

Yustinus Gugus Wahyu Endardiyanto

similarity-role

 Similarity Kuswandono 45-49 Part 2 (Moodle TT)

 Similarity Check - Biro Personalia (Moodle TT)

 Universitas Sanata Dharma

Document Details

Submission ID**trn:oid::1:3305627105****Submission Date****Jul 31, 2025, 10:40 AM GMT+7****Download Date****Jul 31, 2025, 11:08 AM GMT+7****File Name****28828_Yustinus_Gugus_Wahyu_Endardiyanto_similarity-role_1084253_1192339482.pdf****File Size****292.5 KB****10 Pages****7,266 Words****37,843 Characters**

0% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Detection Groups



0 AI-generated only 0%

Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.



0 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%

Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature 18 (2) April 2024
Available online at <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/lc>

P-ISSN 1858-0157
E-ISSN 2460-853X

Investigating the Role of Volitional and Motivational Factors for Postgraduate Students' Self-Regulated Learning in Academic Reading

Annisa Satriani Dewi*, Paulus Kuswando
Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia
*Email: nisasatriani74@gmail.com

Abstract

Academic readings are meaningful and useful sources for academic writing. Both of them are inextricably intertwined. Postgraduate students need to read a lot of academic reading in order to get new insight and knowledge that will be useful for writing academic journals. In order to be successful in reading academic materials, postgraduate students need to apply metacognitive strategies. One of them is being self-regulated learners. There are many factors that promote good self-regulation. Two of them are motivation and volition. Using a mixed-methods explanatory framework, this research aimed to investigate how postgraduates self-regulate themselves in academic readings and to what extent motivational and volitional factors contribute to postgraduate students' self-regulation in academic reading. The data was gathered through questionnaires completed by 31 postgraduate students and interviews with four chosen students. The findings found that most postgraduate students have motivational and volitional factors that influence their reading habits. It was shown that postgraduate students attributed self-regulated learning to their academic reading. Additionally, it was revealed that self-regulated learning showed a positive, significant, and moderate correlation with motivation ($r=.355$) as well as a positive, significant, and moderate correlation with volition ($r=.456$). The study found that academic reading requires postgraduate students to have strong self-regulated learning, motivation, and volitional strategies. Even though the results of the measurement were relatively positive, help from others was still needed, such as from the universities and master's program lecturers, especially when it came to encouraging students to establish self-regulated learning habits. This study may be useful to the university and master's program lecturers.

Keywords: motivation, volition, self-regulation, academic reading, postgraduate students

INTRODUCTION

English language competence is required for postgraduate students to succeed. Pang et al. (2003) stated that getting fluent in the target language is crucial for older students and adults learning to read in a second or foreign language. This involves having several opportunities to speak and utilize the language extensively. In order to be proficient in English, there are four macro-skills that postgraduate students need to acquire. They are reading, reading, speaking and writing. Among those skills, reading has been one of those macro-skills that has caught the interest of the researcher. It is because reading is a complex process that people might find it difficult to do. It is a difficult cognitive process that involves interpreting symbols to create or obtain meaning. According to Wang et al. (2016), many students struggle with understanding during academic reading because of their inadequate English skills. For postgraduate students, reading is needed and crucial. It is something that they should do whether they like it or not. Nahak & Mbato (2022) ut-

tered reading is an activity that requires complete participation in order to provide readers with the knowledge they need to succeed in other academic tasks. Reading itself can help postgraduate students in other subjects and with other aspects during the learning process. Wood (2022) stated reading and writing in academic settings are inextricably intertwined, with the former facilitating the latter. It means reading will help postgraduate students to get new insight and knowledge that will be useful for writing academic papers.

When it comes to master's classes, postgraduate students have to deal with many academic readings. Academic reading itself is more complex than common reading. Knowing the meaning of the vocabulary used in it does not guarantee the readers to understand and comprehend it well. For graduate students, learning academic literacy in a second language with separate discourse values and cultures may be a difficult and complex task (Singh, 2014). Pammu et al. (2014) added that academic reading comprehension refers to the actual people's mental and cultural processes. As a result, many Indonesian

EFL students find it difficult to understand a variety of long texts that are more challenging and complex for readers of second languages. Postgraduate students have to deal with many things such as Nahak & Mbato (2022) stated more that the complexity of academic reading, particularly when using scholarly articles, as well as the text's written objectives, as well as the language and organization that are utilized, and the meaning that the texts convey, continue to present a significant challenge for many students, it cannot be denied in light of the current situation. It is proven with what Oakley et al. (2018) stated previously that academic procrastination, which is defined as "putting things off until later," may result from students being overwhelmed by the intricacy of academic materials. In curricula, reading is usually ignored and hardly ever formally taught or assessed (Wood, 2022).

