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Abstract

Adolescents’ motivation to read continues to decline. The purpose of this embedded single case study was to explore adolescent reading motivation to determine some ways in which adolescents are motivated to read. Through purposeful sampling, the participants included seven twelfth grade students and three English Language Arts teachers in grades nine through eleven. The research site was a small technology-rich, rural, public high school in the northeastern United States. Using the framework of modern expectancy-value theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002), the focus of this study was to explore and examine adolescent students’ motivation to read through an analysis of both students’ self-perceptions of reading motivation and reading attitude, and teachers’ perceptions of students’ reading motivation and attitudes as observed in class. A linear logic model guided the qualitative data analysis process through three phases of data analysis, including coding and thematic development. Findings included that: 1) students held high expectancy-beliefs with lower task-values for reading, 2) students enjoyed digital recreational reading best, while academic digital and recreational print domains were enjoyed less, and academic print was scored least enjoyable, 3) teachers motivate students by observing and adapting to students’ levels of reading motivation, 4) students did not perceive reading as useful outside of school now or in the future, 5) teachers developed successful strategies to address reading motivation and attitudes. Recommendations for increasing reading motivation were developed for the research site. Areas for future study include analysis of adolescents’: level and basis for motivation, attitudes toward printed versus digital text in the classroom, and perceptions of English Language Arts skills in the workforce and secondary education.
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Chapter 1

Statement of the Problem

Educators face an urgent crisis. Despite continuous research on reading and numerous new reading programs promising high interest text, many adolescents still do not want to engage in reading (Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997; McKool, 2007). The negative relationship between less time spent reading and decreasing academic achievement (Brozo, Shiel, & Topping, 2007; Guthrie et al., 1997) makes motivating adolescents to read a concern, as teens in the United States, and internationally, are increasingly disengaged from reading and therefore less able to successfully undertake literacy tasks (Brozo et al., 2007; Cuevas, Russell, & Irving, 2012, p. 446; McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012). The steady decline in adolescent reading motivation has resulted in ever increasing numbers of adolescents who are unmotivated and unable to read strategically and are therefore less prepared for successful college experiences and careers (Brozo et al., 2007). To reverse this trend, educators and researchers must begin to develop and engage with new methods focused on the improvement of adolescent reading motivation and attitude, if reading ability is to improve.

One of the most challenging issues facing teachers of adolescents is that problems with reading ability increase in complexity over time. Reading ability, reading motivation and reading attitude are interrelated and affect reading success separately and in combination (Conradi, Jang, Bryant, Craft & McKenna, 2013; Henk, Marinak, & Melnick, 2012; McKenna et al., 2012; Paige, 2011; Stanovich, 1986). As students progress through school, motivation to read often declines (Applegate & Applegate, 2010; Guthrie et al., 1997) and reading attitudes may become
more negative (McKenna et al., 2012). Negative motivation and attitude issues build over time as the frequency of adolescents’ experiences with negative outcomes in reading activities increases. The students may simply begin to give up. The reading ability of adolescents is further impacted when they no longer practice reading the more complex text presented to them in secondary classes. The students fall even further behind.

The effect of reading motivation on reading ability can be seen in the phenomenon that has been labeled by reading researchers as the “Matthew Effect”, so named in reference to the Bible’s Book of Matthew (Stanovich, 1986). The Matthew Effect essentially means that those who have more gain more, while those who have less, gain less. In reading, this means that students who are strong readers from their earliest learning experiences, tend to increase their reading ability steadily and quickly, while those who experience difficulty early on continually fall further behind their peers (Paige, 2011; Stanovich, 1986). As struggling students’ ability to successfully complete increasingly challenging grade level material decreases, motivation to read decreases and attitude toward reading becomes more negative (McKenna et al., 2012). Students who build a wealth of positive reading experiences do better, while those students who accumulate negative reading experiences avoid the unpleasant task of reading as much as possible. For struggling readers, reading becomes an impossible and unpleasant task.

Over time, the divide between those students who are motivated and strategic readers and those who are not becomes larger (Stanovich, 1986). The motivated students explore more complex material and are exposed to many times more material than the readers who are still struggling to master below-grade level text. The difference in reading ability between the two extremes can amount to several years’ worth of education, with the motivated students eventually establishing a significant edge over those who are reluctant to read (Guthrie et al.,
As time passes, low-performing students no longer expect success when reading and therefore do not readily engage in reading activities (Henk, Marinak, & Melnick, 2012). They may consequently lower their valuation of reading activities, seeing them as less important (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996), as a way of justifying their lack of interest. Students’ low self-perceptions of their ability, engagement and increasingly negative attitudes toward reading foster a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. By the time adolescents approach their final years of high school, this negative cycle may have been at work for years, eventually resulting in an inability to read and an unwillingness to try to read.

More research into reading motivation that focuses on eliminating and remediating this destructive cycle of negativity is necessary. Educators have been struggling with this issue for years and previous attempts to dismantle this negative cycle have been unsuccessful. For example, twelfth grade students’ reading ability has declined for more than thirty years, with attempts at intervention repeatedly proven ineffective. Indeed, Iyengar et al. (2007), authors of the National Endowment for the Arts report, indicate that as of 2005, only approximately one third of twelfth grade students nationwide are proficient in reading. The authors of the report also indicate an increase in the “reading gap” between the genders at twelfth grade, with standardized test scores in reading decreasing more dramatically for males (Iyengar et al., 2007).

Reading ability, a key outcome of reading motivation, has a lasting effect upon an individual’s life. Low reading ability may rob a young adult of the productive future that the individual deserves. As so many higher-paying careers demand a highly technical training, a college education and the ability to read more complex text, the earning potential of a young adult with low reading ability is likely to be limited.
Research problem. The problem of practice addressed in this research is that decreased reading motivation of students in secondary schools leads to lowered reading ability, decreased potential for academic achievement, as well as an inability to engage in daily literacy tasks.

The purpose of this research is to determine viable methods of motivating students to read in the high school English Language Arts classroom. As a means of understanding reading motivation relating to English Language Arts students and their teachers, the theoretical framework of this research is grounded in the modern expectancy-value theory of motivation developed by Eccles et al. (1983, 1984 and Meece et al., 1990, as cited in Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). As students advance through their K-12 educational careers, their confidence in their ability to take on reading assignments is affected by previous experiences (Stanovich, 1986). As the confidence of students changes over time, so does the value they place upon reading tasks. Students with negative reading experiences may lose confidence in their ability to successfully complete a reading assignment and therefore place that task as a lower priority than other tasks where they may have a higher expectancy for completion (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Gambrell et al., 1996). Reading motivation may decrease as confidence and task-value decreases.

Key definitions. Reading ability is a reader’s level of comprehension and fluency while reading, while readers experiencing difficulties are known as struggling readers. Struggling readers are often reading below the grade or age level of their peers and can experience problems in a variety of areas including comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and ability to flexibly apply a variety of strategies to comprehend text (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Paige, 2011; Pitcher, Martinez, Dicembre, Fewster, & McCormick, 2010). Reading motivation, according to Guthrie et al. (1997, p. 439) is “the motivated use of strategies for reading.” Therefore, those who do not read strategically are classified as unmotivated readers. Unmotivated readers avoid the work
required to read closely, apply strategy, set goals, monitor comprehension and connect any existing background knowledge they possess with new material presented in the text (Guthrie et al., 1997, p. 439). Reading engagement may develop from motivated reading, and is described as, “students who are motivated to read, strategic in their approaches to comprehending what they read, knowledgeable in their construction of meaning from text, and socially interactive while reading” (Guthrie, Wigfield, & You, 2013, p. 602). The inclusion of social interaction with reading activities is often a means to encourage children to participate and to value reading activities as more worthwhile (Ivey & Johnston, 2013).

Reading attitude encompasses one’s feelings toward reading—positive, negative or neutral. Reading attitude can be defined as one’s “acquired predispositions to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to aspects of reading” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, as cited in McKenna et al., 2012, p. 285). Readers who claim not to enjoy reading, but do read at times, are known as non-readers, reluctant readers, or resistant readers while students who enjoy and seek to read are described as avid readers. Readers who do not like to read often possess a negative reading attitude, which may be an overall attitude or only for certain modes or purposes in reading (Conradi et al., 2013). There is also a class of readers called aliterate readers who, despite the ability to read, refuse to read because of their intense dislike of reading (Brinda, 2011; Decker, 1986). Reading attitude is closely tied to reading identity. Ivey and Johnston (2013) suggest that adolescents especially may adopt many reading identities over the course of their high school years.

**Justification for the research problem.** Three interrelated strands affecting reading motivation in the classroom will be examined in the literature review: reading motivation research, reading attitude, and technology and reading. Reading motivation is frequently cited as
a major concern of many secondary teachers (Guthrie et al., 1997). As a result, examining reading motivation research may provide some practical research-based methods teachers can use to increase student reading motivation through curriculum design and classroom practice.

One such strategy is an instructional framework called Concept-Oriented Reading strategy (CORI), developed by the National Reading Resource Center (NRRC). This strategy has been effective in motivating struggling secondary students to read in the content areas, particularly in science (Guthrie et al., 1997; Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, & Perencevich, 2006).

The success and unique nature of this strategy lies in its explicit support for reading motivation. CORI incorporates several research-based practices to motivate students: self-selection of reading material and choice of material, collaboration with peers, creativity, explicit reading strategy instruction, connections to real life, and establishing a purpose for reading (Guthrie et al., 1997; Guthrie et al., 2006). Recommended for struggling readers from grades five through twelve, content-area teachers who used CORI reported that their students were more motivated to read as they became focused and curious about investigating real-life problems experienced through class work and then reading to discover the background, processes and explanation for what they observed (Guthrie et al., 1997; Guthrie et al., 2006).

Reading attitude research is often examined according to its impact upon reading motivation and ability. Henk et al. (2012) indicate that students’ self-perceptions of reading attitude can serve to either help motivate or to prevent students from reading. As a result, this study provides a field-tested and validated survey to measure reading attitude of students ranging from the seventh to the tenth grades. The survey is suggested for classroom use in monitoring and developing an optimal classroom climate for reading motivation based on students’ reading
attitude survey responses. The authors of the study urged teachers to use this information to further customize individual student feedback in reading and to provide a way of involving students in making decisions about a future course to take and in goal-setting (Henk et al., 2012).

Researchers often find that technology itself is not the motivating factor in a classroom activity, rather they find that motivation is determined by how that technology is utilized within a classroom for a pedagogical purpose (Gunter, 2012; Jacobs, 2012). If the technology is thoughtfully and meaningfully used, or used for an authentic purpose, it may enhance the interest of students (Abrami, Venkatesh, Meyer, & Wade, 2013; Gunter, 2012; Jacobs, 2012). Jacobs (2012) also cautions that students may not necessarily come to class technology-literate. Adolescents in particular are often assumed to be technologically savvy, when there is usually a range of ability and interest. Jacobs indicates that adolescents are more likely to become motivated by technology when they can engage in a social component of a technology-based activity. Adolescent students were more motivated to read when they worked on discussion boards working with their peers, as they seemed to thrive and crave that peer interaction and feedback (Jacobs, 2012).

**Deficiencies in the evidence.** The deficiencies of evidence in the literature include underexplored areas of research into adolescent reading concerns (Brooks-Yip & Koonce, 2010; McKenna et al., 2012). Quantitative research studies are often successfully used in reading motivation research, but recent research acknowledges the importance of students’ personal input into their own reading goals and futures (Pitcher et al., 2010). The affective areas of reading motivation and attitude need to be explored more fully as these relate to reading motivation and attitude as these areas have not been widely explored as of yet (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; McKenna et al., 2012).
Teachers are often overlooked as a valuable resource. Another deficiency to be noted is that teachers are often observed to determine whether best practices developed by third parties are adhered to and utilized correctly, but teachers are not often consulted concerning their own tried and true beliefs concerning the very students they see daily and what works for these students day in and day out.

Reading motivation is often studied in university lab schools or in a research-oriented context. Eccles and Wigfield (2002) indicate reading motivation needs to be studied in a more typical school context, and also in a wider variety of school contexts, as context has a major impact upon adolescent reading motivation.

Despite evidence that teachers, parents and students themselves are better able to set learning goals when motivations, attitudes, weaknesses and abilities are sought in the classroom (Joint Task Force on Assessment of the International Reading Association and the National Council of teachers of English, 2010), there is an unmet need for research-based classroom applications for increasing reading motivation that can be used by teachers and administrators specifically for adolescents (Guthrie et al., 1997; McKenna et al., 2012). McKenna et al. (2012) note that traditionally, researchers tend to focus on the cognitive difficulties of struggling readers in the primary grades and therefore do not take into consideration the needs of older students who may or may not experience similar problems with reading, particularly with the affective aspects of reading difficulty, which include reading motivation and reading attitude.

