

Students' Engagement in Extensive Reading Activities in English at University of Mataram

^{1*}Adriyan Wijaya Saputra, ²Muhammad Amin, ³Kurniawan Apgrianto

^{1,2,3} English Education Program, Language and Arts Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram, Indonesia

Corresponding Author e-mail: adriyanwijaya2004@gmail.com

Received: September 2026; Revised: September 2026; Published: October 2026

Abstract

This study investigated students' engagement in Extensive Reading activities among English Education students at the University of Mataram. It aimed to describe students' behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement and to identify the factors influencing their engagement. Although previous studies have reported the benefits of Extensive Reading for language proficiency and motivation, relatively little research has simultaneously examined the three engagement dimensions and their contextual influences in Indonesian EFL higher education. A qualitative descriptive design was employed with ten students completing a questionnaire and five students participating in semi-structured interviews. The closed-ended questionnaire functioned only as descriptive supporting data, while the semi-structured interviews provided the main qualitative explanations; therefore, the study was not designed as mixed methods and did not use inferential statistics. The questionnaire was used to identify general patterns through descriptive frequencies and percentages, while the interviews provided more detailed explanations of students' reading experiences. The findings showed generally positive engagement. Behavioral engagement was reflected in relatively strong participation and effort, although reading consistency remained the main challenge. Emotional engagement was shown through interest, enjoyment, motivation, and positive attitudes toward English reading. Cognitive engagement appeared through reading strategies, comprehension monitoring, reflection, and connections between texts and prior knowledge. Five factors influenced engagement: reading materials and personal interest, language difficulty, time and academic responsibilities, motivation and academic requirements, and reading autonomy and lecturer support. Overall, students' engagement in Extensive Reading was shaped by interacting personal, textual, and academic conditions.

Keywords: Extensive Reading, Student Engagement, Behavioral Engagement, Emotional Engagement, Cognitive Engagement.

How to Cite: Saputra, A. W., Amin, M., & Apgrianto, K. (2026). Students' Engagement in Extensive Reading Activities in English at University of Mataram. *Journal of Authentic Research*, 5(4), 7374-173. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jar.v5i4.7085>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/jar.v5i4.7085>

Copyright© 2024, Prayogi et al.

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA License.



INTRODUCTION

English Education students in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context need regular contact with English beyond classroom instruction because sustained exposure supports vocabulary, fluency, and reading comprehension (Grabe, 2009; Renandya, 2021). Reading is one important source of such exposure because it allows students to meet vocabulary, sentence patterns, ideas, and different types of written

discourse repeatedly and to develop independent language learning (Krashen, 2004; Nation, 2015). For university students, reading is also closely connected with academic learning and independent language development. However, reading for academic assignments alone does not necessarily create a sustained reading habit. Students need opportunities to read more broadly and regularly if reading is expected to contribute to long-term language development (Renandya, 2021).

Extensive Reading (ER) is an approach that encourages learners to read a relatively large amount of easy and interesting material mainly for general understanding and enjoyment and with considerable freedom in text selection (Day & Bamford, 1998). In contrast with intensive reading, ER gives learners more freedom to select texts that match their interests and proficiency levels and encourages them to read continuously rather than analyze every linguistic detail. Regular exposure through ER can support vocabulary growth, reading fluency, comprehension, and learner independence (Nakanishi, 2019; Renandya, 2021). Empirical studies have also shown that ER can support vocabulary acquisition, reading rate, and positive reading attitudes when implemented consistently (McLean & Rouault, 2017; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Yamashita, 2013). Nevertheless, the potential benefits of ER depend on whether learners actually engage with reading over time.

Student engagement provides a useful framework for examining this issue because engagement is more than visible participation. Bond et al. (2020) describe engagement as multidimensional, involving behavioral, emotional, and cognitive aspects. This multidimensional view is consistent with earlier engagement research that distinguishes participation, persistence, affect, and strategic investment in learning (Fredricks et al., 2004; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Behavioral engagement concerns participation, effort, persistence, and consistency. Emotional engagement includes interest, enjoyment, motivation, and attitudes toward learning. Cognitive engagement concerns the mental effort and strategies students use to understand, monitor, reflect on, and make meaning from learning materials. In higher education, these dimensions are especially important because students are expected to manage learning with increasing independence (Kahu & Nelson, 2021).