However, because of its direct relationship to academic performance and complicated, discipline-specific nature, research is increasingly emphasizing the fact that it merits education and additional study. There have been many researches that discussed what factors might affect readings. The first study which was held by Bilikozen & Akyel (2014) indicated that language ability, reading interest, and prior knowledge will aid readers in understanding what they are reading. The second study conducted by Channa et al. (2015) indicated metacognitive strategies were taken into account as the input to build reading comprehension materials and a syllabus based on planning, supervising, and assessing ways for students to enhance reading abilities for better comprehension of the text in accordance with their needs. The third study conducted by Mbato (2019) found that although learners had some level of critical reading thinking, for them to develop it, they needed to be in a learning environment where it could be developed regularly and extensively. The fourth study conducted by Nahak & Mbato (2022) stated that both external (effective methods) and internal (self-efficacy) elements were necessary for success when reading academic content. The fifth study, conducted by Sumarsono & Mbato (2021) revealed that students with high self-efficacy will be able to read many readings from different sources. They will also find their problem-solving related to reading problems.

According to experts, academic reading proficiency is taught and learned, but learners receive very little formal instruction in their specific academic disciplines (Howard et al., 2018). In order to be successful in academic reading,

postgraduate students need to apply metacognitive strategies. One of them is being self-regulated learners by doing self-regulation learning. Self-regulation learning strategies were described by Zimmerman (1989) as "activities and processes geared at acquiring knowledge or skill that involve learners' feelings of autonomy, intention, and essential nature". Sulistyawati & Kuswandono (2022) stated that the findings of their study indicated that self-regulation helped students who applied it to successfully understand English text during the online course.

There are many factors that might affect their self-regulation. Two of them are motivation and volition. Mezei (2008) stated there is complex interrelations that characterize motivation and self-regulation. Teachers should help students with motivation and encourage to be more self-regulated in order to succeed in the learning process. Moreover, Cosentino (2017) argued that student motivation and metacognitive abilities frequently interact with self-regulation. The previous study stated that students control the amount of effort they put into academic assignments by utilizing a range of cognitive, volitional, and motivational strategies Wolters (1998). Scholz et al. (2008) found out the important relation of motivational and volitional factors, with a focus on associations at the between- and within-person levels, in self-regulated running training. In addition, the results of structural equation modeling suggest that a twofold motivational component for self-regulated learning is preferable to having volition as a distinct component in addition to cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational belief components (Dörrenbächer & Perels, 2015) metacognitive and motivational components. Nevertheless, these theories partly neglect volition, which is necessary for implementing learning intentions. Therefore, the present study is frontline as it aimed to integrate volition within a comprehensive trait model of self-regulated learning (SRL).

Previous researches have demonstrated a relationship between motivation and self-regulation; volitional and self-regulation; and both motivation and volition with self-regulation. The goal of this research was to determine the relationship of motivation and volition variables to self-regulated learning in different contexts and settings with different participants. This research will focus on how motivational and volitional factors affect postgraduate students' self-regulation in relation to academic readings. It studies the correlation of motivation and volition in self-regulation which later can result in the success of academic reading. This study is undertaken with

the aim of addressing two research issues, which are: How do postgraduates self-regulate themselves in academic readings?; To what extent do motivational and volitional factors contribute to postgraduate students' self-regulation in academic reading?

METHODS

Research Design

This research was aimed to investigate the correlation between motivation and volition elements for postgraduate students' self-regulation in academic reading. Mixed method research was chosen and used during this research. According to Creswell et al. (2003), in order to better comprehend a particular phenomenon, a good study should use a mixed-method approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methodologies in conducting the research. Both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered because employing only one method will not be sufficient to gain a deeper insight. This way is along with what Terrell (2012) already stated previously that no serious problem area, in the opinion of many social scientists today, should be examined using only one study approach.

