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Abstract
Because an understanding of reading attitude is pivotal to reading encouragement, this study investigated the multidimensionality of recreational reading attitude among Jordanian EFL students. A survey of recreational reading attitudes was administered to 225 EFL tertiary students at the University of Jordan. The responses to the 10-item survey were factored using (1) exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and 2 factor dimensions were obtained for the recreational reading attitude: efferent (cognitive) and aesthetic (affective). Results were, then, validated using (2) confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using IBM Amos 23. Results provide statistical evidence and a confirmation through using mixed statistical approaches (i.e., EFA and CFA) that the recreational reading attitude of EFL students is multidimensional, which will yield a better understanding of how attitudes can affect EFL students’ engagement in reading and choices of reading materials, thus introducing a new definition for recreational reading attitudes to encompass their multidimensional nature.
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1. Introduction

According to The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2010a), the ultimate goal of being a literate person is to engage and continue to read. Reading is not a mere symbol deciphering or semantical process; the complexity of the reading behavior surpasses techniques and mental skills to encompass a more sophisticated system of psychological aspects such as attitude. Unfortunately, teachers and researchers, hitherto, tend to focus predominantly on teaching reading skills and overlook the role of attitudes in literacy (Seitz, 2010). Thus, this has created scarcity of research in this domain. Many scholars attest that studies about college students’ attitudes toward reading are scarce (Blackwood, Flowers, Rogers, & Staik, 1991; Salter & Brook, 2007; Wells, 2012), especially in the Arab World (e.g., Al Seyabi & Al Amri, 2016), and the results seem to be inconsistent (Burak, 2004). This inconsistency is probably due to different measurement tools, different milieu and contexts, and different conceptions of the reading attitude construct. One aspect of inconsistency is whether to treat attitude as unidimensional or multidimensional. Thus, this study will provide an understanding of the complex nature of recreational reading attitudes, more specifically those of Jordanian EFL tertiary students.

The lack of sufficient research on recreational reading attitudes of tertiary students, especially in Jordan and generally in the Arab World, has unequivocally created an impetus for the need to explore the recreational reading attitudes of Jordanian EFL students at the tertiary level. Such investigations would yield a better understanding of reading attitude development and its relationship with actual reading engagement of tertiary EFL students. Thus, the purpose of this study was to address this gap and provide evidence using two quantitative methods that the recreational reading attitude construct is multidimensional.
2. Literature Review

2.1. Attitudes

According to van Schooten and de Glopper (2002), attitudes are considered a pivotal construct explaining behaviors. Ajzen (1991) defines attitudes as “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (p. 188). A recent definition is a “latent disposition or tendency to respond with some degree of favorableness or unfavorableness to psychological objects” or any “aspect of an individual’s world, including behavior” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2015, p. 76). That is, the more desirable the attitude of a person toward a behavior, the stronger his or her intention to do that behavior. In the early stages of attitude research, a favored view of attitude was based on a tripartite model, comprising affect, behavioral, and cognitive components. However, there have been some suggestions that attitude should be formed based on the sense of primacy of one component over the other, especially for the affective component (Bengal, Gretton, & Wegener, 2018). This concept is postulated to be based on a system of beliefs about an object and how much value a person associates with doing a certain behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005). The previously mentioned components are assumed to be the antecedents and succedents of attitude (Bengal et al., 2018).

According to Maio, Haddock, and Verplanken (2018), the cognitive component represents responses which reflect how people perceive and think about the attitude object in the form of beliefs. Some scholars label this component as instrumental because it reflects the evaluation toward the object from the point of view of good vs. bad. It is perceived as relationships between the object’s utilitarian aspects and the person’s evaluation of the weight of those aspects (Erwin, 2014). The second component is affective responses which reflect evaluations of feeling toward the object represented by feelings of joy and hate (Maio et al., 2018).