In ER, behavioral engagement can be seen when students choose reading materials, spend time reading, continue when texts become difficult, and maintain reading across weeks. Emotional engagement is reflected in whether students are interested in the topic, enjoy the material, feel motivated to read, and view reading as valuable for their English learning. Cognitive engagement appears when students use strategies such as contextual guessing, rereading, dictionaries, comprehension monitoring, summarizing, reflection, and connecting information with previous knowledge. Looking at the three dimensions together helps explain why a student may enjoy reading but still fail to read consistently, or may read irregularly but process a text actively when reading occurs (Bond et al., 2020; Oga-Baldwin & Fryer, 2020).

Maintaining engagement in ER can be difficult. Students may recognize that reading is useful while still depending on assignments or lecturer requirements to begin reading. University workloads can reduce available reading time, difficult vocabulary can interrupt comprehension, and materials that are too difficult or unrelated to personal interests may reduce enjoyment and persistence. At the same time, appropriate materials, meaningful choice, personal language-learning goals, and

lecturer guidance can support engagement. These contextual influences are important because engagement does not develop only from individual motivation; it is also shaped by the learning environment and the opportunities students receive (Heilporn et al., 2021; Kahu & Nelson, 2021).

Previous research has examined ER in relation to language development, learners' motivation, and reading experiences. Nakanishi (2019) reported positive effects of extensive reading on language proficiency, while studies of engagement and motivation have emphasized the role of autonomy, self-determined motivation, and sustained involvement in language learning (Oga-Baldwin & Fryer, 2020; Ryan & Deci, 2020). Other studies have focused on reading attitudes and motivation in EFL contexts (Takase, 2007; Yamashita, 2013) or on the implementation of ER in challenging environments (Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009). However, examining only outcomes or motivation provides a limited picture of how students actually participate, feel, and think while reading. A more detailed account requires attention to behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement at the same time. This study therefore addresses a research gap by integrating the three engagement dimensions and the contextual factors that shape them in one qualitative descriptive account of Indonesian EFL university students. In doing so, it extends prior ER research beyond outcome-focused and motivation-focused perspectives.

This issue is relevant to English Education students at the University of Mataram. As future English teachers, they are expected to develop their English not only through formal classroom instruction but also through independent learning. Preliminary observations suggested that some students read English materials more often when reading was connected with assignments, while independent reading outside academic requirements was less consistent. This raised the need to examine not simply whether students read, but how they engage in ER and what conditions support or hinder that engagement. The study is significant for students because it can help them recognize and regulate their reading engagement; for lecturers because it can inform guidance and material selection; and for program managers because it can support the design of reading resources and activities that promote sustainable ER.

Therefore, this study investigated students' engagement in Extensive Reading activities among English Education students at the University of Mataram. It addressed two questions: (1) How do students demonstrate behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement in Extensive Reading activities? and (2) What factors influence students' engagement in Extensive Reading activities? The study contributes a multidimensional description of ER engagement in an Indonesian EFL higher-education context and highlights practical conditions that may help students develop more sustainable reading practices.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design. The design was selected because the purpose was to describe how students engaged in Extensive Reading based on their reported experiences rather than to test hypotheses, measure causal effects, or statistically generalize the findings. Qualitative descriptive research was appropriate for presenting students' participation, feelings, reading strategies,

difficulties, and reasons for maintaining or discontinuing reading activities in a clear and experience-near form (Creswell & Poth, 2021).

Two instruments were used: a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. Although the questionnaire contained closed-ended Likert-scale statements, it functioned as supporting descriptive information. The closed-ended items were used only to summarize response patterns and to help organize the interview-based description; they were not used to test hypotheses, establish correlations, or produce inferential statistics. The interview data remained the primary source for explaining how and why students engaged in ER. Therefore, the study is best understood as qualitative descriptive research with descriptive questionnaire support, not as a mixed-methods study. Frequencies and percentages were used only to summarize response patterns among the ten participants. The interviews provided the main detailed qualitative explanations of those patterns.