Data collection procedures

The research data of this research were quantitative and qualitative in nature. The distribution of the Likert-scale questionnaires in the online form was used to collect quantitative data. The researcher chooses to distribute online questionnaires to make the data collection easier. According to Ary et al. (2004), using an online style of questionnaire made it easier to obtain data since the respondents could complete and submit the questionnaire online. The questionnaires with 3 parts consisting of 34 questions will be distributed to the participants to collect general information and to analyze the respondents' levels of motivation, volitional, and self-regulation (strategy knowledge). The first part of the questionnaire is about motivation, it will have 8 questions. The second part of the questionnaire consisting of 8 questions is about volition. The last part of the questionnaire provided with 18 questions is about self-regulation in reading. Each questionnaire contains statements on a scale of 1 to 7. Each scale has its own meaning. The scale will have a leveling meaning, with 1 indicating a significant disagreement and 7 indicating a strong agreement. The questionnaires are adapted from Mbato (2013).

Meanwhile, the qualitative data was ob-

tained through interviewing some selected participants about their motivation and volition. In addition, their planning stage in reading, self-monitoring, self-evaluation in reading were also asked. Sugiyono (2018) argued that an interview is a data collecting method where the participant is invited to share facts, thoughts, and ideas in order to uncover problems more honestly. When conducting interviews, researchers paid close attention and wrote down or record what the informant says. The interview will be done as the means to elucidate and deepen our understanding of the topic (Mbato & Cendra, 2019).

Participants

The participants of the research were thirty-one (31) postgraduate students from some universities in Yogyakarta. They have been exposed to academic reading because they have gotten reading experience since they have to find new insight and knowledge for their academic assignments. Only four of the participants—out of the total—were chosen randomly to be interviewed after giving their informed consent.

Data Analysis Procedures

As it was stated before, this research had two types of data. It will be quantitative data and qualitative data. The data will be analyzed using explanatory design. The data of quantitative will be collected first before the qualitative data. Each data was analyzed in a different way. For the quantitative data for the distribution of the responses, the statistical analysis with the following equation is used to calculate rates.

$$\Sigma x / \Sigma n. 100\%$$

where:

Σx : Total number of voters

Σn : Total number of participants

While for the correlation of motivation and volition to self-regulated learning, the statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26 was utilized to get significant findings. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to find out the correlation.

A narrative inquiry approach was used by the researcher to analyze the qualitative data from interviews, which gave participants the chance to express their opinions. In analyzing the qualitative data in the research, the researcher used some steps of qualitative data analysis. Before examining the data in the qualitative phase, the researchers generated the written note from what the informant said and transcription of the interview. The researchers reviewed the transcription numerous times after receiving it in order to

comprehend the concepts put forth by the participants. The researchers then reduced the amount of data by summarizing, depicting, and mapping the thoughts. In essence, the results of the qualitative phase matched the information from the quantitative data (Sulistyawati & Kuswandono, 2022). The researchers were able to link the quantitative and qualitative data as a result.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

By examining the questionnaires given to 31 postgraduate students, the researchers aimed to determine how the postgraduate students motivational and volitional factors in their self-regulated learning in academic reading. The participants are required to select one of seven responses for each statement on the surveys, including 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (somewhat disagree), 4 (neutral), 5 (somewhat agree), 6 (agree), and 7 (strongly agree). The following tables provides an explanation of the survey's findings using percentage and the amount of voters for each response for each statement on the questionnaire.

Motivation in Academic Reading

In this questionnaire, postgraduate students responded to eight (8) statements about their motivation in reading. The data about their responses to the motivation in reading is further presented in Table 1 and the following bar chart.



Figure 1. Postgraduate responses to eight statements about their motivation in reading

In a questionnaire conducted to 31 postgraduate students, the percentage of their motivation in reading was measured. Table 1 shows that responses from postgraduate students to statement M1 revealed as the greatest proportion, with 71% of the students strongly agree that reading is important. This statement is in line with the statement proposed by Cambria and Guthrie (2010) that reading is important since everyone will ultimately need it for everything in the aspect of life. The qualitative data added credence to the argument. The second and third respondent stated that reading has an important role in her study, it can help her to get more references when they make papers.

Following by moderate agreement statement on M8, which received replies from 55% of the postgraduate respondents, they strongly agreed that reading is helpful to them. Then, slightly more than half of postgraduate students have moderate agreement on fifty-five percent (52%) to statement M3 and M6, they strongly agreed that having reading proficiency is enhanced their good sense of accomplishment and confidential. Forty-five percent (45%) of the postgraduate students agreed to statement M4 that having reading proficiency raises their position among their peers. The agreement of most postgraduate students for statement 7 was 45%, they agreed that being proficient readers will help them to get good job. Then, forty-two percent (42%) of postgraduate students agreed to statement M2 and M7 that being proficient readers will help them in their future career and learning in other subjects.