These deficiencies in the evidence coincide readily with the strengths in qualitative research studies, particularly in that of a case study design. By its nature, qualitative research involves the input and analysis of the experiences of people, including students and teachers, and their interpretations of their experiences, often within their natural, everyday context. This
proposed single case study is qualitative in nature, providing an opportunity to examine high school English Language Arts teachers deeply, within context, through interviews. Students’ affective dimensions will be examined through surveys measuring reading motivation and attitude.

**Audience.** The audience of this study includes those who are interested in encouraging adolescent reading, increasing motivation to read and improving reading attitudes. The purpose of this study is to identify viable methods of successfully motivating students to read that can be used in the classroom through the use of readily available classroom methods and materials. Teachers, administrators, teacher-educators, researchers, state education officials who shape education policy, as well as students and parents, may benefit from this research.

**Significance of the Research Problem**

To be competitive in the quickly expanding global marketplace, today’s adolescent students need the ability to read well; especially to comprehend, analyze, and critically evaluate text (Brozo et al., 2007). Reluctant and aliterate readers lose valuable practice time with reading skills when they do not choose reading as a leisure time activity. These students may fall behind in reading ability, develop a poor reading attitude and become struggling readers. Students’ academic achievement suffers as they experience difficulty in the higher grades with increasingly complex texts and tasks (McKool, 2007; Stanovich, 1986). Students with low academic achievement cannot participate as successfully in a global economy, as the inability to work with text puts them at a disadvantage (Brozo et al., 2007).

Student disengagement is a serious problem for schools as they work to prepare students for the future. Although the dropout rate for students has declined dramatically through the years,
there are still 6.8% of students overall who leave school early (National Center for Educational Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education, 2014, Table 219.70).

A student’s propensity to drop out of school has been theorized to result from a lack of engagement in school. According to Reschly & Christenson (2013), disengagement from school is a continuous process following the Participation-Identification model, first proposed by Finn in 1989 (as cited in Reschly & Christenson, 2013, p. 4). A key feature of this theory is its concept of school readiness and the basic skills that children first arrive with and demonstrate at school (Reschly & Christenson, 2013). Finn posits that engagement or disengagement begins here, at the beginning, therefore those who are underprepared are more likely to eventually become disengaged (Reschly & Christenson, 2013). This theory consists of a behavior component, involving a child’s participation in school activities and an affect component, involving a child’s valuation of school (Reschly & Christenson, 2013).

The problem of high school dropouts can also have a negative effect on local society. Some disengaged students do not graduate from high school for the reason that they cannot pass the required standardized tests for graduation due to low reading ability (Fine, 2005). Other students may drop out due to continuous cycles of reading remediation that fail to culminate in a passing standardized test score. Students simply lose interest in school, fail to participate, develop a lower valuation of school and drop out as they become disengaged students. These students’ career choices are often limited to low paying jobs (Fine, 2005; Iyengar et al., 2007). Adults who cannot read frequently struggle to find and keep a job that pays well enough to sustain themselves and their families. These adults may descend into or continue living in poverty and perhaps, eventually may become incarcerated (Fine, 2005).
Another negative aspect of unmotivated readers is based in education accountability. Standards-based testing mandates for reading currently demand every student in grades three through eight is assessed annually on reading skills and abilities. Older students usually must pass an exit exam in reading and literature to graduate. Students with low reading ability or who are reluctant readers, often do not score well on standardized tests (Brozo et al., 2007; Iyengar et al., 2007). These high school students may be required to repeatedly reattempt to pass the tests they failed. As a result, not only do students come away with a sense of failure that damages their confidence and attitude toward school, but teachers and administrators become disheartened as well. Although recent Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) legislation enacted in 2015 suggests that states now have flexibility to adapt teacher evaluation to their needs, existing state department of education policies require that teachers and schools in most states still be evaluated on the test scores of their students (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015; Sawchuk, 2016). In this way, careers of school personnel are also negatively impacted as students fail the tests, become disengaged, and drop out.

Since reading is central to the successful futures of students, researching and developing ways to increase student motivation to read and then discovering the best methods to implement those practices are important areas of research that need to be addressed. Students’ educational experience, graduation, career choice and future earning power are all affected by their motivation to read (Iyengar et al., 2007). Students’ ability to participate in an increasingly global economy not only depends on their ability to read well, but also on their willingness to read. As students move through the educational system, teachers must be provided with the latest reading research available to ensure all students receive the chance they deserve to achieve their potential.
Positionality Statement

Positionality is an important consideration for any research, however, since this research will necessarily involve human subjects, researcher positionality becomes a primary concern. Positionality is the manifestation of a researcher’s life experiences, beliefs, and personality. As such, a researcher’s positionality affects every aspect of the research conducted. It is the lens through which a researcher sees the world, and therefore must be carefully considered in order to prevent harm from coming to research participants. This positionality statement is an attempt to explain the background and experiences of this researcher as it may relate to the study. This section contains an examination of the researcher’s background and positionality as it pertains to reading, socioeconomic status, educational status and positionality in relation to ethics and bias.

Credibility of this research is addressed through this positionality statement. This positionality statement serves to contextualize this research and the position of the researcher within the context as it relates to the study. This researcher’s positionality is that of an educational professional, specializing in the Reading subject area, who has a passion for helping students overcome difficulties and strive to achieve their potential. Teachers participating in the study will be most similar to this researcher, as teachers are also passionate education professionals concerned about the welfare of their students. The difference will be seen in the experiences of students. Since many students in this area have had different cultural and educational experiences from this researcher’s, positionality differences between the researcher and the researched will be sought out and reflected upon. As a researcher engaging in research in another area of the country, at a school located in an area of lower economic opportunity, cultural beliefs and socioeconomic factors that affect students, families and community members’ decisions will be respected.
**Researcher positionality.** The positionality of this researcher is that of a female, middle-class, highly-educated, mid-career professional educator. This researcher lived life mostly in a New England state, but recently moved to a different state within the Northeast. The town where this researcher attended high school was a large and fairly wealthy suburb. The schools in this town were not lacking for funds for activities, resources, or materials. While a student, this researcher was always an avid and skillful reader, participating in college-track classes, and many activities.

As a child, personal reading experiences were numerous and enjoyable, with parents who read aloud daily and engaged in conversation about the books that were read. Weekly trips to the library as a family were made to choose books to read. Everyone would often come away from the library with numerous books, which would all be read by the end of the following week. Reading was a fun activity that everyone in the family engaged in with great enthusiasm. These first experiences with reading had a positive effect on personal beliefs about reading and books.

Personal experience as a Reading teacher has revealed there are many students who have not been so fortunate as to experience books and reading in such a positive manner. Some students’ experiences present a stark contrast with reading and books to the extent that they do not find reading easy or enjoyable. Reading becomes a difficult, unpleasant task to be avoided as much as possible.

Aside from the enjoyment of reading, another one of the contrasts of concern at present is socioeconomic class. This researcher’s socioeconomic status is middle-class, while many of the students are of a lower socioeconomic class. As a member of the middle-class, this status often creates a contrast to the socioeconomic status of some students and families and it becomes difficult to fully understand their challenges. Also, this researcher does not hail from this area of
the country and does not possess the rich background knowledge and shared experiences of the community going back through childhood that can help build a more complete understanding of the students, families and teachers in the area.

Briscoe’s (2005) concern about the appropriation of the *other* is another concern, which describes the situation when someone powerful takes advantage of those less powerful. As with any research, there is the potential for the research to provide benefits to the researcher at the expense of the participants. To counteract this potential issue, communication of goals, process and results to help confirm to participants they have not been misrepresented in any way is a part of the design. Also, student participants chosen from those students who will not be assigned to this researcher’s classes currently or in the future is a part of the design. The teacher participants are not influenced or supervised by this researcher in any way, however as departmental colleagues willing to help out, the teachers may feel obligated to participate in the study. The consent documents make it clear that the study is strictly voluntary.

**Ethics.** As a scholar-practitioner situated within the institution where this research takes place, there are potential concerns about ethics and bias. For example, as an authority figure, students and parents may be reluctant to share their true feelings, particularly if these are negative, and they may be reluctant to voice concerns or inform the researcher they do not wish to participate in the research. To counteract this issue, the introduction and consent letter clearly states that honest and accurate opinions, thoughts and feelings of participants are being sought and that students are not subject to any bias or negative consequences if they choose not to participate in the surveys.

Ethical operation is important, with the recruitment of volunteers only, and the understanding that participation in the study may end any time participants choose to withdraw.
Teachers and students must complete consent forms. Students are required to obtain parental consent. Parents are provided the opportunity to view the survey in person prior to administration. This study does not involve any participants over which the researcher has any control (Creswell, 2013).

To prevent potential ethical problems, clear communication helps the research process become more transparent. It is vital teachers, students and parents understand the meaning of the consent forms provided, so both students and parents receive copies of the documents, written in an easy to understand manner. In addition, an explanation of the study’s purpose, methods and intended outcome presented with the overarching goal being to assure participants and parents understand the nature of the research is given to participants. Participants are provided with a means of contact, to discuss concerns, ask questions, to opt out of or withdraw from the study.

**Conclusion.** The potential impact of positionality upon research is immense, yet it is a necessary feature of qualitative research, as it is integral to providing meaning and aiding in interpretation of qualitative data (Maxwell, 2005). However, it is also important to remain conscious of one’s positionality and its potential as an obstacle for quality research. Recognizing one’s position of power, specific tendencies and biases, as well as differences and similarities to the groups being studied, are key components for balancing one’s positionality. Although it will never be completely possible to understand the world from another’s perspective, considering the concerns and fears of all involved and keeping lines of communication open as research progresses can help avoid issues with positionality and ethics, as well as improve goodwill and positivity for the researcher and the participants in the study.
Research Questions

Twelfth grade students are a unique population. They have entered their final year in secondary school and most have twelve to thirteen years of experience with traditional K-12 education. These students have experienced the instruction of a variety of teachers and pedagogical approaches in English Language Arts. As they prepare to move to the next phases of their lives, whether it be entering a career, college, or vocational training, as a final, cumulative product of traditional education, their perceptions are valuable to guide future instruction.

Students at the twelfth grade level receive the majority of their experience in reading as it is taught in English Language Arts class periods. The most important information to be gained from these research questions will be effective practices for teachers to strategically use in the classroom to stimulate reading motivation in high school students. Data from student surveys on reading motivation and attitude and teacher interviews concerning their personal opinions and beliefs regarding reading motivation and attitude will be synthesized, analyzed, and combined to provide insight into student and teacher perceptions concerning what methods work to motivate students to read.

Motivated readers are strategic readers, but it is not clear what methods teachers utilize to successfully motivate students to read strategically in the typical high school English Language Arts classroom. Students’ perceptions of their reading motivation and attitudes while in high school affect their plans for the future. The following four questions are explored in this research.

Central Research Question: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?
This is the central research question at the core of the purpose of this research. All of the data collected will be analyzed in order to seek answers to this overarching question driving this research. Teacher interviews from grades nine through eleven comprise the primary data set, with interview questions that focus on teacher experiences with reading motivation and attitude in the classroom. Student survey results on motivation and attitude inform several interview questions presented to teachers.

Sub-Question a. How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?

According to expectancy-value theory, students develop motivation to read over time and through their reading-related experiences. Students’ perceptions of their ability to successfully complete a reading related task and their perceived importance of reading in their lives and to their futures is an important component developed through their years of education. It is important to understand students’ perceptions of their own potential success in reading activities and their personal valuation of reading as these are factors within the classroom that could be potentially controlled (Pitcher et al., 2007). To measure students’ perceptions, a survey tool based in expectancy-value theory known as the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) (Pitcher, et al., 2007) will be used.

Sub-Question b. What are students’ attitudes toward reading?

Students’ attitudes toward reading also develop over time and through past experiences. Twelfth grade students have completed the entire K-12 progression and have a wealth of experience and a higher level of maturity that may provide useful information concerning their past instruction. Students’ attitudes may reveal preferences for digital or print text in the classroom or for recreational purposes. This information is important as it has the potential to
help teachers create a customized high school curriculum for individual students that may better develop, promote and support motivated readers and result in more meaningful English Language Arts activities.

Sub-Question c. How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?

English Language Arts teachers are often the sole providers of reading instruction in the high school context. Teacher perceptions and observations regarding what works and what does not work in regard to motivating students to read is a valuable source of information that may provide insight into the successful instruction of high school English Language Arts students. Conducting semi-structured interviews with practicing high school English Language Arts teachers may provide evidence of strategies and methods that work for both individuals and for the group across the body of collected interview data, while allowing the opportunity to engage in discussion with teachers at a greater depth. Significant student survey results will be provided to teachers through questions provided in the interview protocol. The inclusion of findings from the student survey results may provide an additional opportunity for teachers to provide input concerning their personal experiences with the reading motivation and attitudes of this twelfth grade group of students.

