم شدند. گروه آزمایشی ده جلسه آموزش خواندن مبتنی بر استراتژی ادغام شده ی "تفکر - تمرین دو نفره - به اشتراک گذاری" که توسط بیکر و وسترب (۲۰۰۰) ارائه شده بود، دریافت کردند. در این جلسات، دانش آموزان به طور فردی به یک متن فکر کردند، نظرات خود را در گروه های دو نفره بحث کردند و بینش های خود را با کلاس به اشتراک گذاشتند. گروه کنترل، آموزش معادل را با استفاده از روش های سنتی مستقیم دریافت کرد. هر دو گروه پرسشنامه ی اصلاح شده ی انگیزه خواندن (MRQ) (ویگفیلد و گاتری، ۱۹۹۷) را تکمیل کردند و نگرش های دانش آموزان نسبت به استراتژی تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک گذاری از طریق مصاحبه ی نیمه ساختاریافته ارزیابی شد. تحلیل کمی نشان داد که تفاوت معناداری در انگیزه خواندن بین گروه های آزمایشی و کنترل وجود ندارد، که نشان می دهد استراتژی تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک گذاری تأثیری بر انگیزه ی درونی یا بیرونی نداشته است. در مقابل، یافته های کیفی نشان داد که اکثر شرکت کنندگان دیدگاه های مثبتی نسبت به تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک گذاری داشتند، هرچند نتایج مربوط به انگیزه برای خواندن متناقض بود و نشان داد که استفاده از این استراتژی آموزشی به بهبودهای قابل اندازه گیری منجر نشده است. این ناهمبستگی پیچیدگی انگیزه را برجسته می کند، به این معنی که متغیر انگیزه تحت تأثیر تجربیات ذهنی است که به طور کمی قابل ثبت نیستند. به طور کلی، روش تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک گذاری در بهبود مهارت های درک مطلب خواندنی در بین زبان آموزان سطح متوسط نسبتاً موفق بوده است و نیاز به توجه معلمان زبان خارجی، طراحان برنامه درسی و سیاست گذاران به دیدگاه های دانش آموزان را برای

درک بهتر نیازها و ترجیحات یادگیری آن‌ها، به‌منظور ایجاد آموزش خواندن مؤثرتر که هم درک و هم انگیزه را بهبود بخشد، نشان می‌دهد.

کلیدواژه‌ها: خواندن، انگیزه خواندن، استراتژی خواندن، تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک‌گذاری، خواندن ادغام‌شده با تفکر-تمرین دو نفره-به اشتراک‌گذاری