Participants and Research Context

The study was conducted in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram. Participants were undergraduate students in the fifth semester or above who had experience with English reading activities, including Extensive Reading. Purposive sampling was used because participants needed to meet specific criteria relevant to the research questions.

Ten students completed the questionnaire. Five of these students subsequently participated in semi-structured interviews. The interview participants were selected purposively to provide variation in reading habits, questionnaire responses, and reading experiences. The study was intended to provide a detailed description of these participants rather than represent all English Education students statistically.

Instruments and Data Collection

The questionnaire included statements covering behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement. Behavioral indicators included participation, effort, persistence, and consistency. Emotional indicators included interest, enjoyment, motivation, and positive attitude. Cognitive indicators included learning strategies, comprehension monitoring, reflection, and meaning-making. Participants responded using a five-point scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The instrument was reviewed by two experts in English language teaching and language assessment and piloted with five non-participant students; revisions were made to improve item clarity, wording, and alignment with the engagement dimensions.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted individually after the questionnaire. Each interview lasted approximately 20–30 minutes and explored reading habits, participation, effort, persistence, consistency, feelings toward reading, motivation, strategies, comprehension monitoring, reflection, and factors that supported or hindered engagement. With participants' consent, the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. The interview format allowed follow-up questions when participants' responses required clarification or further explanation (Dejonckheere & Vaughn, 2019).

Data Analysis

Questionnaire responses were summarized using frequencies and percentages to identify general patterns. Positive responses refer to Agree and Strongly Agree. Interview transcripts were read repeatedly and organized according to the three engagement dimensions and recurring factors related to the second research question. The questionnaire and interview data were then compared and integrated. In reporting each major finding, the questionnaire pattern was followed by direct interview evidence and interpretation.

For the second research question, recurring interview patterns were grouped into five factors: reading materials and personal interest, language difficulty, time and academic responsibilities, motivation and academic requirements, and reading autonomy and lecturer support. Direct participant quotations were retained verbatim to show the evidence supporting the interpretations. Questionnaire Item 23 was unavailable in the collected dataset because of a technical issue during data export; it was not reconstructed or estimated. This missing item is acknowledged as a limitation and does not affect the interview-based analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Students' Engagement

The integrated findings showed engagement across behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions, but the strength of engagement differed across indicators. Behavioral participation and effort were relatively strong, while consistency was weaker. Emotional engagement was generally positive, especially in relation to interest and the perceived value of reading for English improvement. Cognitive engagement was particularly visible in strategy use and comprehension monitoring. These findings support the view that engagement is multidimensional: students may be strong in one dimension while experiencing difficulty in another (Bond et al., 2020; Kahu & Nelson, 2021). This pattern is also consistent with Fredricks et al. (2004), who argue that behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement are related but distinct, and with Skinner and Belmont (1993), who emphasize the interplay between observable participation and affective investment.

Table 1. Summary of Questionnaire Patterns by Engagement Dimension

Dimension	Indicator	Positive Responses	Main Pattern
Behavioral	Participation	70–80%	Generally active participation
Behavioral	Effort	90%	Strong effort to understand texts
Behavioral	Persistence	50–80%	Varied persistence when difficulty occurred
Behavioral	Consistency	40–60%	Weakest and most variable behavioral aspect
Emotional	Interest	90%	High interest in preferred topics
Emotional	Enjoyment	80–90%	Generally positive enjoyment
Emotional	Motivation	60–100%	Strong improvement goals; weaker independent motivation
Emotional	Positive attitude	90%	Reading widely viewed as useful
Cognitive	Learning strategies	70–90%	Frequent use of strategies

Cognitive	Monitoring comprehension	90–100%	Strongest cognitive pattern
Cognitive	Reflection	70–80%	Positive but less uniform
Cognitive	Meaning-making	90%*	Strong connection with prior knowledge

Behavioral Engagement in Extensive Reading

Behavioral engagement was reflected in students' participation, effort, persistence, and consistency. The questionnaire showed that 70–80% of participants responded positively to participation indicators and 90% responded positively to effort indicators. These patterns suggest that students generally engaged with English materials and were willing to invest effort when texts were difficult. However, persistence varied from 50–80%, and consistency was lower at 40–60%.