Theoretical Framework

Modern expectancy-value theory research has built upon the prior work of achievement motivation researchers such as Kurt Lewin, John William Atkinson, David McClelland and others who developed the foundation of expectancy-value theory beginning as early as the 1930s (Wigfield, Byrnes, & Eccles, 2012). The theory’s application to the field of education developed and expanded in the late twentieth century and was initially undertaken principally by educational psychology researchers Jacquelynne Eccles and Allan Wigfield (Wigfield, Byrnes, &
Eccles and Wigfield, along with their colleagues, developed a complex expansion of prior expectancy-value theory, called the Expectancy-Value Model of Achievement (Parsons, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, et al., 1983, as cited in Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). This model includes additional components that can affect motivation, including a child’s personality, outlook, culture, emotional state, goals, prior experiences, attitudes, as well as the core components of expectancy-value theory, the expectancy-beliefs and task-values (Parsons, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, et al., 1983, as cited in Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

**Modern expectancy-value theory.** The modern education-oriented iteration of expectancy-value theory is much more context-oriented than its predecessors. Current views of reading motivation are based on the idea that students are influenced in a myriad of ways and that they respond to these influences in a variety of unique ways as well. Students are one small part of a larger system and are affected not only by their past experiences and beliefs, but also by the classroom environment, peer interactions, teacher interactions, family beliefs, culture and the world surrounding them. This broader interpretation of the theory has made expectancy-value theory more valuable to educational research. As a result of its ease of use and flexible application, expectancy-value theory has become one of the most widely utilized theories for the study of academic motivation and especially reading motivation.

According to Eccles and Wigfield (2002), current expectancy-value theory is based on the idea that one undertakes a task or an activity with a certain set of assumptions. First, an individual entering into an activity has a certain preconceived expectancy for achieving the completion of this task successfully. This is known as an expectancy-related belief. Certain individuals may have higher or lower expectancy-related beliefs for a certain task, and across a variety of tasks. Second, an individual engaging in a task also has a certain preconceived value
for the completion of that activity or task. This is known as a task-value belief. In the task-value belief, an individual demonstrates his or her value for completing this task, deciding what level of importance or value this task has within that individual’s achievement goals. The two aspects of the theory, expectancy-related beliefs and task-value beliefs affect an individual’s level of persistence, achievement performance and choice (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

In addition, Eccles and Wigfield (2002) offer the unique perspective that task-value is comprised of four distinct areas: attainment value, intrinsic value, utility value and cost (p. 119). Attainment value is the student’s perception of the need to excel in a task (p. 119). Intrinsic value is the level at which a student becomes motivated to participate in a task because of his or her enjoyment or interest in the activity (p.120). The utility value is a measure of the individual student’s perception of the task’s usefulness to his or her future goals (p. 120). Cost is merely the student’s perception of what sacrifices must be made in order to engage in a task (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). These task-value components help shape the motivation levels of individual students. Measuring each of these areas can provide information as to the extent that individual students value an assignment or activity and the reasons why the activity is valuable.

Eccles and Wigfield (2002) indicate expectancy-beliefs and task-values affect students’ ability to perform well in school, determination to achieve and influences which tasks they choose to engage in (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002, p. 118). Their research has shown that expectancy-beliefs about performance affect student performance in English and mathematics, while task-values affect student plans for future courses in mathematics, English and Physics (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Both expectancy-beliefs and task-values ultimately affect students’ choice of career (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).
**Expectancy-value theoretical framework.** Adolescents have a lifetime of school experience, learning, success, failures, goals, and the attitudes and motivation that have developed according to their own personal experiences over the span of their K-12 careers. As students age and gain experience, they discover there are certain tasks at which they are better and certain tasks at which they are not (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Students associate positively with their strengths. This encourages the formation of expectancy-values, as students expect to do well at certain things and not as well at others (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). To mitigate the negative associations, students may engage in behaviors, such as placing a lower task-value on activities deemed more difficult, in response to waning expectancy-beliefs over time (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Adolescents have had years of instruction and reading experiences to build expectancy-beliefs and task-values. It is important to study adolescents precisely because they have a lifetime of expectancy-value theory-related behavior behind them.

The expectancy-value theoretical framework has been utilized extensively for reading motivation research since Eccles et al. (1983) first introduced their Expectancy-Value Model for Achievement. As a result, there have been a wealth of literature, data and enhancements developed over time that can be applied to real-life classroom contexts. For this study, the theory provides a useful way to identify certain strengths and weaknesses of students and a framework to discuss strategies to address these strengths and weaknesses with teachers.

Assigning a label based in expectancy-value theory to the behavior observed in the classroom can make analysis and discussion of the behavior easier to complete. For example, the fact that some students are reluctant to engage in English Language Arts classroom activities can be interpreted through this theory to indicate either that students do not have the necessary positive expectancy-beliefs to undertake the task, or perhaps that the students do not value the
task highly enough to be motivated to engage. With the key characteristics of expectancy-value theory identified, a strategy can be developed based on the wealth of prior research, that will enhance strengths or provide support and intervention for weaknesses in the students. Because of the depth of prior research, the expectancy-value theoretical framework is a valuable tool that can make the dynamics of reading motivation within the high school classroom clearer and more easily understood and addressed by those who work with the students on a daily basis, the teachers.

Using expectancy-value theory for this research will provide insight not only into the experiences of adolescent readers, but also into the experiences of their English Language Arts teachers. Teachers are under intense pressure to create meaningful and authentic learning experiences for students. English Language Arts teachers are also keenly aware of their students’ learning needs and expectations for assignments. This study will examine teachers’ attempts to meet the needs of their students with authentic, interesting lessons and assignments that students feel optimistic about attempting.

The theory can also be used to examine teachers’ proactive and reactive responses to students’ motivation levels. Expectancy-value theory already exists as a tool that can be used to examine how teachers build on their students’ successes and negotiate students’ weaknesses to increase student reading motivation on a daily basis in the classroom. Teachers create an environment for nurturing reading motivation through developing the expectancy-beliefs of students and creating valuable tasks that students see as worthwhile endeavors important to their futures. Teachers must be able to tailor curriculum and persuade students to see the value in the tasks asked of them and to act as their coaches when students feel an assignment may be just out of reach. The strategies, skills, and observations of English Language Arts teachers as they
engage in the process of teaching their students will be examined in this research. The use of expectancy-value theory will enhance this research because it is closely related to the activities that teachers engage in every day as they teach adolescent students.

**Problem of practice.** Expectancy-value theory is an appropriate theoretical framework to investigate the problem of practice and research questions because, being older, adolescent students have accumulated a wealth of experiences, values and beliefs about reading and teachers regularly attempt to motivate students through developing positive student expectancy-beliefs and values toward reading assignments. The problem of practice is that adolescents are increasingly less motivated to read and as a result are increasingly unprepared to engage in the literacy tasks demanded of them by real-life activities (Brozo et al., 2007). Past researchers have been unable to pinpoint the cause of this decline and therefore have been unable to provide solutions that can target the problem. Teachers need strategies that can be used in the secondary classroom to motivate students to read.

**Case study methodology.** Expectancy-value theory informs the case study methodology in that the theory is adaptable and appropriate for discussing adolescent reading motivation and the ways in which teachers attempt to foster reading motivation in the classroom. The theory is appropriate because teachers are generally concerned with whether their students will want to undertake an assignment given in class, and also whether the students will find that assignment to be a worthwhile and meaningful activity. The case study methodology is appropriate because teachers’ perspectives on creating high quality reading assignments that meet the needs of the students can be gathered and explored in greater depth using this methodology. This study’s research questions have been designed to explore both teacher and student perspectives on
adolescent reading motivation in depth, using both the case study methodology and the expectancy-value theory as a lens for analysis.

The research data for the study is generated from three sources: the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) survey (Pitcher et al., 2007), the Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitudes (SARA) (Conradi et al., 2013) and teacher interviews. The two surveys to be administered to students are compatible with expectancy-value theory. The teacher interview questions were built using the components of expectancy-value theory. The data generated from these three data sets are useful in determining student needs for curriculum and instruction, as activities can be adapted to encourage increased motivation if student weaknesses and strengths in motivation are known (Pitcher et al., 2007). The teacher interviews provide insight into the ways that teachers nurture the reading motivation of their students.

Finally, the use of expectancy-value theory, with its established utility as a primary reading motivation theoretical framework, offers this study a tradition of credibility, but also offers the opportunity for a unique, non-traditional investigation into reading motivation. An expectancy-value theoretical framework allows the researcher to explore the research questions because it allows an in-depth analysis of the perceptions of adolescents’ reading motivation and attitude through the surveys and the perceptions and reflections of teachers on their students’ reading motivation strengths and weaknesses through the interviews. The views of teachers on reading motivation provide a unique perspective that is not often seen in reading research, since it is often quantitative and student focused.
Chapter 2

This literature review is an examination of three key areas of research affecting reading motivation: reading motivation research, reading attitudes, and technology and reading motivation and how these key areas can reveal ways students become engaged with or disengaged from reading. Reading motivation is the willingness of students to voluntarily engage in the activity of reading with attention to strategies for learning and in-depth thought about text (Applegate & Applegate, 2010; Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997, p. 439). Often, students’ levels of intrinsic motivation will also directly impact their reading ability (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Guthrie et al., 1997, p. 439). Reading ability is determined by the extent to which a student comprehends text at grade level. Students who read below grade level are described as struggling readers.

Adolescents who experience a decline in intrinsic motivation to read will often show an eventual decline in reading ability due to the negative effects of little practice reading and the application of superficial reading strategies (Guthrie et al., 1997; Stanovich, 1986). Guthrie et al. (1997) indicate that intrinsic motivation frequently begins to decline at the middle school level, while extrinsic motivation tends to remain steady. Paige (2011) indicates that extrinsic motivation can be harnessed and utilized to help develop lagging intrinsic motivation. Since intrinsic motivation can be directly influenced by increasing extrinsic motivation, it is important that teachers recognize ways in which the motivation that exists within the classroom population can be grown and developed into increased intrinsic motivation.

Reading attitude includes the reader’s emotions connected with reading and experienced while reading. Negative reading attitudes are often associated with low reading motivation and, consequently, low academic achievement (McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012).
Technology can provide a way for students to become metacognitive and involved in authentic tasks as technology often provides opportunities for communication with other readers, interaction with technology and opportunities for reflection. In examining reading motivation, reading attitudes and technology and reading, it is hoped that insight into preventing and remediating problems in reading motivation can be implemented within the classroom.

This literature review is presented utilizing three interrelated strands: reading motivation research, reading attitudes, and technology and reading motivation. Within each section is a discussion of a slightly different aspect of motivating students to engage in reading. In the reading motivation research section, the motivation research and special engagement considerations of different types of readers are examined. In the reading attitudes section, the attitudes and identities of readers are examined. In the technology and reading motivation section, use of technology involving real-world tasks, interactive features and reading collaboration are discussed as a possible motivator for student reading. A synthesis of important ideas within each section is presented before moving to the next section. Finally, the validity of the thesis of this literature review is discussed in the conclusion and additional areas for research are suggested in the final section.

**Reading Motivation Research**

**Struggling readers.** Struggling readers often remain struggling readers if intervention is not attempted or is unsuccessful. Readers who struggle with comprehension are understandably not motivated to read. This creates a cycle that is difficult for students to break. Students who have become unmotivated need an effective intervention to help overcome their difficulties. The problem is that it is often difficult to know how to best help a student.
Reading Specialists, teachers who specialize in reading instruction and remediation, are necessary to help struggling readers find that much-needed intervention, although school districts often see these as unnecessary. One common method used by districts to address struggling readers instead, are the commercial reading programs, such as SRA Corrective Reading, or Scholastic Read 180. Reading programs are sometimes ineffective, tending to be one-size-fits-all, while targeting student needs inaccurately. Many times the true reading weaknesses for individual students are not addressed or not addressed adequately in these programs, leading to wasted time and stagnating progress. Students may spend years within these programs without ever achieving proficiency (Pitcher, Martinez, Dicembre, Fewster, & McCormick, 2010). Often there is no preexisting solution to a student’s reading problem and teachers need to creatively seek out new ways of increasing reading ability and engaging students (Pitcher et al., 2010).

**Non-traditional texts in the classroom.** Several researchers, including Ciampa (2012), Gabriel, Allington, and Billen (2012), and McKool (2007), suggest struggling readers are more motivated to read when offered the opportunity to self-select their reading materials. Self-selected magazines for struggling readers provide many avenues for differentiation and personalization. Students often do not view reading a magazine as “real” reading and therefore, feel less pressure. An associated factor that could encourage motivation is the “novelty effect” (Gabriel et al., 2012). This occurs when students become excited or interested in a new aspect of reading, such as a genre, some new technology or a personalized choice of text simply because it is new to them. The students will then engage in reading because of this newly generated excitement. Gabriel et al. (2012) showed the novelty effect at work when students who chose their own magazines read the entire magazine the very day they received it and then reread it several times over the following days (Gabriel et al., 2012). The novelty effect can lead to
increased voluntary reading, often outside of school, since magazines are not a preferred school reading genre. The novelty effect and self-selection of alternative genres may be effective ways to help teachers and parents encourage students to read voluntarily (Ciampa, 2012; Gabriel et al., 2012).