2.2. Recreational Reading Attitudes

The scope of the current research was limited to attitudes toward reading, with specific focus on recreational reading. Hence, it is important to delineate what is meant by recreational reading to distinguish it from other kinds of reading before elaborating on its association with attitudes. Thus, for the purpose of the current study, it is important to provide a brief synopsis about the meaning of recreational reading. The term recreational reading means any type of reading that extends to include a wide range of topics in the form of printed and digital texts and is determined by the reader’s preference of what, when, and where is read, which does not bear any assessment other than the reader to himself or herself (Richardson & Eccles, 2007). Throughout the years, many researchers have used various terms to refer to recreational reading, to name a few, leisure reading (Hughes-Hassell & Rodge, 2007; Stokmans, 1999), spare-time reading (Searls, Mead, & Ward, 1985), reading outside-of-school (Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988), voluntary reading (Gilbert & Fister, 2010; Krashen, 2011; Richardson & Eccles, 2007), and recreational reading (Gallik, 1999; Klauda & Wigfield, 2012). The extant literature on reading indicates that these terms have been used interchangeably to mean recreational reading.

Reading attitudes are very important in language learning (van Schooten & de Glopper, 2002). McKenna (2001, p. 124) indicates that reading attitudes are “vital to any effort to systematically foster engaged readers.” Moreover, many scholars (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Henk & Melnick, 1995; McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995) have linked having a positive attitude with engagement and continuing to read. Reading attitude has been also proved to affect reading competency (Becker, McElvany, & Kortenbruck, 2010; Schaffner, Philipp, & Schiefele, 2014; Schaffner, Schiefele, & Ullerts, 2013; Schiefele, Schaffner, Möller, & Wigfield, 2012). Logan and Johnston (2009) confirm that reading attitude influences many things including regularity of reading, diversity of reading topics chosen, and enjoying reading. Petscher (2010) regards reading attitude second in importance after reading skills and expresses his concerns that it is not given apt attention by teachers in class activities.

The complexity of the attitude concept generated many definitions when scholars attempted to provide a reading-specific one. Scholars have, thus, defined the term in many ways reflecting its complex nature. Alexander and Filler (1976), for example, were the first to coin a definition of reading attitudes. They defined it as “a system of feelings related to reading which causes the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation” (p. 1). Smith (1990) defines it as “a state of mind, accompanied by feelings and emotions, that make reading more or less probable” (p. 215). Sainsbury and Schagen (2004), on the other hand, provide a more complex definition, where reading attitude for them is “the intrinsic motivation in the form of a positive self-concept as a reader, a desire and tendency to read and a reported enjoyment of or interest in
reading; and its opposite, a negative self-concept as a reader, a desire and tendency to avoid reading and a reported dislike of the activity” (p. 374). A more recent definition is “a child’s enjoyment of reading both within and outside of school” (Logan & Johnston, 2009).

Providing more information on the nature of recreational reading attitudes is invaluable. Although there have been some attempts to acknowledge the multidimensionality of reading attitudes, they were mostly in Western contexts and mainly at the school level (e.g., Al Seyabi & Al Amri, 2016; Broeder & Stokmans, 2013; Erwin, 2001, 2014; Mathewson, 2004; McKenna et al., 1995; Rhodes, Blanchard, & Matheson, 2006; Rhodes & Courneya, 2003). The nature of the samples used in researching attitudes has also caused variations in the kinds of attitudes. In addition, there is limited research on reading attitudes from a multidimensional point of view, and only few studies have investigated the dimensions of attitudes toward recreational reading of EFL students at the tertiary level. It is worth noting that there is no consensus on the dimensions of reading attitudes. On the one hand, a number of scholars have attested to the multidimensionality of the attitude construct. For example, Erwin (2014) has divided attitude into three parts which were referred to as the triadic model of attitude. Several studies have also used the multicomponent nature of attitudes as the base for their reading models (Mathewson, 2004; McKenna et al., 1995; Rhodes et al., 2006; Rhodes & Courneya, 2003; Mathewson, 2004), for example, elucidates the constituents of reading attitude in his model: It comprises three components: (a) prevailing feelings about reading (affective component), (b) action readiness for reading (behavioral or conative component), and (c) evaluative beliefs about reading (cognitive component; Mathewson, 2004; Yamashita, 2007). Rhodes et al. (2006) attest that the attitude construct is best presented as a multicomponent construct. On the other hand, other scholars (e.g., van Schooten & de Glopper, 2002) have used attitude as a bidimensional construct to predict reading habits using the theory of planned behaviour: These two distinct components are affective (hedonic) and cognitive (instrumental). In the TPB, nevertheless, only two components are employed: affective and cognitive. The conative component has been excluded due to its similarities with the intention construct, causing multicollinearity, that is, having two constructs measuring the same thing.