The distinction between participation and consistency became clearer in the interviews. Students often read when a lecturer assigned material, when a course required preparation, or when they encountered a personally interesting text. Independent reading therefore existed, but it was not equally regular for all participants. This is important because ER depends on sustained exposure, not only occasional participation (Nakanishi, 2019; Renandya, 2021). The contrast between relatively high effort and lower consistency also shows that behavioral engagement should not be reduced to a single indicator such as participation (Fredricks et al., 2004). "Honestly, no. I don't have a regular reading schedule yet. I usually read when I have free time or when there's an assignment." (P1)

"No, I don't really have a fixed schedule. I usually read when I have time or when I'm in the mood." (P2)

These statements explain why consistency was the weakest behavioral aspect. The issue was not simply unwillingness to read. Reading frequency was shaped by available time, academic responsibilities, tiredness, mood, and immediate assignments. Students could value reading and still fail to maintain a stable weekly routine.

Effort, by contrast, was much stronger. Participants described rereading difficult sections, guessing word meaning from context, using dictionaries or translation tools, and spending additional time when a text was important. This suggests that behavioral effort was often activated once students were already engaged in reading. In other words, starting and maintaining a routine was more difficult than investing effort during an individual reading session.

The findings are consistent with the idea that engagement involves both participation and sustained investment. Oga-Baldwin and Fryer (2020) emphasize that motivation and engagement are related to sustained language-learning behavior. Skinner and Belmont (1993) similarly show that engagement is expressed through both action and persistence over time. The current findings add that, in ER, positive effort does not automatically become regular reading behavior when students face competing academic demands.

Emotional Engagement in Extensive Reading

Emotional engagement was generally positive. Interest reached 90% positive responses, enjoyment ranged from 80–90%, and positive attitude reached 90%. The strongest result appeared in motivation to improve English, with all ten participants responding positively. However, only 60% responded positively to being motivated

to read when a lecturer did not require it. This difference indicates that students could strongly value reading for English development while still depending partly on external academic requirements. This pattern resonates with self-determination theory, which distinguishes autonomous motivation from controlled motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2020), and with ER research showing that motivation and attitudes are shaped by reading experiences and materials (Takase, 2007; Yamashita, 2013).

Interest in the topic and perceived difficulty strongly shaped enjoyment. Students were more likely to enjoy reading when the topic matched their personal interests and the language was manageable. Conversely, too many unfamiliar words or difficult sentences could reduce enjoyment and make reading feel tiring.

"If the topic is interesting and the language is easy to understand, I enjoy reading it. But if there are too many words that I don't know, I get a little bored and find it difficult." (P1)

"If I like the topic, I can enjoy it and sometimes I don't even think too much about the fact that it's in English. I can just keep reading." (P2)

These responses show that emotional engagement was not a fixed personal characteristic. It changed according to the reading experience. Interesting and understandable materials supported curiosity and enjoyment, while difficulty could reduce positive feelings. This relationship is important in ER because learner choice and accessible texts are central principles of the approach (Day & Bamford, 1998; Nakanishi, 2019; Renandya, 2021).

Students also described clear language-learning goals. P1 and P5 linked reading with vocabulary development, comprehension, academic study, and future needs as English Education students. Thus, emotional engagement was supported by both immediate enjoyment and longer-term instrumental value. Yet the lower independent-motivation result suggests that recognizing the value of reading did not always lead to self-initiated reading when no academic requirement was present. This finding extends prior motivation-focused ER research by showing that positive attitudes and perceived value can coexist with weaker self-initiated reading behavior in a university EFL setting.

Cognitive Engagement in Extensive Reading

Cognitive engagement appeared through learning strategies, comprehension monitoring, reflection, and meaning-making. Positive responses for learning strategies ranged from 70–90%, while comprehension monitoring reached 90–100%. Reflection was positive but more variable at 70–80%. Item 24 showed 90% positive responses for connecting information with students' own knowledge or opinions. Item 23 was unavailable and was not reconstructed.