Based on the previous bar figure and table, most postgraduate students made it clear through their answers that they agreed that reading is important and useful to them. Not just for academic goals, but it is useful also for other things. They believe that reading proficiency will help them with their future career. It can aid them to get good career in the future. This result supports earlier research in the same field. Cambria & Guthrie (2010) that reading has an influence on students' academic progress, chances for future education, prospective career paths, and chances of finding meaningful work. The qualitative data provided additional support for the conclusion. The first and third respondent stated that reading is beneficial for her because she can get many new knowledge from reading which will be useful for her future career.

Being a proficient reader also make their self-confidence increased. Cook et al. (2017) found that students' academic engagement and social-emotional learning (SEL), such as respect for others, effective communication and problem-solving, self-management, self-awareness, and self-confidence, are improved by shared reading. Their beliefs in being proficient readers impact their motivation in reading. Qualitative data was also used to support the conclusion. The third respondent argued that reading improves her self-confidence. It is because she is able to answer the questions from the lecturer in the class because she has the knowledge from reading.

Volition in Academic Reading

Volition refers to people's ability to take action based on internal drive and decision-making rather than outside stimuli. In this part, fi-

Table 1. Postgraduate students' responses to the motivation in reading

Statement	1	2	3	5	6	7	8
Reading is important and crucial for me as a post-graduate student	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%	2 6%	6 19%	22 71%
My ability to read well will be useful for my future profession	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	4 13%	13 42%	12 39%
Having a strong reading ability makes me feel accomplished	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%	3 10%	11 35%	16 52%
Being a proficient reader raises my position among my peers	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%	2 6%	6 19%	8 26%	14 45%
Being a proficient reader will help me find a decent career	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%	4 13%	14 45%	12 39%
My confidence will increase if I have reading proficiency	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4 13%	11 35%	16 52%
Being a proficient reader will be helpful when I study other courses	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	3 10%	13 42%	13 35%
Overall, I believe that reading is beneficial to me	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 10%	11 35%	17 55%

Figure 2 and Table 2 summarizes the postgraduate students' volition in reading. Based on Figure 2 and Table 2, it can be seen that the distribution of postgraduate responses for each statements varied from *strongly agree* to *disagree* option. None of them voted on *strongly disagree* choice.




Figure 2. Postgraduate responses to eight statement about their volition in reading

Figure 2 and Table 2 show that postgraduate student responses to statement V3 revealed the highest percentage, with 83% of students choosing *agree* option. They agreed that they choose to be focus when they are reading. Then, the *somewhat agree* option has the highest percentage on statement V1, V5, V6, and V7. On those statements, there are more than 30% students chose somewhat agree option. They somewhat agreed that once they set their reading goals, they will try to achieve them (statement V1). Then, they have the ability to protect their reading goals from interruptions (statement V5) and they are able to resist peer pressure that is detrimental to their reading goals (statement 6). In addition, they will not let

their environment stop them from achieving their reading goals.

Further explanations are needed for statement V4, V5, and V6 due to the moderate percentage of students who were unsure about the statements (V4/35%; V5/26%; V6/26%). The results may indicate being persistent in achieving reading goals (V4), capable of protecting reading goals from interruptions (V5), and withstand peer pressure in accordance to the reading goals (V6) were challenging for postgraduate students to do.

Most students, in general, indicated through their responses that they do volition actions in reading. They deliberately decide and initiate a course of action in reading. Meanwhile, few postgraduate students were still unable to do volition actions in their reading.

Self-Regulated Learning in Academic Reading

The results of participants' self-regulated learning in academic reading are summarized in Table 3.




Figure 3. Postgraduate students' responses to eighteen statements about their self-regulated learning in reading

Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature 18 (2) April 2024

Table 2. Postgraduate students' responses to the volition in reading

Statement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Once I have set my reading goals, I try to fulfil them	0 0%	1 3%	2 6%	2 6%	10 32%	8 26%	8 26%
I keep track of my progress to accomplish my reading goals	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	5 16%	10 32%	11 35%	3 10%
When reading, I pay whole attention to what I am reading	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4 13%	9 29%	13 42%	5 16%
I am the kind of person who is committed to accomplish my reading goals	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	11 35%	8 26%	8 26%	2 6%
I have the ability to protect my reading goals from any distractions	0 0%	1 3%	6 19%	8 26%	10 32%	4 13%	2 6%
I have the ability to withstand peer pressure that is harmful to my reading goals	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	8 26%	12 39%	7 23%	2 6%
My environment will not stop me from accomplishing my reading goals	0 0%	1 3%	2 6%	7 23%	12 39%	8 26%	1 3%
I consider myself a persistent individual who will persevere in attempting to fulfill my reading goals	0 0%	0 0%	1 19%	6 19%	9 29%	9 29%	6 19%