Erwin (2014) asserts that “the most modern and popular conceptions of attitudes are as a combination of affect and cognition” (p. 17). He adds that the attitude construct used by Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action is a combination of the cognitive and affective components of attitude, whereas the conative part was used as the behavioral intention construct in the theory.

Understanding the importance of reading attitude will help provide insights on how to encourage and engage students in reading especially recreational reading. To put things under theoretical perspective, Rosenblatt’s (1985) transactional theory of reading distinguishes between two kinds of reading (i.e., efferent and aesthetic reading) according to their purpose (as cited in Garces-Bacsal & Yeo, 2017). In efferent reading, the reader’s attitude and purpose of reading are cognitive, that is, they read for instrumental purposes and perceive the text as informational and concentrate on the amount of gathered information gleaned at the end of reading (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014). On the other hand, aesthetic reading/readers have affective stance behind their engagement with the text, that is, they view reading as an interaction between his or her imagination and text in which the reader immerse himself or herself to live the enjoyment of impersonating its characters and events (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014; Ilogho, 2011).

Thus, this research adds to the current literature on the attitudes of Jordanian EFL students toward recreational reading. It also provides a statistical evidence supported by justifications from previous literature on the multidimensionality of recreational reading attitudes. This helps other researchers study reading attitudes, in general, and recreational reading, in particular, to take into consideration the multicomponent nature of the construct.

3. Research Design

3.1. Sample

The survey was administered to 225 third- and fourth-year English major students in a public university in Jordan (i.e., the University of Jordan). The sample size is about 33% of the total population. The rationale behind limiting the sample to third- and fourth-year students was because these students had completed 2-3 years of university education, were expected to have had more exposure to reading English texts, and had developed their reading habits than first- and
second-year students. In addition, this would eliminate limitedness of reading due to weakness in the English language. In this regard, Al-Khasawneh (2010) and Rabab’ah (2005) assert that many Arab universities admit high school graduates into English studies programs despite their low levels of proficiency in that language. As for the sampling method, the study utilized a nonprobability sampling method (i.e., purposive sampling).

3.2. Research Instrument

The study utilized a quantitative method using a questionnaire to establish the multidimensionality of the reading attitude construct. The questionnaire had two sections: (1) The Demographic Information section asked the students for their university ID, gender, and year level; (2) the Recreational Reading Attitude section comprised attitude items (e.g., “Recreational reading improves my reading ability”) and (e.g., “I think recreational reading is enjoyable”; see Appendix for a full version of the questionnaire). The self-reported questionnaire items were adapted from previous literature (see Table 1):

### Table 1. Sources of Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>van Schooten and de Glopper (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>van Schooten, de Glopper, &amp; Stoel (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaires are considered one of the most popular research instruments applied in social sciences. According to Sekaran (2003) and Dörnyei (2007), questionnaires are mainly used for the purposes of measuring behavioral (e.g., habits) and attitudinal (e.g., attitudes, beliefs) responses.

3.2.1. Pilot Study

According to Sekaran (2003) and Sekaran and Bougie (2010), pretesting, whether it is for interview questions or questionnaires, is highly important to ensure that the questions are free of ambiguity or bias and that there are no problems in the wording or the measurement. Thus, the questionnaire was pilot-tested before administration on a group of students taken from the same sample and excluded from the main study. From 35 questionnaires administered, 33 questionnaires were obtained, and of these, 4 were deemed useless. Accordingly, a total of 29 questionnaires were used for the pilot testing. Reliability analysis was conducted by computing Cronbach’s alpha. The result of the pilot study is presented in Table 2, indicating that the constructs’ items accomplished acceptable reliability with Cronbach’s alpha:

### Table 2. Reliability Test of Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Attitude</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

The sample taken from the population of English majors was 225 students, comprising third- and fourth-year students. As shown in Table 3, the study had an unequal ratio between the males and the females, with 15 (6.7%) and 210 (93.3%) of respondents, respectively. This is normal because females are more likely to be associated with humanities and that they are usually overrepresented in education, humanities, and health fields (Chrisler & McCreary, 2010):