The interviews showed that students used flexible strategies rather than depending on one technique. Participants commonly tried to infer meaning from context, reread difficult sections, consult dictionaries or translation tools, and use other digital resources when comprehension remained incomplete. This strategic behavior is consistent with reading research showing that successful L2 readers coordinate multiple strategies and monitor comprehension during reading (Grabe, 2009).

"First, I usually reread it. If there's vocabulary that I don't know, I try to understand it from the context first." (P3)

"Usually, I read the whole text first to understand the content and the topic. I don't immediately look up every word." (P5)

These statements demonstrate active problem solving. Students did not simply stop when they encountered an unfamiliar word. They adjusted strategies according to the problem. The particularly strong comprehension-monitoring result also indicates that participants were generally aware when understanding was incomplete.

Monitoring was visible in the way students checked their understanding. Participants reported recalling the main message, explaining content in their own words, summarizing, and returning to sections that remained unclear. P5, for example, explained that after reading, the participant tried to remember the content and explain it using personal understanding, then reread a section if comprehension was incomplete.

Reflection and meaning-making were present but less uniform. Some students thought about main ideas after reading and connected information with previous knowledge or experience. Others explained that reflection was not always intentional and occurred more often when a text was personally relevant. This suggests that cognitive engagement can be strong during the reading process even when behavioral consistency is weaker. A student may read irregularly but still process a text actively and strategically when reading occurs. This finding supports the multidimensional premise that cognitive investment can vary independently from the frequency of reading behavior (Bond et al., 2020; Fredricks et al., 2004).

This multidimensional contrast is theoretically important. Bond et al. (2020) argue that behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement are related but distinct. The findings support this view because the strongest cognitive indicator, comprehension monitoring, reached 90–100%, whereas weekly behavioral consistency was substantially lower. The contrast also suggests that ER programs should not evaluate engagement only through reading frequency; strategy use and comprehension monitoring may remain strong even when routines are unstable.

Factors Influencing Students' Engagement

Five recurring factors were identified primarily from the interview data. They did not operate independently; one factor could affect several dimensions of engagement at the same time. For example, an interesting text could increase emotional interest and behavioral willingness to continue, whereas difficult vocabulary could increase cognitive effort while also reducing enjoyment and persistence. Table 2 presents the supporting and hindering conditions for these five factors.

Table 2. Factors Influencing Students' Engagement in Extensive Reading

Factor	Supporting Conditions	Hindering Conditions
Reading materials and personal interest	Interesting, relevant, preferred topics; suitable level	Boring, unsuitable, or personally irrelevant materials
Language difficulty	Manageable vocabulary and sentence structure	Unfamiliar vocabulary, long sentences, complex grammar
Time and academic responsibilities	Available free time; manageable workload	Heavy assignments, limited time, tiredness
Motivation and academic requirements	English-improvement goals; academic purpose	Dependence on assignments; lower self-initiated motivation

Reading autonomy and lecturer support	Choice of topics/materials plus guidance	Limited choice or materials not matched to student level
---------------------------------------	--	--

Reading Materials and Personal Interest

Reading materials and personal interest were central to students' willingness to begin and continue reading. The questionnaire showed 90% positive responses to interest in preferred topics and curiosity when a topic was attractive. Interviews reinforced this pattern. P1 selected the manga *Blue Lock* because the story related to football and competition, while P2 and P5 similarly described stronger motivation when materials matched their interests.

Material selection therefore influenced both the start and continuation of reading. Personal relevance could make English reading feel less like an academic obligation and more like an enjoyable activity. This finding supports a central ER principle: learners are more likely to read extensively when they have access to interesting and level-appropriate texts and some freedom of choice (Day & Bamford, 1998; Nakanishi, 2019; Renandya, 2021). It also aligns with Krashen's (2004) argument that voluntary reading is supported by access to comprehensible and engaging materials.

Language Difficulty

Language difficulty was a recurring barrier. Participants mentioned unfamiliar vocabulary, long sentences, complicated grammar, and difficulty finding materials at the right level. When too many unknown words appeared, reading became slower and more tiring. P2 explained that very difficult English novels required repeated reading and frequent dictionary or translation use. P5 similarly identified vocabulary and long sentences as the most common problems.