Magazines can also help motivate struggling readers to engage in independent reading as the magazines have built-in methods of differentiation (Gabriel et al., 2012). Since the magazine has been self-selected, it likely contains a topic of interest and familiarity, which helps motivate the student to read. If the topic of a magazine is familiar to the student, the vocabulary will often be familiar, too, and so issues of vocabulary weakness and lack of background knowledge are alleviated. Reading fluency will develop as a student finally reads text that is accessible (Gabriel et al., 2012) as well as interesting. If the text proves too difficult, pictures and captions can assist in comprehension. If additional difficulties persist, there are often numerous other related articles to read, and often these articles are at varying levels of difficulty (Gabriel et al., 2012).

If teachers can implement student choice into the classroom, students may become more motivated to read. In a study by Morgan and Wagner (2013), the teacher of a sophomore English class developed a unit where students could choose a novel to read and the students would each complete a literary analysis of their books. Struggling readers could choose less difficult books they were familiar with and advanced readers could choose more challenging books for their assignments. The teacher would then teach what he termed “mini-lessons” where he would discuss literary terminology and concepts and the students would proceed to locate and identify examples and discuss these in a journal. The teacher conferenced with every student individually (Morgan & Wagner, 2013). This individual attention meant that each student had an open invitation to ask questions and the teacher could check on each student personally to determine
whether the concepts were understood and if, in fact, the student was reading (Morgan & Wagner, 2013). The result was that, not only were the students more motivated to read their self-selected books, they also understood more because of their increased motivation and comprehension, as well as through the individual attention they received in class (Morgan & Wagner, 2013).

**Psychology based reading research to help struggling readers.** Emotions felt while reading, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to read, situational interest, and methods of assessment of motivation are fields of research developed to help struggling readers improve reading ability and motivation.

**Emotions while reading.** Often, motivation is affected as students experience emotions as a reaction to the activity and difficulty of reading. The field of study examining emotions felt while actively reading is called Moment to Moment Emotions in Reading, (M2M). The M2M emotions consist of: equilibrium (regular easy reading, or “flow”), confusion, delight, surprise, frustration, and boredom (Graesser, D'Mello, & Stahl, 2012). The emotions most often experienced by readers follow a predictable cycle. For example, in a helpful, positive cycle, a student will start at a state of equilibrium or flow, reading quickly and easily, suddenly experience confusion, with perhaps an unknown word or concept encountered in the text, then transition to delight when the meaning is discovered, and finally move back to the easygoing equilibrium or flow state (Graesser et al., 2012). In a harmful, negative cycle, a student will start reading at a state of equilibrium or flow, move to confusion when encountering something unknown, and then, if the confusion is not resolved, transition to frustration and finally boredom as the student decides comprehension is impossible (Graesser et al., 2012).
The discovery of these cycles is important in that these are predictable and therefore useful to help struggling readers develop an awareness of emotions experienced as they read. In turn, these cycles can help them determine when they need help. Computers and interactive software can also be utilized to help readers identify patterns and emotions experienced (Graesser et al., 2012).

**Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to read.** Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation are important tools when attempting to engage struggling readers. In a study by Zentall and Lee (2012), students who were primed with positive reinforcement on their reading abilities not only raised their levels of achievement to match the praise, but also achieved more than students who were not praised. There was a similar effect for extrinsic motivation when the researchers asked the students from each group to compare themselves to the most “clever” student they know and attempted to get the student to compete with that student (Zentall & Lee, 2012). One of the most important findings of this study was that motivation is not only more important to struggling readers than average readers, but also, when remediating reading difficulties, motivational strategy must be included in the action plan (Zentall & Lee, 2012).

Goal theory is also used in motivating struggling readers. To implement this strategy, students are asked to personally consider two types of goals: mastery goals and performance goals. The mastery goals are intrinsic and have to do with a student’s own education and how that student is achieving according to previously set goals. Performance goals are more extrinsic in that they focus on a comparison of how the student is doing in relation to others in the group. This type of strategic goal setting was successful with respect to motivation (Zentall & Lee, 2012).
**Situational interest and motivation to read.** Sometimes student motivation can be inspired with one interesting book or activity. For example, a student may engage with a certain favorite book he or she has reread several times. When a student becomes interested by a specific reading context, a book, a reading partner, or an activity, the process is known as situational interest (Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, & Perencevich, 2006; Paige, 2011).

Paige (2011), suggested a four phase model of situational interest to motivate struggling readers. The author suggests classroom teachers proceed in four phases. The first phase is to use extrinsic motivators to awaken a student’s interest in a topic during instruction. If the teacher is successful in capturing the student’s interest, the second phase is to nurture that student’s interest in the topic over time. After continuous encouragement in the classroom and cultivation of the student’s interest, eventually, the student will learn to value that topic, while demonstrating increasing levels of intrinsic motivation to engage with the topic. Finally, as the student explores and engages with the topic over time, the topic will become personal, as intrinsic motivation finally occurs (Paige, 2011, p. 416). If teachers could implement this model, it might be possible to motivate students to read more predictably.

In a study by Guthrie et al. (2006) involving third grade students, the authors concluded that situational interest can lead to increased motivation to read. In the research, the authors noted that teachers can affect student intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and situational interest through teaching methods and strategies. The Concept-Oriented Reading (CORI) strategy (Guthrie et al., 2006) was used to engage students in authentic tasks and stimulate curiosity about a topic through books using both narrative and informational genres. The authors found that the students who preferred informational books increased their intrinsic motivation over the course of the four month long program and the students who preferred narrative books decreased in
extrinsic motivation (Guthrie et al., 2006). Both of these changes in motivation represent a positive change in motivation brought about through situational interest.

CORI was also used successfully with fifth and seventh grade students in much the same manner (Guthrie et al., 1997; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014). Guthrie and others recommend that to increase situated, intrinsic motivation, teachers should provide support and opportunities for students to engage in hands-on activities and exciting reading lessons or activities to draw students into the lesson, and by extension, the texts that they will read related to the activities. To increase generalized motivation to read, teachers should provide choice of text and activities, opportunities for meaningful collaboration on books, stimulating texts, and authentic tasks related to the reading (Guthrie et al., 2006).

**Assessment of student motivation to read.** Teachers may sometimes need to determine student reading motivation through surveys and questionnaires. One survey by Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) examined three areas of reading motivation: self-efficacy, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and the importance of social interaction (p. 420). Their purpose was to determine if there was a method that could be used to develop predictions of potential avid or reluctant readers. The authors had previously developed a tool for measuring motivation to read based on these three areas, called the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) and this is the tool they used to develop predictions (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). It was found that the MRQ could, in certain instances, predict whether students would demonstrate behavior indicative of an avid or a reluctant reader (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997, p. 429). The authors concluded that students who had previously read more broadly and in larger amounts were more likely to continue this practice, whereas those students who read less frequently were less likely to change their ways
(Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997, p. 429). Students who were intrinsically motivated were more likely to be avid readers.

Motivation to read may also be assessed by teachers using a profile known as the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP). The profile consists of two parts: a reading survey and an interview (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996; Pitcher, Albright, DeLaney, Walker, Seunariesingh, Mogge, Headley, Ridgeway, Peck, Hunt, & Dunston, 2007). The MRP, originally developed by Gambrell et al. (1996) was developed under the framework of expectancy-value theory put forth by J. Eccles in 1983, where motivation correlates with participants’ expectations of success in reading and also by their perception of how worthwhile reading is to them (Gambrell et al., 1996). The survey measures a student’s self-concept as a reader, including self-confidence and confidence as compared to peers, perception of value of reading, including how often students read and their attitudes about engagement in reading. The survey and the interview each take approximately fifteen to twenty minutes to administer (Gambrell et al., 1996). The survey can be administered to a whole group. The interviews must be completed individually, and consist of predetermined open response questions (Gambrell et al., 1996, p. 519). The MRP is particularly useful for students attending grades two through six, as this was the group for whom the MRP was designed.

As the MRP was designed for elementary-level students, Pitcher et al. (2007) found it necessary to adapt the survey for their work with middle and high school students. The adapted survey, known as the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) also consists of two parts: a survey of multiple choice questions and an interview, except that the questions were changed to reflect recent research regarding adolescent readers. The authors chose to adapt the language to appeal to the older audience, and included a question on race and ethnicity as well. Students were
surveyed concerning school activities and assignments enjoyed by students and the use of technology in reading (Pitcher et al., 2007). The purpose of the survey, as with the MRP, is to provide teachers with data to inform reading instruction. The intent of the AMRP is to measure the same areas of concern as the MRP, but for the older groups of students.

The AMRP (Pitcher et al., 2007) was especially useful to determine students’ enjoyment and utilization of multiliteracies, the variety of modes in which students read. Adolescents in particular, enjoyed magazines and electronic modes of reading, especially using the Internet on their computers. They also engaged in electronic modes of communication, such as email and Instant Messages on the Internet as well. Findings of the study included the importance of the social aspects of electronic reading and writing, with students often engaging with family members and friends electronically (Pitcher et al., 2007).

The Pitcher et al. (2007) study also revealed that students were influenced by teachers. For example, students especially enjoyed when teachers read aloud to them and recommended books for them to read. Some enjoyed literature circles and sustained silent reading. More importantly, it was noted that overall, teachers’ attitudes can greatly affect students’ attitudes and motivation (Pitcher et al., 2007).

**Struggling teachers.** Applegate & Applegate (2004) examined the reading motivation of pre-service teachers. In conducting the research, the authors developed a survey, which asked second-year university students enrolled in teacher certification courses at two universities, one each with high SAT score admission and low SAT score admission, about their reading habits. The survey contained open-ended questions regarding the amount of reading the students did for pleasure over the summer, how much they enjoyed reading for pleasure, characteristics remembered from their reading instruction as K-12 students, their ratings of reading done at
home as a child and in elementary school, as well as their favorite author (Applegate & Applegate, 2004).

For the first study, the results were shocking in that of the 195 students surveyed, 54.3% were classified as reluctant readers. Only 25.2% of respondents were potential teachers who enjoyed reading. The students who reported positive reading experiences in elementary school and at home when young were slightly more likely to be avid readers, showing that these positive experiences from the past may have had an effect on their future outlooks on reading. There was a remarkable difference in the results between the two universities. 65.8% of students at the lower SAT score university were categorized as reluctant readers while potential teachers at the higher SAT score university reported 47.1% of students as reluctant readers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004).

The authors conducted a follow-up study to address issues over K-12 levels of reading in the survey. The authors rewrote the survey to separate high school, elementary and middle school responses and included a question about college level reading. They also removed some less important questions. A comparable number of students were surveyed, at 184 students, also in their sophomore year of the same two universities, and enrolled in teacher certification classes. In the results of this new survey, the results were somewhat better, in that only 48.4% of potential elementary school teachers were reluctant readers. The study was repeated one more time, with a new set of students from the same universities and the results revealed 51.5% were reluctant readers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004).

Clearly, if teachers must model enthusiastic and engaged reading to students in order to promote reading engagement, then teachers must be motivated to enjoy reading themselves. Therefore, it seems some of the issues with reading motivation in the classroom could potentially
be a result of the teacher’s decreased willingness to teach reading and failure to instill the love of reading in the students through modeling and appropriate lesson planning. School districts and universities may need to do more to encourage a love of reading in their teachers and future teachers (Applegate & Applegate, 2004).

**Teachers and student motivation.** Often, teachers recognize that students experience a significant reading loss over the summer vacation months. As a result, many teachers and schools implement a summer reading program to help address this problem. Kim (2007) showed that a voluntary summer reading intervention providing first through fifth grade students with books according to individual reading levels and interests motivates students to read, particularly with low income students. Students were split into two groups. One group received a package of ten books matched to their interests and reading abilities, as well as postcards to record answers to predetermined questions and letters from teachers, while the other group received none of these items (Kim, 2007). Results of the study include that the students who received the books read on average about three more books over the summer, therefore showing increased motivation to read. The largest gain was with low income students. Only 3% of low income students who received the book package reported reading less than ten books, whereas 32% of the control group who were low income students reported reading less than ten books (Kim, 2007, p. 513).

Students did not, however, improve their reading achievement scores as a result of their participation in the research. Younger students did not benefit as much, possibly because they had not yet gained enough independence as readers. When structuring voluntary summer reading, teachers should plan to scaffold reading strategies as part of the reading program so students get the most out of their summer reading experience (Kim, 2007).
Teachers generally do not have difficulty determining student levels of intrinsic motivation. Sweet, Guthrie, and Ng (1998), found that the highest achieving students were often the most intrinsically motivated students. As part of the study, the authors developed a survey to measure teacher perceptions of students’ intrinsic motivation. Teacher follow-up interviews were also conducted to clarify findings. The authors concluded that teachers’ perceptions of students’ needs for cooperative learning, choice in activity and text, interesting learning activities, interest in topics, and stimulating writing together determine extent of student achievement in reading (Sweet et al., 1998). In general, the authors confirmed the validity of previous research indicating that higher achieving students were more intrinsically motivated, while lower achieving students were more extrinsically motivated and that teachers were very likely to be cognizant of which students possessed which types of motivations. The implications for practice were that teachers should strive to include scaffolding for intrinsic motivation development in the classroom to improve student achievement, through emphasis on cooperative learning, choice in activity and text, interesting learning activities and matching writing and reading topics to students’ interests (Sweet et al., 1998).