### Table 3. Demographic Information of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth-Year</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Measurements Reliability and Validity

All the questionnaire items were measured through a 5-point Likert scale with options ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). A high reliability means all indicators measure the same thing (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009) explain that if an instrument is reliable, it will relatively adhere to the same results, even if it is administered to the same person at different times. Therefore, scale reliability with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.70 is preferred; however, it is important to indicate that a scale with Cronbach’s alpha less than 0.5 is not acceptable (Hair et al., 2010; Nunnally, 1978). Bagozzi and Yi (2012) and Wu and Wang (2005) state that a value of .60 and above can be acceptable. The reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of the cognitive and affective items were 0.89 and 0.85, respectively, indicating a good reliability.

Face validity refers to “whether items on a questionnaire appear both appropriate to the phenomenon being measured and being easily understood” (Jenkinson, Peters, & Bromberg, 2011, p. 3). The content and face validities of the instruments were assessed through a panel of applied linguistics judges from two different universities in Jordan. Feedback and comments on the items of the instrument and its appropriateness linguistically and for the Arabic context were provided. These comments were, then, taken into account in the evaluation of the instrument validity, where if an item had received more than two comments, it was put under review for amendment or deletion. The overall agreement of the panel of judges provided evidence of content validity.

4.2.1. Factorial analyses

In order to establish construct validity, this study utilized a triangulation technique of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (i.e., EFA and CFA, respectively) to test the factorial stability and multidimensionality of the proposed factors. To determine the interrelationship among the items in the questionnaire in EFA, a principal components analysis was performed. The number of factors to be extracted is based on the following criteria: (a) minimum eigenvalues of 1.0 and factor loading of individual items with a minimum loading of .32 or higher. However, before conducting the factor analysis, KMO and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were tested to measure sampling adequacy for data structure detection. The KMO test may vary between 0 and 1, with numbers ranging between 0.80’s and 0.90’s which support the use of factor analysis (Munro, 2005). The latter is a statistical test for the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix. In other words, Bartlett’s test of sphericity is used to test whether correlation matrix is suitable for factor analysis (Munro, 2005). According to Hair et al. (2010), a rule of thumb concerning the test of Bartlett’s test of sphericity, a probability level (i.e., Sig.) of < .05 indicates that sufficient correlations exist among the variables which determines the appropriateness of factor analysis. Table 4 shows that KMO was (.848) and Bartlett’s test of sphericity p-value was < .05, which supported proceeding with EFA:

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</th>
<th>.848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>1299.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows a scree plot of components and their eigenvalues loading. Factor loadings of .32 and above, the minimum suggested in Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), were initially examined and anything less was suppressed as mentioned earlier. In addition, in order to provide simplicity and clarity of factor loadings, an oblique method of rotation has been utilized (i.e., Promax with Kaiser normalization rotation):
As shown in the factor analysis displayed in Table 5, the attitude items in the matrix loaded cleanly on two factors: cognitive and affective attitudes. The items of cognitive attitude ranged from .77 to .91, and the items of the affective construct ranged from .75 to .84:

Table 5. Standardized Regression Weights (i.e., Factor Loadings Matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cog1</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog3</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog4</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog5</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog6</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff1</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff2</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff3</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff4</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff5</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction method: Principal component analysis
Rotation method: Promax with Kaiser normalization

In order to confirm the results of EFA, another quantitative test is conducted. We utilized CFA which was intended to validate the hypothesised dimensions of the attitude construct and provide a triangulation for multidimensionality of the recreational reading attitudes of EFL students. The model evaluation test was conducted using IBM AMOS (version 23) in the form of a second order measurement model.