Table 3. Postgraduate students' responses to self-regulated learning in reading

Statement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I choose my reading goal in beforehand, and I read with that goals in mind	0 0%	1 3%	2 6%	2 6%	7 23%	11 35%	8 26%
I decide in advance specific aspects of information to look for, and I focus on that information when I read	0 0%	1 3%	1 3%	2 6%	5 16%	13 42%	9 29%
I consider what I already know about the subject before I start reading.	0 0%	1 3%	1 3%	3 1%	10 32%	8 26%	8 26%
I make an effort to guess what the text will be about	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%	5 16%	8 26%	13 42%	4 13%
I occasionally assess the content as I read to see whether it makes sense to me	0 0%	1 3%	0 0%	3 10%	9 29%	10 32%	8 26%
I imagine the content or make illustrations based on what I read	0 0%	1 3%	1 3%	7 23%	4 13%	10 32%	8 26%
As I read, I motivate myself by telling myself things like, "I can do it."	2 6%	0 0%	0 0%	4 13%	8 26%	9 29%	8 29%
When reading academic literature or solving difficulties, I collaborate with my classmates	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%	5 16%	10 32%	10 32%	5 16%
When I come across a challenging or unfamiliar term, I try to understand its meaning from the context (such as other words or pictures)	0 0%	1 3%	0 0%	2 6%	2 6%	12 39%	14 45%
I highlight the parts of the text that I don't understand and create a specific question to fix the problem	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%	4 13%	6 19%	10 32%	10 32%
To help me resolve a comprehension problem, I use reference resources (such as a dictionary, textbook, or online)	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4 13%	8 26%	18 58%

Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature 18 (2) April 2024

I check to see whether my prediction was accurate after reading	1 3%	0 0%	0 0%	6 19%	7 23%	10 32%	7 23%
I summarize the key points I read (either cognitively or in writing)	0 0%	1 3%	0 0%	2 6%	9 29%	10 32%	9 29%
I assess my understanding by considering how well I comprehend what I've read	0 0%	1 3%	1 3%	2 6%	10 32%	10 32%	7 23%
After reading, I assess whether my understanding has improved and consider any other understanding-enhancing techniques	1 0.03	0 0%	0 0%	4 13%	7 23%	12 39%	7 23%
I analyze whether I've met my reading goal	0 0%	0 0%	2 6%	6 19%	8 26%	8 26%	7 23%
I emphasize important ideas, phrases, and words	0 0%	1 3%	0 0%	2 6%	5 16%	9 29%	14 45%
I take notes essential keywords and ideas	1 3%	0 0%	1 3%	2 6%	6 19%	11 35%	10 32%

Similar to postgraduate students' level of volition in reading, the distribution of postgraduate responses for each statement about their self-regulated learning in academic reading varied from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* option. The responses from postgraduate students to statement SLR11 revealed that the highest percentage was indicated. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of postgraduate students strongly agreed on the use of reference materials like dictionary, textbook, or website to help them with a comprehension issue. The qualitative data added confirmation to the conclusion. The four respondents said that they often have difficulties in reading because they do not know the meaning of the text. However, that difficulty does not stop them from continuing reading. They make use of dictionary, both online and conventional, to help them grasp the meaning. Their statement was in line with what Wijaya & Mbato (2022) stated that one of the challenges of learning to read in a second language that usually prevents Indonesian EFL students from developing such a deep grasp of their texts is a lack of vocabulary knowledge.

Furthermore, statement SLR9 and SLR17 has the highest voting from postgraduate students compared to other scale options. Both statements SLR9 and SLR17 have forty-five percent (45%) agreement. They strongly agreed that they attempt to decipher the meaning of a challenging or unfamiliar term from the context in which it is used (such as other words or pictures) and also focus on ideas, key words, and phrases when they do reading activity. This statement resonated with the notion put out by Hinds et al. (1992) that context may serve as a source of understanding and meaning. The qualitative data strengthened the conclusion by adding confirmation. The four

respondents have the same idea that sometimes they will see the context to guess the meaning of the words which they do not understand.