*Motivation through the expectancy-value theory.* Teachers have great effect on student perceptions of reading and therefore on student motivation to read. Applegate & Applegate (2010) studied the effects of teachers on student motivation through the framework of expectancy-value theory. This theory states that motivation occurs as a result of two prerequisites: the perceived probability of success in an endeavor and the importance placed upon the endeavor (Applegate & Applegate, 2010). The authors used the MRP measurement tool developed by Gambrell et al. (1996). Applegate and Applegate (2010) indicate that students who are unmotivated to read score low in both prerequisites, while students who are motivated score
highly in these two prerequisites (Applegate & Applegate, 2010). The key to success would be to try to transform the unmotivated students into motivated students by engaging in instruction that increases students’ value of reading and confidence in reading (Applegate & Applegate, 2010).

Engaged students are motivated to employ appropriate reading strategies to make sense of what they read (Guthrie et al., 1997). Applegate and Applegate (2010) studied the motivation of elementary level students who were able to achieve higher levels of comprehension through more complex thought about a text. The authors determined that students who were able to respond successfully to questions requiring these higher levels of thought were often the more motivated readers. This discovery may mean that explicitly teaching students to comprehend through complex thought about a text may help motivate students to read, by increasing their success at comprehension (Applegate & Applegate, 2010).

Concept-Oriented Reading (CORI) is a classroom strategy developed to increase motivation of students to read (Guthrie et al., 1997). There are seven aspects of the CORI program: observation of real-life situations, theoretical planning, reading strategy instruction, independent learning, shared learning experiences, opportunities for student creativity and communication, and well-crafted instruction (Guthrie et al., 1997, p. 440-443). This particular program has been very popular in classrooms and has been shown to increase reading motivation in low-achieving readers, when applied appropriately, by involving students in reading for an authentic purpose (Guthrie et al., 1997). CORI is particularly effective in content area classes, as students engage in observation and then seek to find out more about the topic through the CORI strategy. Students’ investigation into a topic often will include the use of reading strategies to locate information about their topics of interest (Guthrie et al., 1997).
Synthesis of reading motivation literature. Struggling readers need special attention. Reading Specialists provide resources and expertise that other teachers often cannot for reading instruction (Pitcher et al., 2010). Many struggling readers are male, and so differentiation becomes a key component in the implementation of motivational strategies in the reading classroom (Applegate & Applegate, 2010). To increase the chances of motivation, teachers should have multiple text genres available, including non-traditional genres, such as magazines, from which students may choose. Student-selected text can ensure each student has something interesting to read and is a method shown to motivate students to want to read (Ciampa, 2012; Gabriel et al., 2012; McKool, 2007).

The novelty effect can help get students re-interested in reading initially. If a teacher in the classroom can activate excitement in reading through newly acquired non-traditional texts, this excitement can be built upon. In another example, providing a packet of books for summer reading can lead to an increased number of books read over the summer due to the novelty effect (Kim, 2007). Once that excitement is created, then the teacher needs to provide reading strategy instruction and apply motivation theory to help students, perhaps using the four phase model of situational interest, or the expectancy-value framework, possibly motivating students extrinsically at first, but more and more intrinsically through goal setting techniques as the students gain confidence and excitement about reading.

Teachers often have difficulty improving students’ reading motivation. Some teachers do not demonstrate or model true reading motivation themselves and therefore do not create the excitement within their students causing them to want to read (Applegate & Applegate, 2004, 2010). Sometimes teachers have difficulty identifying students who are motivated or
unmotivated to read and their underlying weaknesses or strengths (Sweet et al., 1998). This is where teacher administered surveys and questionnaires may be useful.

Student reading motivation can be measured by a variety of methods, including surveys and questionnaires. Some of the most popular and useful surveys include the MRP (Gambrell et al., 1996), the AMRP (Pitcher et al., 2007) and the MRQ (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Certain surveys are more useful for certain situations and to uncover certain data, for example the AMRP is structured for use with adolescents, but all can be administered within the classroom and are useful in giving teachers insight into student strengths and weaknesses in reading motivation. This data may then be used to inform instruction in the classroom.

One particularly effective teaching method for motivating students to read is CORI. This instructional strategy was developed to engage readers in a variety of ways and is inquiry-based, a feature that boys especially find stimulating (Fisher & Frye, 2012). CORI involves self-selected reading, explicit reading strategy instruction, hands-on learning experiences, peer collaboration, creativity and interesting activities that develop student autonomy (Guthrie et al., 1997). A feature of this instructional strategy is that students learn and gain a sense of autonomy, which has been shown to increase intrinsic motivation, which in turn, is associated with increased reading motivation (Guthrie et al., 2006).

**Reading Attitudes**

Researchers, in an attempt to try to alleviate and discover the source of the decline of reading motivation, have decided that part of the problem lies in reading attitude. McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer (2012), define reading attitude as “acquired predispositions to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respects to aspects of reading” (McKenna et al., 2012, p. 285). Positive attitudes lead to motivation in reading, while negative
attitudes inhibit motivation, progress and achievement in reading. Research in reading attitude is focused on how to manipulate the attitudes of students to help develop a positive reading attitude. Student reading attitudes may be assessed by teachers in the classroom to help determine strengths and weaknesses of students’ attitudes and plan instruction accordingly.

**Assessment of student reading attitudes.** Teachers need to know how students feel about the act of reading in order to understand how to motivate these students to read. There are a variety of surveys and inventories that have been developed to determine students’ reading attitudes to inform classroom practice. Two of the most commonly used surveys are described.

**Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitudes (SARA).** In order to more fully understand students’ existing reading attitudes, a tool for measurement, such as the Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitudes (SARA), may be used. Developed by Conradi, Jang, Bryant, Craft, & McKenna (2013), this survey can be administered anonymously to students, within a mere ten minute time frame, using data provided by the student, yet has been researched and tested for validity and reliability. In taking the survey, students have an opportunity to express their feelings about reading according to purpose and medium. The survey is used to measure how students feel about reading for academic purposes versus recreational purposes and also measures student attitudes toward print reading and digital reading within the two purposes (Conradi et al., 2013).

**The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 (RSPS2).** A survey developed by Henk, Marinak, and Melnick (2012) called The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 (RSPS2) measures student attitudes and behaviors associated with reading. This survey is invaluable due to its basis in Bandura’s theory of perceived self-efficacy of 1977 and 1982 (p. 312). Self-efficacy is the level of confidence displayed by a student that affects that student’s decision as to whether or not a
task may be completed successfully (Henk et al., 2012). This theory states that higher levels of self-efficacy mean that the student will be more likely to see value in completing a task and see that task as being more easily accomplished. Bandura’s theory includes four areas to be measured to evaluate self-efficacy; including students’ performance with reading tasks over time, how students feel their skills compare to peers, how students feel about the feedback received from peers, and the emotions felt by students when completing reading tasks (Henk et al., 2012, p. 312). The authors of the survey have altered Bandura’s original model to interpret the performance area to mean a student’s perception of his ability to complete a reading task compared to how the student has done in the past (Henk et al., 2012, p. 312-313).

The survey takes between 20-25 minutes to administer within the classroom. Students are asked questions based on these four areas and are scored based on their responses for strength within each area. The raw score will determine whether there are any of the four areas in which a student may be exceptionally low or high. This information can help researchers and teachers create and implement interventions to help improve reading attitude and ultimately reading motivation within a classroom (Henk et al., 2012).

**Negative effects of standardized testing.** State standardized testing can affect students’ reading attitudes negatively. Struggling readers as well as thriving readers often experience a decline in enjoyment and engagement in reading when the stress of standardized testing and preparations for testing begins to be felt (Enriquez, 2013). Struggling readers especially tend to buckle under the pressure and their engagement suffers because teachers are not able to do interesting activities in class that could pique their interests since they are under time constraints and increased pressure (Enriquez, 2013). Struggling readers, the most essential readers to address, are often left behind in this way.
A current method of standardized test preparation that is based in the standards, is to break down reading into separate skills for students to practice and master. As the students drill these separate skills, often students will begin to lose their enthusiasm for reading. Research addressing skill-based test preparation provides evidence that teachers must be more responsive to students.

For example, Francois (2013) concludes that students find value in reading by using what they read to connect with those around them and to understand the world in which they live. Teachers must encourage interest in voluntary reading by offering students an abundance of books to read, rather than fragments, excerpts and skill drills. Students must be allowed to self-select their reading material, as this is a way that helps students make connections between their own lives and what they read, and to school as well (Francois, 2013; Gabriel et al., 2012).

Reading interesting material in school assists students in connecting home to school literacy, which helps students see purpose in their work which can develop a positive attitude (Francois, 2013, p. 148-149; Gabriel et al., 2012). Reading is also about developing student identities, building background knowledge of the world and people around them and helps students explore the choices possible for their futures (Francois, 2013). Isolating skills for test preparation purposes makes reading mechanical and takes the exploration and discovery away from the act of reading, which decreases a student’s willingness to read.

Students’ reading attitude and motivation can also suffer as a result of too much emphasis on certain academic genres of text for the purposes of testing. For example, Language Arts classrooms generally hold the genres of poetry, short stories, novels and essays in great esteem, while students themselves may engage in alternative genres outside of school (Gabriel et al., 2012). Many students report they enjoy reading magazines, comic books, fantasy, anime, graphic
novels and other genres not often valued in school. Once students see that their choice of reading materials is ignored in favor of those they are not interested in, students may become disengaged and disillusioned with school, thinking that there is nothing there for them, and so, their reading attitudes become negative. If students’ reading attitudes become negative, reading motivation decreases and students begin a downward spiral of falling behind in reading (Enriquez, 2013).

Standardized testing monopolizes the time of United States and international students, as well. Brozo et al. (2007) examined Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) results for 2000. PISA exams are given internationally in thirty-two countries, including the United States, the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom. The exams measure higher order reading skills through four authentic reading modes: private, public, occupational and educational (Brozo et al., 2007). The authors studied results for these countries to determine factors that influence reading motivation and engagement. The authors indicate that frequency of reading and reading attitude are major factors in students’ ability to score well on the PISA testing. The problem the authors have identified is that many students either do not want to read or that they do not have time for leisure reading (Brozo et al., 2007). Ireland was the example given, with the authors’ analysis of the results indicating students who read the least for pleasure scored the lowest on the tests, while the students who read the most scored the highest. Measures of reading attitude had similar results. Those with the least positive attitudes toward reading achieved the lowest scores, while those students with the most positive reading attitudes scored the highest on the test (Brozo et al., 2007).

Teachers and students alike must begin providing more opportunities and time for pleasure reading. The authors suggest that more time for reading for pleasure must be allotted for students, as many students may spend most of their time studying by reading for standardized
tests, rather than for pleasure (Brozo et al., 2007). Reading for pleasure, since it is self-selected, tends to have a longer term effect on reading ability and engagement (Brozo et al., 2007). However, the authors caution that the students must be held accountable for their reading through an evaluation system that records the extent to which students have read and understood their books (Brozo et al., 2007). Last, the authors state that the gap that exists between reading at home and reading at school needs to be addressed. Reading attitude of students is affected by the activities and genres read at school. This attitude carries over to the students’ home life and may encourage or discourage a student from reading for pleasure (Brozo et al., 2007).

**Reading identities and student reading attitudes.** Student reading identities and reading attitudes interact and intertwine to determine student reading motivation, and ultimately, ability.

**Males versus females.** To address negative reading attitudes and help bridge home and school, student reading identities are a useful tool. A reading identity is the self-perception of a student as a reader (McKenna et al., 2012). To develop a positive reading identity, students must feel a connection between the literacy practices they engage in outside of school and the literacy practices utilized within the classroom. To bridge this gap, students need to feel their reading genre choices and opinions are valued. McKenna et al. (2012) state that to assess student reading identities, researchers must examine how and why students read outside of class and their favored modes of choice.

McKenna et al. (2012), studied students’ reading modes of choice while reading digital or print texts. They made several key observations. They discovered that in general, females have more positive reading attitudes than males. Possibly as a result, the ability gap between males and females increases as students age and move through school. The authors also noted a
difference in preference between males and females in print versus digital formats and also in outside-of-school versus academic reading. The authors recorded a preference in males for digital formats for outside-of-school reading, whereas females tended to prefer print. Females showed a preference for academic reading in both print and digital formats (p. 298).

Only slight gender differences appeared when other researchers examined attitudes about e-reader use, but there was a larger difference in student effectiveness by gender. In a study by Huang, Liang, and Chiu (2013) females showed a slightly higher satisfaction rate with using e-readers and a more positive attitude than males, as well. Males and females both enjoyed reading on the e-readers and using their interactive features, however when the actual reading study began, the females were more skillful at using them (Huang et al., 2013, p. 107). Comprehension scores of females reading on e-readers was consistently and significantly higher than that of males. Females generally had a faster reading rate and read much more actively and strategically than males did. Males enjoyed the interactive features more than females, and it is possible that it was a distraction (Huang et al., 2013, p. 107).