Figure 2 delineates the second order factor CFA to demonstrate the multidimensionality of the attitude construct. The model fit the data and all goodness of measures fit indices achieved recommended values. However, the model had some modifications in which one item was deleted and two error items were covaried, as they had a high modification index (MI) value. Thus, the results showed that the recreational reading attitude loaded clearly on two subconstructs: The factor loadings of attitude on cognitive and affective were 0.70 and 0.48, respectively.
Table 6 presents the results of goodness-of-fit indices (GFI) for the CFA model (see Figure 2). The model yielded 33 df on which chi-square goodness-of-fit was computed. The model yielded a model with a chi-square fit index ($\chi^2 = 77.336, df = 33, p = .000$) and relative chi-square (i.e., normal chi-square) $\chi^2/df = 2.344$. The normal chi-square fell below the cut-off point of 3.000, as suggested by Kline (2011). Because chi-square statistics should not be the only analysis used for establishing decisions about model fit (Hair et al., 2010), other fit measures were used like comparative fit index (CFI) = .96 (> .95), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) = .949 (> .95), the overall good fit index (GFI) = .941, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .077  (< .08), and standardized RMR = .047. Therefore, the results of the indices showed the model of goodness-of-fit indices in which the final model fit the data, as recommended by Hair et al. (2010):

Table 6. Results of Goodness-of-Fit Indices of the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOF Indices</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$(CMIN/df)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Value</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&gt;.5</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>&gt;.95</td>
<td>&gt;.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Model</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

The results indicate that the Jordanian students had two different types of reading attitudes: cognitive and affective. These two composed the recreational reading attitude construct. The results also showed that the factor loading of the cognitive component was higher than the affective component on the attitude construct: .70 and .48, respectively. This distinction was statistically supported in this study through EFA and CFA. The findings support previous studies about attitude, in general (Broeder & Stokmans, 2013; Mathewson, 2004; McKenna et al., 1995; Stokmans, 1999; van Schooten & de Glopper, 2002; van Schooten et al., 2004; Yamashita, 2013), and in reading attitude models, in particular. Yamashita (2013) attests that the field is yet to reach an agreement on the construct of attitudinal reading; however, a multidimensional view appears to provide overall support. Stokmans (1999) utilized EFA in her study in which she identified three aspects of the reading attitude as functioned for reading.

The rationale for this refinement of the reading attitude was justified by previously mentioned studies in order to provide explanation and unveil students’ attitudes stance toward recreational reading. Thus, the distinction serves as a useful conceptualization for designing effective behavioral interventions. Having said that, reading attitude construct should be considered multidimensional, encompassing a utilitarian and emotional beliefs about the reading activity, especially for EFL students. This distinction may help explain why students’ engagement in recreational reading plummets as they advance in their school years and later in their adults life, as cited in many previous studies (e.g., Merga & Mat Roni, 2018; OECD, 2010b; Sainsbury & Schagen, 2004). This is clear because it is taught as a school subject and used for gathering information and knowledge in EFL contexts. Perhaps, this is due to students’ indifference to reading.
practice because the skill required is already acquired (Merga & Mat Roni, 2018). This is an aspect which cannot be overlooked or dominated by the affective one which is represented mostly in L1 contexts. The multicomponent view of the reading attitude should provide an insight on the real motive or function of reading to EFL students, especially for Jordanian students for it will provide an invaluable information for the promotion of recreational reading among them.

In addition, some studies have also utilized the attitude construct to predict reading behavior in the theory of planned behavior (TPB). Broeder and Stokmans (2013) have used TPB and attest that attitude is a multidimensional component; however, they have used different terms: hedonic for affective and utilitarian for cognitive. Rhodes et al. (2006), for example, attest that the attitude construct in TPB is best presented as a multicomponent construct. Specifically in the reading domain, van Schooten and de Glopper (2002) have used TPB to predict reading habits and used the attitude construct in the theory of planned behavior as two distinct components; affective and cognitive. It is clear that the findings from this study confirm the effect of reading attitude on reading behavior (van Schooten & de Glopper, 2002). Moreover, the multidimensionality of the reading attitudes in this study will present a chance to determine which kind of attitude is more influential with the Jordanian EFL students at the tertiary level.