Difficulty did not always stop reading immediately. In some cases, it increased cognitive effort because students used more strategies. However, sustained difficulty could reduce emotional enjoyment and behavioral persistence. This illustrates how the same factor can influence more than one engagement dimension. This finding is consistent with vocabulary and reading research indicating that lexical access and text difficulty strongly shape comprehension and persistence (Nation, 2015; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006).

Time and Academic Responsibilities

Time and academic responsibilities were closely related to behavioral consistency. Several participants explained that reading depended on whether they had free time and how many university assignments they needed to complete. P2 stated that the main problems were consistency and time and that assignments or tiredness often resulted in not reading, even when there was an intention to read.

This finding explains the contrast between high interest and lower weekly consistency. Students did not necessarily avoid reading because they disliked it. Instead, reading competed with other academic priorities. In higher education, such contextual constraints are important because independent learning requires students to manage multiple responsibilities (Heilporn et al., 2021; Kahu & Nelson, 2021). This contextual explanation extends individual-level accounts of motivation by showing

that time and workload are part of the engagement environment rather than merely personal barriers.

Motivation and Academic Requirements

Motivation operated in two related ways. Students commonly reported personal goals such as improving vocabulary, reading comprehension, and overall English ability. At the same time, academic requirements frequently provided an immediate reason to read. The questionnaire difference between 100% positive motivation for English improvement and 60% positive motivation without lecturer requirements clearly reflects this pattern. This distinction reflects the difference between autonomous and controlled forms of motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2020).

Academic requirements were therefore not simply negative. Assignments could help initiate reading and provide structure. However, frequent dependence on assignments also indicated that independent motivation had not developed equally among all participants. The challenge is to use academic structure to support, rather than replace, self-directed reading.

Reading Autonomy and Lecturer Support

Participants valued autonomy, particularly the ability to choose materials that matched their interests and proficiency levels. At the same time, they did not suggest that lecturers should be absent from the process. Instead, they preferred guidance that helped them locate appropriate texts, set realistic goals, and maintain reading activities.

P5 suggested that lecturers provide several choices so students could select topics they liked, while P2 recommended varied materials such as novels, articles, and short stories. These responses indicate that autonomy and lecturer support are complementary rather than contradictory. Meaningful choice can strengthen ownership, while lecturer guidance can reduce the difficulty of finding suitable materials and provide structure for students whose independent reading routines are not yet stable.

"I think the type of reading material, the difficulty, the time I have, and also my mood are important. If the topic is interesting and the language is easy to understand, I'm more motivated to read." (P5)

These findings are consistent with ER implementation research showing that learner choice needs to be accompanied by teacher scaffolding, especially when students have limited experience with independent reading (Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009; Day & Bamford, 1998).

Implications of the Findings

The findings have theoretical, practical, and methodological implications. Theoretically, they reinforce the value of viewing ER engagement as multidimensional. A single indicator, such as reading participation, would not have shown the full pattern. Students generally valued reading and used active cognitive strategies, yet regularity remained difficult. The contrast between 90% positive interest and only 40% agreement on regular weekly reading illustrates why emotional engagement should not be treated as equivalent to behavioral consistency. This supports multidimensional engagement theories (Bond et al., 2020; Fredricks et al., 2004) and extends them to ER in Indonesian EFL higher education.

Practically, ER programs should pay attention to the conditions that make sustained reading possible. Students need access to varied and manageable materials, opportunities to choose topics that interest them, and guidance on strategies for dealing with difficult vocabulary or sentences. Reading targets should be realistic enough to fit alongside university responsibilities. Short reflections, discussions, or reading logs may provide structure without removing learner autonomy. For students, the findings suggest the importance of setting realistic routines and selecting texts at an appropriate level; for lecturers, they suggest combining autonomy with scaffolding; and for program managers, they support the provision of varied printed and digital reading resources.