**Out-of-school reading.** The reading practice and engagement stemming from reading outside of school is essential to academic achievement. McKool (2007), examined reasons why students did or did not read outside of school. McKool (2007) found that two factors lead to student motivation to read out of school which tie in directly to student reading identity: students’ concepts of their own reading ability and students’ valuation of reading (p. 120). Reading attitude is also an important component of reading identity (McKenna et al., 2012, p. 284; McKool, 2007, p. 121).

McKool (2007), in examination of reading identities, reaffirmed that avid readers tend to have a more positive reading attitude than reluctant readers. McKenna et al. (2012) say student
reading attitudes depend on their success as readers. If students do not experience success, then students regard reading as an unpleasant activity. McKool (2007) found additional evidence that reading identity may be formed early on, as most avid readers found learning to read easy and most avid readers could read before they started school or learned while in Kindergarten. Avid readers often reported they were read to and saw reading for enjoyment modeled in their homes. Reluctant readers usually reported they did not have the same positive experiences at home as the avid readers (McKool, 2007).

**Readers’ attitudes: student input.** McKool provided student recommendations for instruction influenced by responses from students interviewed, whether avid, reluctant, low income or middle/high income. Almost all students McKool interviewed preferred the option for self-selected books and books in a series. Struggling and reluctant readers especially enjoy these books since students may have already established familiarity with characters, settings and the author’s writing style (McKool, 2007). Students indicated they enjoyed discussion times provided by teachers that allowed students to discuss books read with other students. They also enjoyed teachers’ book recommendations based on student interests. McKool found reluctant readers often had difficulty locating text to read because they could not locate genres they enjoyed, such as magazines, comic books and graphic novels. Reluctant readers suggested more read-alouds would inspire them to read (McKool, 2007). Students stated using the Internet and technology can help them enjoy reading more (McKenna et al., 2012; McKool, 2007).

Often, the biggest difference in student reading attitude can be made by teachers. Simon (2012) studied student reading identity, social identity and alternative literacies bridging the home and school contexts. This connection between home and school was made through the use of an online classroom discussion forum. In this particular study, a boy who had only a few years
previously spoken exclusively in Chinese, and had shown reluctance to speak in class, found communicating on the online classroom forum more comfortable, but came to enjoy the personal interaction with the teacher that he felt he could not conduct in person (Simon, 2012). The student had previously assumed the identity of a social outsider, someone who students and teachers alike did not talk to (Simon, 2012). The discussion board and the careful attention of the teacher helped the student become more confident and shed this identity of an outsider, awakening the student’s identity as a reader and writer online.

Another student in the same study was a self-described reader, writer and artist (Simon, 2012). This student was frequently in trouble at school because of his passion for non-traditional literary genres such as comics, graphic novels and manga. The teacher in the study found this particular student was extremely knowledgeable in these genres and learned from them in a way similar to the way in which more academic genres are often learned from in school (Simon, 2012). The student and the school had an apparent mismatch of beliefs on acceptable genres for school learning, and because of this discontinuity between home and school, this student was not engaging in academic reading in school (Simon, 2012). Once the student’s teacher recognized this issue and customized assigned readings and assignments to meet the needs of the student, his motivation and attitude improved. The most important message the author feels should be taken from this study was that when teachers learn from, listen to and engage with their students, solutions can often be found that improve reading motivation, identity and academic success (Simon, 2012).

**Teachers’ use of metacognitive reading strategies.** Some authors have noted that metacognitive strategies and comprehension reading strategies are effective in improving the reading attitudes of struggling students because they improve student confidence (Keskin, 2013).
Specific metacognitive reading strategies such as before, during and after reading strategies, for example, the K-W-L strategy, have been shown to improve reading ability and therefore reading attitude (Ciampa, 2012; Guthrie et al., 1997; Pitcher et al., 2010). Keskin notes a positive correlation in that metacognitive reading strategies improve reading attitude in students, by improving students’ reading abilities, which in turn leads to increased proficiency in reading. Improved academic achievement often results (Keskin, 2013).

Keskin’s (2013) definition of reading attitude consists of two factors: the emotional dimension and the cognitive dimension. The emotional dimension is where positive or negative reading attitudes develop. The cognitive dimension contains the formed beliefs about the task of reading. Keskin believes the metacognitive strategies work because they interact with both dimensions (Keskin, 2013, p. 312).

Keskin (2013) indicates academic reading attitude is developed and formed by teachers in the classroom. Teachers act as role models motivating and encouraging students to engage in academic reading and affect academic reading attitude. In contrast, influences outside of school are responsible for a student’s attitude toward reading in general. A key finding is that students who developed a positive academic attitude with the use of metacognitive strategies, also developed a positive general attitude toward reading. Those students often went on to achieve academic success (Keskin, 2013).

**Teachers impact developing reading attitudes.** Student reading attitudes can become more positive if students are allowed input into the structure or design for the class. For example, several sources conclude that students enjoy and benefit from being involved in planning and implementing the goals in their education (Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Joint Task Force on Assessment of the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of
English, 2010; McKool, 2007; Pitcher et al., 2010). This gives students additional incentive since their educational plan was partially self-developed. Students and parents alike are also valuable sources of information about student strengths and weaknesses (Pitcher et al., 2010). Teachers should create an atmosphere of inquiry, where students enjoy and actively take part in learning. Inquiry is especially motivating for males, as is setting an authentic purpose for reading (Fisher & Frye, 2012). Teacher modeling of personal reading motivation through discussion of the teacher’s favorite or recently read books help to call attention to real reading taking place (Corcoran & Mamalakis, 2009) which can also help improve reading attitude.

**Synthesis of reading attitude literature.** It is now becoming recognized that reading attitude is integral to reading motivation. Increased reading attitude is often a precursor to or concurrent with increased or high levels of reading motivation. Several surveys have been developed to measure reading attitude, such as the SARA (Conradi et al., 2013) and the RSPS2 (Henk et al., 2012). The surveys can easily be administered within a class period in a classroom, by the teacher. The surveys provide useful information that teachers can use in determining an intervention and plan of action for students with negative reading attitudes and low motivation.

Standardized testing often negatively affects students’ reading attitudes. Teachers focus on skill drills. Test strategy and practice often takes away from real reading time that motivates students. For reading activities, it is important to provide a variety of genres for students to choose from to read, as self-selected books tend to increase motivation (Francois, 2013; Gabriel et al., 2012). Students see the value in self-selecting their books as they often use these books to learn about their world and explore their own identities, which can help bridge the chasm between home and school (Brozo et al., 2007; Francois, 2013), leading to improved academic achievement (Francois, 2013). To improve reading attitudes and ultimately reading motivation,
students must be encouraged and given the opportunity to increase the amount of reading for pleasure they engage in outside of school. Amount of reading for pleasure has been linked to higher standardized test scores. However, there must be some form of accountability for students when engaging in pleasure reading activities in order for it to be effective (Brozo et al., 2007).

Developing a positive reading attitude is the key to developing a motivated and skillful reader who can achieve academically. Much of what can be done to improve reading attitude can be helped by a student’s teachers. Although they may be formed early in life, students’ reading identities can still be directly influenced in the classroom. Encouraging students to engage with the reading genres of their choice (Enriquez, 2013), for example, by a teacher reaching out to a student through his reading identity as a comic book reader, can motivate a student to engage at school, as well (Simon, 2012). Positive reading identities are often developed and created through choices available to students and provided by teachers.

Teachers who actively seek students’ input also affect student reading attitude and motivation because the teachers learn what students enjoy and are then able to implement these changes into the curriculum (McKool, 2007; Pitcher et al., 2010). Teachers can also affect reading identities and attitudes through the instruction of metacognitive reading strategies to students. Students who are trained in these active reading strategies are more likely to recognize their own loss of comprehension and fix the problem before it becomes insurmountable (Ciampa, 2012; Guthrie et al., 1997; Keskin, 2013; Pitcher et al., 2010). Students gain confidence in reading by using these strategies which leads to increased academic achievement.

**Technology and Reading Motivation**

Technology has been touted as a means of increasing student engagement and motivation to read. E-books, e-readers, blogs, wikis, e-portfolios, podcasts, smart phones, iPads, iPods, as
well as other technology have been examined as possible proof that technology is the much sought after cure for students’ reading motivation problems (Jacobs, 2012). Although technology development often outpaces the speed of research, there have been interesting results in the variety of studies done on the effect technology has on reading motivation. The most important finding is that many of the electronic-based modes of reading often will motivate a reader to read, but only if there is a clearly-set, relevant purpose for the activity or lesson and there is a genuine and compelling opportunity for student reaction to the reading material and interaction with other students, teachers, and even outside audiences (Jacobs, 2012).

Jacobs (2012) studied motivating adolescents through technology and found that technology in and of itself does not always motivate students to learn more. Jacobs discovered that the theory indicating technology motivates teens to learn and read has not been firmly established by research, even though it is often cited and discussed. Jacobs’ (2012) found that instead of reading motivation being a direct result of the technology used in a lesson, it is more likely a result of social activity within the context of a technology-based lesson in the classroom. Jacobs cautions that to create a successful literacy activity utilizing technology, teachers must consider students’ desire for social connections to other students (Jacobs, 2012). Discussion boards are often used successfully to address this need.

Since communication is central to the discussion board, some studies have found these discussions to be useful tools for students to engage, learn about and discuss reading assignments with peers. Discussion boards provide students with opportunities for autonomous student-directed discussion and learning, whereas, within the classroom, teacher-directed learning may be the norm (Grisham & Wolsey, 2006). In a study by Grisham and Wolsey (2006), students engaged in an online discussion board as the whole class read a book. The authors of this study
replaced traditional classroom strategies and methods, such as Literature Circles, where students share their ideas on books with each other in small groups, with the discussion boards. In the study, the student interactions on the discussion boards proved to be more lively, thoughtful and thought-provoking than previously used methods and became a successful means to build community. Increased classroom community created a community of practice, where students worked together for the common purpose of understanding and reflecting on the book, successfully increasing student engagement (Grisham & Wolsey, 2006).

The increased presence of community became apparent as students worked together, attempting to make meaning through discussion of characters, plot, text connections and other aspects of the text that caught their interest at the moment they were creating their posts or responding. The fact that discussion boards provided enhanced thinking time for responses, proved valuable as complexity and depth of responses improved over the previously utilized practice of Literature Circles (Grisham & Wolsey, 2006). Students were also compelled to respond to each other, creating authentic tasks within the discussion board. Building on Vygotsky’s theory of social learning, the authors found that, indeed, students did learn more by increasing their own involvement in their learning and teachers’ creation of more authentic tasks, through the use of technology (Grisham & Wolsey, 2006).

**Students and authentic tasks.** Students often have difficulty with visualization and creating a mental image of text. Parkhill and Davey (2014), the authors of recent research regarding a reading program entitled Audio Visual Achievement in Literacy, Language and Learning (AVAILLL), indicate that reading subtitles of a movie may increase student comprehension, decoding, attitude and motivation to read, particularly in ELLs, struggling readers and students in their early teen years. The movies utilized for this program were all
chosen from popular and high quality, high interest novels. The program is seen as another way to bridge students’ home lives with school.

In studies by Parkhill and Davey (2014) and Parkhill and Johnson (2009) the AVAILLL intervention program is described. Its effectiveness seems to stem from its ability to enhance and improve visualization while reading. The images on the screen help to create an image in the mind as the student reads the subtitles on the screen and this improvement seems to transfer over to reading books (Parkhill & Davey, 2014). The program also contains other elements important to reading instruction, including components focusing on fluency, vocabulary and most importantly, collaboration with peers. The research reported an overall increase or improvement in student reading ability and motivation to read for pleasure, however there was concern about the novelty effect and whether the level of improvement seen in this six-week study duration could be sustained over time (Parkhill & Johnson, 2009).

Another researcher also sought to combine student visualization and popular movies to improve reading motivation and ability by inviting students to create movie trailers for existing books. In this study, Gunter (2012), utilizes a teaching method called signature pedagogy, which focuses on real-world application of skills to produce an authentic product (p. 137). Gunter says many students today are not as motivated to read because they do not see real-world value in it (Gunter, 2012). Writing, production and editing of a movie or trailer based on a book is an example of an authentic task that could capture not only the interest, but also the imagination of students.

Gunter’s (2012) idea for creating a movie trailer resulted from her observations in the classroom. She noticed the most notable difference between readers who enjoy reading and readers who do not, is the way they approach their reading. Readers who enjoy reading imagine
the story, like one would watch a movie. Readers who do not enjoy reading, often do not make
a movie in their mind as they read, because they do not know how to create this visualization.
Gunter (2012) showed that creating movies helps students make sense of difficult text by
developing their ability to visualize while providing a real-world purpose for their work. She
reported more than 45% of the students engaged in the study developed more positive reading
attitudes as a result of not only an increased ability to comprehend, but also an increase in self-
efficacy (Gunter, 2012, p. 149-151).