In this study, the results indicate that the Jordanian students view recreational reading from an efferent or utilitarian stance. In this stance, his or her emotions usually dominate the reading experience. Efferent readers emphasize the factual information derived from the text, rather than experiencing emotions and feelings of the meanings (Pantaleo, 2013). The reader in this stance focuses predominantly on the facade part of the meanings. Pantaleo (2013) asserts that the distinction between aesthetic and efferent readings is contingent mainly on the kind of stance a reader embraces when engaged in the reading activity. Nevertheless, Rosenblatt (1985, 1994) attests that the reader determines the stance, that
is, any text can have both stances. She also adds that it is uncommon to have one single stance associated with a text, as readers tend to fluctuate between the stances while reading. Thus, having both cognitive and affective aspects in which dominance is largely cognitive in the attitudes of the EFL Jordanian students corroborates with Rosenblatt’s (1985, 1994) classification.

The results of the current study may be explained by either classification system reported in the previous literature to describe EFL students who have attitude ambivalence. However, Rosenblatt’s (1985, 1994) distinction provides a more elaborative explanation to the current case of the Jordanian EFL students’ attitudes.

6. Conclusion

The factorial analysis results revealed that the recreational reading attitude construct of the Jordanian English majors was multidimensional. According to the factor loading of the cognitive component on the attitude construct, the Jordanian EFL students tend to believe that English texts are mainly considered as a source of information, rather than a source of enjoyment. Consequently, the cognitive aspect of attitude outpowers the affective aspect when it comes to reading leading them to read, even when engaging in recreational reading, from a utilitarian stance, rather than from an enjoyment stance. This may suggest that approaches to reading taught in Jordan, being part of the Arab World, tend to focus on teaching and reading English texts as a school subject, rather than a way of enjoyment. This pedagogical approach instils in the students a belief system that grows from school years to college years to become a habit of treating reading as a way of getting information from English texts. As a result, it will create a whole generation who is able to read, but refuses to read, that is, a competency to read, but lacks the desire to keep reading. This has been explained previously as having attitude intercomponent ambivalence. Thus, this study encourages educators to instil aesthetic values derived from reading and not consider it as mere beliefs of utilitarian. It is important to modify the definition of recreational reading attitude according to the multidimensional nature of reading attitude to encompass the two dimensions. Thus, a proposed definition is to introduce recreational reading attitudes as positive or negative predispositions about reading texts whether digital or printed based on a belief system instilled in the reader to treat texts from an efferent or aesthetic stance, whether the text is of informational or aesthetic nature for the reader.

Further research is recommended to investigate the effect of attitude components and other possible factors on recreational reading habits. Another recommendation is the investigation of parents’ influence and encouragement which is of great importance, such as parents’ attitudes toward reading. Furthermore, a study of comparison between L1 and L2 attitudes of the Jordanian EFL students would reveal important and interesting information about how the students’ reading attitude differs in each language. Such studies have the potential to reveal which kind of attitudes (affective or cognitive) the students harbor about reading in their L1 or L2.

In the Jordanian and other Arab EFL contexts, there is a strong need for educational institutions, curriculum developers, and teachers to focus on developing positive reading attitudes—whether affective or cognitive, especially in the early stages of education. The focus on the cultivation and nurturing of reading as an enjoyable habit among EFL students is necessary from the onset of educational levels. Although cognitive or instrumental attitudes are important to motivate EFL students, it is also important to instil in them that reading is an enjoyable activity which can ensure the development of life-long readers. Thus, training of teachers on proper and interesting pedagogies when delivering the curriculum is as important as the curriculum itself. On the other hand, providing EFL students with time allocated for recreational reading, whether at school or university level, is also recommended. Implications of this research for the attitude domain in also redefining reading attitudes are significant. The reading attitude is no longer treated as a unidimensional concept; understanding of reading attitudes should be based on their multidimensional nature, which will provide a better understanding of the purposes behind reading and the context and the medium in which an individual reads.
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**Appendix**

**Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Demographic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Gender : 1. Male 2. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Age : __________ Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Level : 1. Third 2. Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University ID # : ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Quality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Recreational Reading</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recreational reading is good for gaining knowledge and learning about the world.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is important for my educational and professional career to read many types of recreational reading materials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recreational reading improves my reading ability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think that recreational reading is a waste of time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recreational reading teaches you how to write better.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recreational reading makes me happy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to stay home and engage in recreational reading (i.e., novels, newspapers, and magazines).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I think recreational reading is enjoyable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I hate recreational reading.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recreational reading makes me tired and sleepy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>