On the other hand, the *agree* option has highest voting among other scale options for statements SLR1, SLR2, SLR 4, SLR5, SLR6, SLR9, SLR12, SLR13, SLR15, and SLR 18. It can be seen from the Figure 1 (SLR1/35%, SLR2/42%, SLR3/26%, SLR4/42, SLR5/32, SLR6/32, SLR9/39%, SLR12/32%, SLR13/32%, SLR15/39%, and SLR18/35%). It indicated that majority of postgraduate students applied self-regulated learning in academic reading.

The Correlation of Motivation and Volition in Self-Regulated Learning in Academic Reading

In order to investigate the correlation of motivational and volitional factors in postgraduate students' self-regulated learning in academic reading, Pearson product-moment correlation was used. The outcome of the correlation study is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation between motivation and volition in self-regulated learning in academic reading

		Self-Regulated Learning
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.398*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026
	N	31
Volition	Pearson Correlation	.576**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	31

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Based on Table 4, it can be concluded that there is correlation between motivational and volitional factors in postgraduate students' self-regulated learning in academic reading. Using the sig. (2-tailed) significance value, it is clear from the output table above that there is a substantial correlation between motivation and self-regulated learning variables in academic reading since the value of sig. (2-tailed) between motivation and self-regulated learning is $0.026 < 0.05$. This conclusion is consistent with other previous researches that found that self-regulation and motivation are interrelated (Cosentino, 2017). Then, motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning techniques have a significant correlation (Tanriseven & Dilmaç, 2013). Additionally, the correlation between volition and self-regulated learning has a value of sig. (2-tailed) of $0.001 < 0.05$, indicating that the two variables are significantly correlated. This statement is in line with previous study which the majority of self-regulation is dependent on volitional processes (Corno, 1989).

Furthermore, it is feasible to conclude that there is a relationship or correlation between the motivation variable and the self-regulated learning variable based on the r count value (Pearson product-moment correlations). It is known that the r count value for the relationship between motivation and self-regulated learning is equal to $0.398 > r$ (0.355). It can also be inferred that there is a relationship or correlation between the volitional variable and the Self-Regulated Learning variable since the r value for the relationship between volitional and Self-Regulated Learning is equal to $0.576 > r$ (0.456). The positive Pearson product-moment correlations in this research, or the r count, indicate a positive and significant correlation between the two variables, or, put another way, that rising motivation and volitional will likewise raise student self-regulated learning in academic reading. This result of the study is supported by earlier research that claims there is a complete understanding of the interrelations between motivational, volitional, and self-regulated learning that occur within and between people (Scholz et al., 2008).

CONCLUSION

It is noteworthy to emphasize how important academic reading is for postgraduate students. This study clarified the relationship between motivation and volitional variables on postgraduate students' self-regulated learning in academic reading at several Yogyakarta institutions. This study's findings indicated that most

postgraduate students have motivational and volitional factors that influence their reading habits. Additionally, it was shown that postgraduate students attributed self-regulated learning for their academic reading. The self-regulated learning in academic reading of postgraduate students is correlated with motivational and volitional variables.

However, this study has a drawback. The study's participant population of students ($N=31$) was rather small. As a result, the conclusions could not be applied to the entire Indonesian or Asian postgraduate population. As a result, further researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies with different contexts and bigger participant populations. Furthermore, there is an implication to this study. A learning environment that gives students many opportunities to fully recognize their potential will foster self-regulated learning. As a result, it's critical that the university as a whole and master's program lecturers in particular foster an academic environment where all students may build self-regulated learning, motivational, and volitional strategies that will make academic reading easier for postgraduate students.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2004). *Introduction to Research in Education* (Eight, Issue 1).
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a Psychology of Human Agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1(2), 164–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x>
- Berardo, S. A. (2006). The Use of Authentic Materials in the Teaching of Reading. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 6(2), 60–69. http://search.proquest.com/docview/85666685?accountid=14548%5Cnhttp://metadata.lib.hku.hk/hku?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&genre=article&sid=ProQ:ProQ:ilba&atitle=The+Use+of+Authentic+Materials+in+the+Teaching+of+Reading&ti
- Bilikozen, N., & Akyel, A. (2014). EFL reading comprehension, individual differences and text difficulty. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 14(2), 263–296.
- Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P. R., & Zeidner, M. (2000). Handbook of Self-Regulation. *Handbook of Self-Regulation*, 1–9. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780121098902500305>
- Cambria, J., & Guthrie, J. T. (2010). Motivating and Engaging Students in Reading. *The NERA Journal*, 46(1). <http://www.nereading.org>
- Channa, M. A., Nordin, Z. S., Siming, I. A., Chandio, A. A., & Koondher, M. A. (2015). Developing Reading Comprehension through Metacog-

Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature 18 (2) April 2024

- nitive Strategies: A Review of Previous Studies. *English Language Teaching*, 8(8), 181–186. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n8p181>
- Cook, A. L., Silva, M. R., Hayden, L. A., Brodsky, L., & Coddling, R. (2017). Exploring the Use of Shared Reading as a Culturally Responsive Counseling Intervention to Promote Academic and Social-Emotional Development. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling*, 3(1), 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23727810.2017.1280327>
- Corno, L. (1989). *Self-Regulated Learning: A Volitional Analysis*. 111–141. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3618-4_5
- Cosentino, C. L. (2017a). The effects of self-regulation strategies on reading comprehension, motivation for learning, and self-efficacy with struggling readers. *Education Dissertations*, 6(11). <https://repository.wcsu.edu/educationdis/68%0AThis>
- Cosentino, C. L. (2017b). *The Effects Of Self-Regulation Strategies On Reading Comprehension, Motivation For Learning, And Self-Efficacy With Struggling Readers*. 2013–2015.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). An Expanded Typology for Classifying Mixed Methods Research Into Designs. *Methodological Issues in Conducting Mixed Methods Research Designs*, 209–240. <https://doi.org/10.2190/4U0V-9R10-4TXM-D0JN>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). The Psychology of the Language Learner. In *Routledge*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429482946>
- Dörrenbächer, L., & Perels, F. (2015). Volition completes the puzzle: Development and evaluation of an integrative trait model of self-regulated learning. *Frontline Learning Research*, 3(4), 14–36. <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v3i4.179>
- Heckhausen, J., & Schulz, R. (1995). *A Life-Span Theory of Control* (pp. 284–3–4). American Psychological Association.
- Hinds, P. S., Chaves, D. E., & Sandra, M. C. (1992). from the SAGE Social Science Collections . Downloaded. *Qualitative Health Research*, 2(1), 61–74.
- Howard, P. J., Gorzycki, M., Desa, G., & Allen, D. D. (2018). Academic Reading: Comparing Students' and Faculty Perceptions of Its Value, Practice, and Pedagogy. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 48(3), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2018.1472942>
- Husman, J., McCann, E., & Crowson, H. M. (2000). Volitional strategies and future time perspective: Embracing the complexity of dynamic interactions. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33(7–8), 777–799. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355\(00\)00050-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(00)00050-1)
- Ireson, J. (2008). *Learners, Learning and Educational Activity*. Routledge.
- Johnson, A. P. (Andrew P. (2008). *Teaching Reading and Writing : a guidebook for tutoring and remediating students*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Kitsantas, A., Steen, S., & Huie, F. (2009). The role of self-regulated strategies and goal orientation in predicting achievement of elementary school children. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 2(1), 65–81.
- Martin, D. (1993, January 19). *How to Be a Successful Student: A Complete Summary of Tools, Tips and Techniques for Becoming a Master Student (Education)(2nd Edition)* (2nd ed.). Marin Trails Publishing.
- Mbato, C. L. (2013). Facilitating EFL learners' self-regulation in reading : implementing a meta-cognitive approach in an Indonesian higher education context. In *Southern Cross University School of Education*.
- Mbato, C. L. (2019). Indonesian EFL Learners' Critical Thinking in Reading: Bridging the Gap between Declarative, Procedural and Conditional Knowledge. *Jurnal Humaniora*, 31(1), 92. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v31i1.37295>
- Mbato, C. L., & Cendra, A. (2019). Efl undergraduate students' self-regulation in thesis writing: help-seeking and motivation-regulation. *JELE (Journal of English Language and Education)*, 5(1), 67. <https://doi.org/10.26486/jele.v5i1.949>
- McCann, E. J., & Turner, J. E. (2004). Increasing student learning through volitional control. *Teachers College Record*, 106(9), 1695–1714. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2004.00401.x>
- Mega, C., Ronconi, L., & De Beni, R. (2014). What makes a good student? How emotions, self-regulated learning, and motivation contribute to academic Achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(1), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033546>
- Mezei, G. (2008). *Motivation And Self-Regulated Learning: A Case Study Of A Pre-Intermediate And An Upper-Intermediate Adult Student* (Vol. 2).
- Miller, K., & Merdian, H. (2020). Its not a waste of time!" academics' views on the role and function of academic reading: A thematic analysis. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.17.2.3>
- Molnar, E. (2002). *Az önszabályozó tanulás*. 102(1), 3–16.
- Nahak, Y., & Mbato, C. L. (2022). Undergraduate Students' Perceived Self-Efficacy in Academic Reading. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(2).
- Nurdianti, S., Rosita, R., & Fadloeli, O. (2019). Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Through Reciprocal Teaching Strategy on Report Text. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 2(5), 601. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i5.p601-607>
- Oakley, B., Sejnowski, T., & McConville, A. (2018). Advance Praise for Diagnosketch. In *Penguin*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780197636954.002.0001>
- Pammu, A., Amir, Z., & Maasum, T. N. R. T. M. (2014). Metacognitive Reading Strategies of Less Proficient Tertiary Learners: A Case

Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature 18 (2) April 2024

- Study of EFL Learners at a Public University in Makassar, Indonesia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 357–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.049>
- Pang, E. S., Muaka, A., Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (2003). *International Academy Of Education International Bureau Of Education Teaching reading*. <http://www.curtin.edu.au/curtin/dept/smec/iae>
- Paris, S. G., & Paris, A. H. (2001). Classroom applications of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_4
- Patel, D. M. F., & Jain, P. M. (2008). English language. In *Sunrise Publisher & Distributors*. Sunrise Publisher & Distributors. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ywes/49.1.34>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The Role of Goal Orientation in Self-Regulated Learning. *Handbook of Self-Regulation*, 451–502. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780121098902500433>
- Scholz, U., Nagy, G., Schüz, B., & Ziegelmann, J. P. (2008). The role of motivational and volitional factors for self-regulated running training: Associations on the between- and within- person level. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(3), 421–439. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466607X266606>
- Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal Setting and Self-Efficacy During Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 21(1), 71–86. <https://www.unhcr.org/publications/manuals/4d9352319/unhcr-protection-training-manual-european-border-entry-officials-2-legal.html?query=excom> 1989
- Singh, M. K. M. (2014). Challenges in Academic Reading and Overcoming Strategies in Taught Master Programmes: A Case Study of International Graduate Students in Malaysia. *Higher Education Studies*, 4(4), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v4n4p76>
- Snow, R. E., & Jackson III, D. N. (1994). Individual differences in conation: Selected constructs and measures. *Motivation: Theory and Research*, 1522(310), 71–99.
- Sugiyono (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. CV Alfabeta.
- Sulistiyawati, K. T., & Kuswandono, P. (2022). Students' Self-regulation in English Reading Comprehension during Online Class in Yogyakarta Private Senior High School. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 8(2), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v8i2.3493>
- Sumarsono, A. Y. P., & Mbato, C. L. (2021). Undergraduate Students' Self-Efficacy Strategies in Writing Academic Papers. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 16(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v16i1.29476>
- Tanriseven, I., & Dilmaç, B. (2013). Predictive relationships between secondary school students' human values, motivational beliefs, and self-regulated learning strategies. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(1), 29–36.
- Terrell, S. R. (2012). Mixed-Methods Research Methodologies Abstract and Key Words. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(1), 254–280.
- Turner, J. E., & Husman, J. (2008). Emotional and Cognitive Self-Regulation Following Academic Shame. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 20(1), 138–173. http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA197929010&v=2.1&u=les_main&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w
- Urguhart, S., & Weir, C. (2013). Reading in a Second Language. In *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0006>
- Wang, Y., Liu, D., Qu, H., Luo, Q., & Ma, X. (2016). A guided tour of literature review: Facilitating academic Paper reading with narrative visualization. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2968220.2968242>
- Wijaya, K. F., & Mbato, C. L. (2022). The Important Role Of Metacognitive Strategies In Indonesian Efl Reading Learning Contexts. *Uc Journal: ELT, Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 3(1), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.24071/uc.v3i1.3445>
- Wood, B. J. (2022, January 10). *The purpose and practice of academic reading*. Making Digital History. <https://makingdigitalhistory.co.uk/2022/01/10/the-purpose-and-practice-of-academic-reading/>
- Wolters, C. A. (1998). Self-Regulated Learning and College Students' Regulation of Motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 224–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.002>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A Social Cognitive View of Self-Regulated Academic Learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 329–339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.3.329>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Academic studying and the development of personal skill: A self-regulatory perspective. In *Educational Psychologist* (Vol. 33, pp. 73–86).
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bonner, S., & Kovach, R. (1996). *Developing self-regulated learners: Beyond achievement to self-efficacy*. American Psychological Association.