Sometimes, technology alone is useful to provide assistance to students. In one study by
Boeglin-Quintana and Donovan (2013), iPods were used to motivate Kindergarten students,
some of whom were English Language Learners (ELLs), to practice reading and to lessen their
level of distraction. The students were given iPod Shuffles with audio recordings of books on
them. Students were given copies of the books to read as they listened to the audiobooks. The
authors expected an increase in reading fluency (the ability to read accurately and quickly)
however, were surprised to discover no change in reading fluency among the students in the
study. The authors did find that students were ultimately more engaged in reading and more
motivated to read.

The authors indicated that part of this increased motivation and engagement was due to
the novelty effect with the use of the iPod Shuffles. The use of technology was also instrumental
in keeping the students with the iPod Shuffles on task. The students were not distracted from
reading as were the students without iPod Shuffles. Also, through the use of the technology,
students had access to stories they could then talk about with their peers, whereas before they
had the technology, they may not have had access to the stories at home or been able to read the
stories at school (Boeglin-Quintana & Donovan, 2013).
The authors concluded that all students benefited from teacher read-alouds whether or not technology was used. One focus of the Boeglin-Quintana and Donovan (2013) study were ELLs and their home experiences with reading. Many were not reading at all in their homes. The authors suggest that iPod Shuffles could increase student access to read-alouds, whether at home or at school, thus increasing student practice with reading and exposure to fluent reading in English. Since the iPod Shuffles were exciting for the students to use, the extra use of the iPods could increase student motivation to read over time (Boeglin-Quintana & Donovan, 2013).

**Students using metacognitive e-portfolios and e-readers.** Another technological method of motivating readers and writers through an authentic task is with the use of e-portfolios. A study by Abrami, Venkatesh, Meyer, and Wade (2013) focuses on using e-portfolios through an online software program entitled ePEARL, to encourage self-regulated learning. The acronym ePEARL stands for “electronic Portfolio Encouraging Active and Reflective Learning.” The e-portfolios for this study emphasized the writing process from beginning to end, but there is also a reading component contained within these portfolios as well. The e-portfolios include a recording area where students can read or perform their work aloud or on video and post their work to receive feedback. The portfolios can be used to store multiple student created artifacts (text, video, sound and images) and allow space for written dialogue among teachers, students, and parents for reflection, analysis and ranking of the pieces (Abrami et al., 2013, p. 1189).

Focusing on both achievement and progress, the use of e-portfolios was associated with increased self-regulation of learners. Self-regulated learners are those who are “metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally active participants in their learning” (Abrami et al., 2013, p. 1188). Self-regulation occurs in phases, including: forethought, performance and self-reflection
Students who began reading and writing using e-portfolios became more conscious of their abilities, their weaknesses and strengths, and were able to think metacognitively about their work as they participated more actively in their education. Students learning how to use process portfolios such as these exhibited more control over their education through increased self-regulation of learning. They monitored their own motivation, behavior, evaluating their own successes and failures. They became motivated to do their best work by planning and setting goals, following through with their plans and evaluating whether their goals had been achieved. Students also were able to gain additional insight on their achievements through feedback from peers, teachers and parents, while increasing their active participation in reading and writing activities (Abrami et al., 2013).

**E-books and motivation to read.** Struggling readers are also often motivated by the interactive features of e-books. Students enjoy the interactive aspects and extras like puzzles, quizzes, animations, pictures, sound and games (Maynard, 2010). E-books give readers an extra level of involvement in the text through these added features. Often, struggling readers are fascinated by these additional aspects of the e-book, and students are more likely to become engaged. Many struggling readers are kinesthetic learners who need to be able to manipulate text or involve movement of their bodies while they read. Often, because of this, kinesthetic learners are more successful reading on a computer (Enriquez, 2013).

E-readers have numerous features that make reading interesting, motivating and less difficult for struggling readers. They are somewhat more kinesthetic in that there are options to engage readers in ways print books cannot. In some cases, readers were able to break up longer, more difficult reading tasks through the use of these interactive features (Maynard, 2010) which extended the time spent reading. Features that encourage students to look up unfamiliar words or
have text read out loud to them as they read are also important as they make reading clarification strategies easier to employ (Anderson & Balajthy, 2009; Ciampa, 2012). The novelty effect has been shown to increase motivation with e-books, too. As a result of these added features, e-books can help students enjoy their independent reading practice, while increasing motivation to read.

Wright, Fugett, and Caputa (2013) showed students’ motivation to use reference resources while using e-readers increased because students were able to work more metacognitively. Students used a variety of e-reader tools to engage in text while reading such as highlighting, dictionaries, thesauruses, speech narration and bookmarking. Readers who took part in the study reported increased enjoyment of reading when they could use a text narrator. It was found that the text narrator was as effective in student learning as an adult reading aloud would have been (Wright et al., 2013).

Ciampa (2012), the author of a study of e-books used by first grade students, indicated that e-books are a technology that often leads to increased motivation, but can also increase comprehension. Ciampa (2012) found in her research that her author-developed online reading program (ICANREAD) helped motivate students to read in school and at home. The students increased comprehension through the practice of reading strategies, which could develop higher order thinking skills. The younger the students start learning these strategies and developing higher order thinking abilities, the more able these students will be to read successfully, therefore increasing motivation to read (Ciampa, 2012; Guthrie et al., 1997; Keskin, 2013; Pitcher et al., 2010). The e-books have the additional benefit of helping students build automaticity in reading and relieve some of the difficulty seen by beginners and struggling readers in the decoding of words with which they are unfamiliar (Ciampa, 2012). As a result of reading with less difficulty,
students were more motivated to read, but especially more motivated to read using the online reading program, where they had achieved success (Ciampa, 2012).

**Teachers’ resistance to technology.** Sometimes teachers undermine their own students’ motivation to read with technology. Ladbrook (2009) has written about the appearance of a new “digital divide” (p. 137) that exists between the skills of the teacher and the skills of the student. Reluctant teachers avoid using technology in the classroom because they do not feel competent in its use (Gunter, 2012; Ladbrook, 2009). When teachers unsuccessfully integrate technology into a lesson, students may disengage quickly. Like Gunter (2012), Ladbrook discovered teachers also may be hesitant to use text from popular culture and digital technology in the classroom. Teachers studied often did not feel that popular culture or digital technology could provide a benefit for classroom instruction and therefore were unmotivated to attempt their use. Some did not know how to operate the technology and avoided it for that reason. Ladbrook surveyed forty-one teachers, and nine said that the digital and print texts students engaged in outside of school were not important, when matching text to student, whether digital or print, has been shown to have a positive effect on reading attitude, motivation and ability (Ladbrook, 2009).

**Synthesis of technology and motivation literature.** Jacobs (2012) cautions that technology can help motivate students to read, but the use of socially interactive authentic tasks, the presentation behind the technology, and the lesson built around the technology are much more important than electronics alone in ensuring a quality educational experience. Grisham and Wolsey’s (2006) study involving discussion boards found that the technology was effective at building community and was essential in encouraging deep and thoughtful discussion of literary topics.
Teachers who use authentic tasks with technology also help students set a purpose, improve visualization and increase reading motivation. Parkhill and Davey (2014) and Parkhill and Johnson (2009) suggested that students who read movie subtitles of movies that correspond to quality children’s literature and took part in a program that emphasized learning vocabulary and fluency through collaboration showed improvement in reading achievement, particularly in struggling or English Language Learners. Gunter’s (2012) signature pedagogy was also effective, not just because students were able to make movies and edit using technology, but because the students were engaging in authentic tasks that were carefully crafted to improve student issues with visualization of narratives.

Sometimes the technology can be the change agent and the motivator for students. For example, the study of Kindergarten students listening to iPod Shuffles owes much of its success to the novelty effect, but also, to the fact that students could listen to a story, then discuss it with other students within the class. English Language Learner students in particular, benefited from the more frequent read-alouds, courtesy of the technology (Boeglin-Quintana & Donovan, 2013).

Helping students become more metacognitive also results in successful learning using technology. E-portfolios and e-readers, as well as e-books, seem to encourage students to think more carefully, and become more autonomous and metacognitive about their reading. With e-portfolios, students are engaged in an authentic task, keeping track of their writing assignments, then reading and responding to inquiries by their teacher. This approach improved self-regulation and autonomy of students, which in turn could increase intrinsic motivation (Abrami et al., 2013).

The use of e-readers and e-books also led to the increased autonomy of students. Student accessible, built-in dictionaries, highlighters, voice-to-text software, bookmarking and the ability
to change font sizes all help struggling students without motivation, to read independently (Anderson & Balajthy, 2009; Ciampa, 2012; Wright et al., 2013).

Ladbrook (2009) showed teachers often have trouble integrating technology into lessons effectively. Many teachers also did not see the importance of integrating technology, due to their lack of knowledge about the technology. Therefore, technology “enhanced” lessons were often inferior to non-technology based lessons (Gunter, 2012; Ladbrook, 2009).

**Conclusion**

This literature review provides an overview of recent research directions and foci in the areas of reading motivation, reading attitudes and the use of technology in the classroom to enhance reading motivation. The purpose of this literature review was to illuminate numerous strategies and teaching methods already developed that could potentially increase motivation to read in the classroom and highlighted methods for teachers to gather additional information about their students to inform instruction. By examining the broad conclusions presented, an argument in favor of teacher ability to increase reading motivation in the classroom can be established.

There are several broad conclusions important to reading motivation research in the classroom that can be drawn from the literature surveyed. One of the key pieces of information is that reading motivation and reading attitude can be measured through surveys and questionnaires and the resulting data can be used to drive instructional decisions (Conradi et al., 2013; Gambrell et al., 1996; Henk et al., 2012; McKenna et al., 2012; Pitcher et al., 2007). Teachers can use surveys such as the MRP, AMRP, SARA and RSP2 to obtain vital information on their students’ motivation to read and their attitudes toward text according to purpose and medium. A teacher’s knowledge of students’ strengths and preferences can be used to develop curriculum that can
increase students’ reading motivation levels and promote a more positive attitude toward reading, possibly leading to increased reading achievement in English Language Arts (Conradi et al., 2013; Pitcher et al., 2007).

Another broad conclusion involves the importance of the cultivation of intrinsic motivation for reading achievement and comprehension (Guthrie et al., 1997; Guthrie et al., 2006; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Paige, 2011; Schaffner, Schiefele, & Ulferts, 2013). As struggling students’ negative experiences with reading begin to accumulate in the later elementary years, students begin to lower their expectancy for success and competence beliefs decline as the struggling students experience more and more difficult tasks (Guthrie et al., 1997). The result is that intrinsic motivation decreases and engagement with English Language Arts activities may also decrease (Guthrie et al., 1997). The recognition and analysis of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of the readers in a classroom can be used by teachers to increase intrinsic reading motivation. As students begin to become more intrinsically motivated, they will be more likely to engage in reading and may achieve more academically (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997; Zentall & Lee, 2012).

Reading attitudes and reading identities intertwine, affecting each other and reading motivation and ability, as well as reading achievement (McKenna et al., 2012, Pitcher et al., 2007; Stanovich, 1986). If a student is a reluctant reader, that student will be less likely to read, therefore showing a decrease in reading ability over time and becoming less motivated to read as the student achieves less success in reading. To affect an improvement in one area may mean an improvement in other areas (Stanovich, 1986).

Expectancy-value theory applies to this process in that as students see decreasing academic success in reading-related endeavors, there is a decrease in their expectancy-belief and
they begin to lose confidence in their ability to engage in reading related tasks (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Guthrie et al., 1997). As this expectancy-belief continues to erode in adolescent readers, their task-value decreases for reading related activities as well. Students may begin to avoid reading-related activities because they see these activities as less important, since they feel they will not successfully complete them anyway (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Gambrell et al., 1996).

This is an area that requires more study, as it is not known exactly how these areas work together and how changes in one area affect the others. The areas do tie closely together and previous studies have attempted to address the individual components of the reader, including the interconnectedness of affective areas and cognitive areas of reading.

A bridge that spans the divide between home and school needs to be built in order to engage readers successfully academically and recreationally (Francois, 2013). Reading attitude and identity is often at least partly formed outside of school (Francois, 2013; McKool, 2007), therefore a bridge from home to school must somehow be constructed to address reading deficiencies in students. Students who are provided with an opportunity to self-select reading material and activities that engage them in this material, as well as interact and collaborate with the students around them often see reading as a positive experience (Francois, 2013). Their personal values about reading, including genre and issues generated from textual content, interest the students in a way that applies to their realities (Francois, 2013). They then begin to take interest in reading as it becomes a way to engage with others in a meaningful, authentic way that is self-determined.