The findings also suggest that lecturers should avoid interpreting irregular reading only as low motivation. Students may have positive attitudes but face limited time, difficult materials, or competing academic demands. Supporting engagement therefore requires attention to both students' personal motivation and the learning environment in which reading takes place. Methodologically, the study shows that a qualitative descriptive design with descriptive questionnaire support can capture both general patterns and explanatory accounts of engagement; however, future studies should combine self-report data with reading logs or observations to examine actual reading behavior more directly.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that students in the English Education Study Program at the University of Mataram demonstrated behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement in Extensive Reading, but these dimensions were not equally strong. Behavioral engagement was visible in participation and effort, yet consistency remained the central challenge. Emotional engagement was generally positive, particularly when reading materials were interesting, accessible, and perceived as useful for English improvement. Cognitive engagement was evident in students' strategic reading, comprehension monitoring, reflection, and meaning-making. In relation to the second research question, engagement was influenced by five interacting factors: reading materials and personal interest, language difficulty, time and academic responsibilities, motivation and academic requirements, and reading autonomy and lecturer support. These findings indicate that engagement in Extensive Reading cannot be explained by motivation alone; it is shaped by the interaction between personal, textual, and academic conditions.

The study contributes theoretically by supporting a multidimensional view of engagement in the context of Extensive Reading, showing that emotional and cognitive investment may remain strong even when behavioral consistency is weak. Practically, the findings highlight the need for accessible and varied reading materials, meaningful learner choice, realistic reading targets, and lecturer scaffolding that supports rather than replaces independent reading. Methodologically, the study illustrates the value of a qualitative descriptive design supported by descriptive questionnaire data for capturing both general patterns and students' explanations of their reading experiences. However, the study is limited by its small purposive sample, reliance mainly on self-report data, and the unavailability of Questionnaire Item 23. Therefore, the findings provide a contextual and in-depth description rather than a statistically generalizable account of Extensive Reading engagement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Students are encouraged to develop realistic reading routines that can be maintained alongside academic responsibilities, to select materials matching both their interests and language levels, and to continue using appropriate strategies when comprehension difficulties occur. Lecturers are encouraged to provide varied and level-appropriate reading options, allow meaningful student choice, and combine autonomy with guidance such as realistic targets, text recommendations, brief reflections, or discussions. The English Education Study Program should improve access to varied printed and digital reading resources at different difficulty levels. Future researchers are recommended to involve broader participant groups, multiple institutions, and additional data sources such as reading logs, classroom observations, or longitudinal records, and to examine how specific Extensive Reading interventions, material types, and lecturer scaffolding influence behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement over time.

REFERENCES

- Al-Homoud, F., & Schmitt, N. (2009). Extensive reading in a challenging environment: A comparison of extensive and intensive reading approaches in Saudi Arabia. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 383–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809341508>
- Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2021). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dejonckheere, M., & Vaughn, L. M. (2019). Semistructured interviewing in primary care research: A balance of relationship and rigour. *Family Medicine and Community Health*, 7(2), e000057. <https://doi.org/10.1136/fmch-2018-000057>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heilporn, G., Lakhal, S., & Bélisle, M. (2021). An examination of teachers' strategies to foster student engagement in blended learning in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(25). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00260-3>
- Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2021). Student engagement in the educational interface: Understanding the mechanisms of student success. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 40(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1770577>
- Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research* (2nd ed.). Libraries Unlimited.

- McLean, S., & Rouault, G. (2017). The effectiveness and efficiency of extensive reading at developing reading rates. *System*, 70, 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.09.003>
- Nakanishi, T. (2019). Extensive reading and the development of language proficiency: A meta-analysis. *System*, 84, 102124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102124>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2015). Principles guiding vocabulary learning through extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27(1), 136–145.
- Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Fryer, L. K. (2020). Self-determined motivation, engagement, and achievement in language learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 78, 101817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101817>
- Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 18(1), 1–28.
- Renandya, W. A. (2021). Extensive reading and listening in the EFL classroom: Principles and practices. *RELC Journal*, 52(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220987209>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(4), 571–581. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.85.4.571>
- Suk, N. (2017). The effects of extensive reading on reading comprehension, reading rate, and vocabulary acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 52(1), 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.152>
- Takase, A. (2007). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19(1), 1–18.
- Yamashita, J. (2013). Effects of extensive reading on reading attitudes in a foreign language. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 25(2), 248–263.