Another repeated theme is that the development of student autonomy usually increases intrinsic motivation (Gabriel et al., 2012; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Ivey & Johnston, 2013).
Students, especially older students, enjoy exercising their ability to make a choice about their classroom activities. Student selected reading material and student selected activities are more likely to result in the success of the student academically (Gabriel et al., 2012; Morgan & Wagner, 2013). Their personal choices are often intrinsically motivating, as students will assign a high task-value on those activities they already deem to be important (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

Teachers can have a direct impact on students’ reading achievement through appropriate instructional planning (Guthrie et al., 1997). As students are provided reading comprehension instruction including useful comprehension strategies and tools for reading, their motivation may increase and their reading attitudes may become more positive (Keskin, 2013) and the student may become more intrinsically motivated to engage. Teacher-provided authentic, real-world tasks, cooperative learning, choice in reading, and reading or writing activities, reading strategy instruction, inquiry-based learning, and metacognitive activities are all classroom strategies that researchers have shown effective to increase students’ levels of autonomy, intrinsic motivation and reading ability (Gabriel et al., 2012; Gunter, 2012; Guthrie et al., 1997; Keskin, 2013).

Another theme in the literature is that technology for the sake of technology use is not effective. Students prefer authentic tasks and collaborating with peers on assignments (Grisham & Wolsey, 2006; Gunter, 2012; Jacobs, 2012). So, as these activities are undertaken with various forms of technology, students may become more motivated to read and their reading attitudes may improve (Gunter, 2012; Wright et al., 2013). Technology, such as e-readers, e-books, iPods, discussion boards, movie-creation software, e-portfolios, can be utilized by teachers effectively within the classroom to increase reading motivation and achievement, using effective classroom strategies (Gunter, 2012). Various types of technology seem to have certain strengths and
weaknesses for specific purposes and it is important for teachers to engage in some research on a technology before implementing it within the classroom, so they will be aware of its strengths and weaknesses (Ladbrook, 2009). Also, the novelty effect can drive student intrinsic motivation in reading for a short period of time (Gabriel et al., 2012). The novelty effect must be complemented with another motivational strategy in order to be effective over the long term.

With appropriate planning, research, and implementation, teachers’ use of technology can be effective at increasing reading motivation and achievement.

One purpose of this literature review was to explore previous research on reading motivation. Through the examination of this body of literature, this researcher has attempted to prove the validity of the thesis indicating reading motivation, reading attitude and identity are related, measurable, and malleable, and teachers can affect real improvements on the ability of students to read by responding to students’ levels of motivation and attitudes with appropriate interventions (Conradi et al., 2013; Gambrell et al., 1996; Henk et al., 2012; Ivey & Johnston, 2013; McKenna et al., 2012; Pitcher et al., 2007; Stanovich, 1986). An analysis of the literature also might lead one to conclude that technology utilized by teachers for learning can be an effective tool for improving and increasing reading motivation of students in the classroom when research on reading motivation and reading attitude are considered (Abrami et al., 2013).

Teachers can utilize this broad variety of reading motivation and attitude research within the classroom to improve reading motivation and attitudes.

What still needs to be explored. Reading motivation is a complex process, interrelated with many factors that affect its development, including reading attitude, reading identity and reading ability. How these aspects of reading work together to spark reading motivation is just beginning to be understood. The process and mechanism for development of reading motivation
and how it can be sustained is a topic often studied, yet it seems the research completed so far has barely scratched the surface and has not been as effective in practice as hoped. As a result, many students are still unmotivated to read and do not achieve to their potential. Teachers and administrators continue to search for research-based, classroom-friendly strategies to increase reading motivation in their students (Brozo et al., 2007, p. 307).

Researchers must continue to analyze and assess the advantages, disadvantages and impacts on reading with technology with respect to reading motivation. As a result of a continued search for strategies for reading motivation that work, and with the increased access to technology seen by many classrooms, the effect of technology on reading motivation needs to be explored further. Currently, Gunter (2012) contends there are conflicting bodies of research in which students may or may not be as fluent in the use of technology as originally expected. It is also worth investigating whether the same features of quality, motivating classroom reading instruction hold true for technology-rich classrooms or if new features that are more effective may emerge.

It is worthwhile to examine whether current theories concerning intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to read hold true when using technology to deliver instruction and learning activities. Student preferences for print versus digital content should also be a factor of reading attitude explored in whether reading motivation through technology is successful.

Researchers have recently begun to understand the importance and power of student input into their own educations (Abrami et al., 2013; McKool, 2007; Pitcher et al., 2010). Consequently, it is important to investigate students’ responses to and perception of their experiences with reading and literacy activities in the classroom in order to develop and plan curriculum to help increase reading motivation. Directly gathering student opinions of the effect
of classroom activities on reading motivation may provide additional insight into thought-processes and opinions that may prove valuable to teachers and administrators developing reading programs (Conradi et al., 2013; Gambrell et al., 1996; Henk et al., 2012; McKenna et al., 2012; Pitcher et al., 2007).

Strategies to nurture reading motivation and attitude within the typical classroom are needed. Teachers are often not taught about motivational strategies in preparatory programs and teachers’ ability and knowledge of increasing reading motivation may vary widely (Applegate & Applegate, 2004). Teachers may or may not be fluent in technology applications (Jacobs, 2012; Ladbrook, 2009). Future research should explore teachers’ perceptions of technology and its effects on motivation of students to read. Assembling a body of data concerning teacher perceptions of the effect of classroom activities and instruction on reading motivation may be useful as a tool to further determine the most effective way to increase reading motivation.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to determine details about the reading motivation and attitudes of twelfth grade students in English Language Arts classes, so that the strategies, methods, and curriculum of the school can be modified to better serve the needs of the student population at the high school level. This purpose was achieved through the primary data set, the interviews with English Language Arts teachers of grades nine to eleven, concerning observed student reading motivation and attitudes as well as teachers’ attempts to encourage motivation. Reading motivation and attitude surveys were administered to twelfth grade students to receive student input to inform the teacher interview protocol and to triangulate data. The methodology of this study is a single, embedded case study.

Research questions. The research questions of this study are listed below, beginning with the central question, and following with three sub-questions.

Central Research Question: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?

a. How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?

b. What are students’ attitudes toward reading?

c. How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?

Theoretical framework. The theoretical framework of this research is modern expectancy-value theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). The theory considers two components of motivation: expectancy-belief, which is the student’s expectation or belief that a task can be completed successfully and task-value, which is the value placed by the student upon completing the task and the degree to which the completion of the task will provide a benefit for the student.
The theory informs the research questions in that it provides an effective lens to examine, analyze and gauge adolescent reading motivation and teacher perspectives on student reading motivation.

Research Design

Qualitative approach. The selection of a qualitative approach provides this researcher with an opportunity not often presented in reading motivation research. Traditionally, reading motivation studies are conducted using a quantitative approach, with limited opportunity for participants to express their own opinions and ideas, as surveys are the primary tool for data collection. This researcher has chosen to structure this research using the case study approach. This choice provides the researcher an additional opportunity to collect and analyze the observations, ideas and opinions of the teachers of students who have reported their own opinions on their reading motivation and attitude.

Reading is a complex process, with personal attitudes and motivations of every individual affecting the level of success achieved by students. Teaching English Language Arts is also a complex process that requires teachers to affect students’ reading motivation levels for reading activities within the classroom and for homework. The qualitative paradigm allows a researcher to engage in an in-depth exploration that encourages the building of rich, thick narrative and description of reading motivation through the use of interviews. Data collected qualitatively goes beyond the reach of numbers and predetermined survey questions. The qualitative data collected will provide the researcher with results that traditional quantitative reading motivation studies cannot provide.

For the stated research questions, the qualitative approach is appropriate because of its potential to focus on the personal perspectives of teachers. Reading motivation is intensely
personal and requires a more personalized approach than has traditionally been applied. With a qualitative approach, a researcher has the opportunity to develop insight into the workings of the individual. The potential to gather and analyze a wealth of rich, descriptive data, means that reading motivation is an area that needs to be explored using this approach.

A qualitative design is also useful for the scholar-practitioner in particular because of the close proximity of the research to a real-life educational context and the closeness of the researcher to the people being studied. Interview data can capitalize on the closeness of the researcher to the people being studied. A scholar-practitioner needs to be able to transform research into practice and qualitative research can provide material to build that bridge from the results of the study to the classroom. Classroom applications of research to practice are in demand and the existing data are incomplete. The scholar-practitioner can provide this much-needed service and bridge between the research abilities of the scholar and the concern for practicality and impact on English Language Arts curriculum.

**Research paradigm.** The research paradigm utilized in this research is the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm. This paradigm aligns with the case study approach because a case study researcher is required to gather, analyze and understand the detailed perspectives of individuals within a real-life context. In order to begin to understand the multiple-realities of teachers and students, it is necessary to use a research methodology that does not require researcher control over behavior (Yin, 2014). The case study approach is well-suited to the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm because it allows for the collection and construction of a case file of data representing multiple-realities (Yin, 2014). In qualitative research, researcher positionality provides a tool to focus interpretation of those multiple realities
and individual perceptions into the findings of a case study that may provide insight into teachers’ impact upon adolescent reading motivation.

**Research Tradition**

This research was conducted with an embedded single case study design to examine the impact of teachers’ practice on the reading motivation of adolescents. The unit of study is reading motivation. The bounded case consists of three data sets from two embedded units within the site: two sets from the students and one set from the teachers. The case study approach is an appropriate choice for this research for several reasons. First, the case study approach is unique because it provides a researcher the capability to utilize a variety of data sources. The first and second data sets consist of students’ responses to reading motivation and attitude surveys, which are scored and examined for trends. Although the survey data is not the primary data set, it is crucial to understanding reading motivation for twelfth grade students at this site, which will then inform teacher interviews, the primary data set. The embedded single case study design provides the researcher the opportunity to gather and analyze teachers’ perspectives of student reading motivation based on the student data and the teachers’ own experiences within the classroom.

The case study tradition has a flexible design that a researcher can adapt to the particular case being studied and does not have a standard format to use in its construction (Creswell, 2013; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014). The beauty of the case study approach is its ability to provide a researcher the opportunity to obtain “a holistic understanding of a phenomenon within real-life contexts from the perspective of those involved” (Boblin, Ireland, Kirkpatrick, & Robertson, 2013, p. 1268). According to Yin (2014), a key theorist associated with the tradition, the case study approach allows the researcher to investigate “complex social phenomena” (p. 2). Whereas
reading motivation is a complex process and the act of teachers attempting to motivate students
to read is also a complex social phenomenon, case study design makes sense. Especially as
Eccles and Wigfield (2002) note that the various contexts of students within schools and
classrooms is an area in need of exploration.

The case study approach presents researchers with a method of studying modern and
ongoing events that draws data from a wide range of evidence and methods of investigation,
without requiring control over the behaviors of the participants (Yin, 2014). These are important
points to this study in particular because current student perceptions of reading motivation and
the current experiences of the teachers with student reading motivation are needed to provide
useful instructional recommendations for the future.

Yin indicates that the ability to study participants within their context is an important
feature for the case study approach. The consideration of context is important for reading
motivation as it is highly dependent on context (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002), and the interaction of
students, teachers and curriculum within a school environment. The consideration of context in
research may present better opportunities for generalizability and transferability to other similar
contexts and may provide insight that can guide teacher curriculum development and pedagogy
(Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

Yin (2014) discusses a series of rationales useful for undertaking a single case study. He
describes a common or typical single case study which is “to capture the circumstances and
conditions of an everyday situation…because of the lessons they might provide about the social
processes related to some theoretical interest” (Yin, 2014, p. 52). This study is an example of the
common rationale for a single case study as the participants and students are representative of
teachers and students engaging in their regular daily activities within their everyday context of
the high school. This researcher seeks to study teachers from a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, with teachers describing the ways in which they go about their everyday business of teaching students in the English Language Arts subject area. The researcher seeks to construct an interpretation of the teachers’ attempts to motivate students to read, a social activity by nature, through the lens of expectancy-value theory.

**Positionality statement.** Credibility of this research is addressed through this positionality statement. This positionality statement serves to contextualize this research and the position of the researcher within the context as it relates to the study. This researcher’s positionality is that of an educational professional, specializing in the Reading subject area, who has a passion for helping students overcome difficulties and strive to achieve their potential. Teachers participating in the study will be most similar to this researcher, as teachers are also passionate education professionals concerned about the welfare of their students. The difference will be seen in the experiences of students. Since many students in this area have had different cultural and educational experiences from this researcher’s, positionality differences between the researcher and the researched will be sought out and reflected upon. As a researcher engaging in research in another area of the country, at a school located in an area of lower economic opportunity, cultural beliefs and socioeconomic factors that affect students, families and community members’ decisions will be respected.

**Researcher positionality.** The positionality of this researcher is that of a female, middle-class, highly-educated, mid-career professional educator. This researcher lived life mostly in a New England state, but recently moved to a different state within the Northeast. The town where this researcher attended high school was a large and fairly wealthy suburb. The schools in this town were not lacking for funds for activities, resources, or materials. While a student, this
researcher was always an avid and skillful reader, participating in college-track classes, and many activities.

As a child, personal reading experiences were numerous and enjoyable, with parents who read aloud daily and engaged in conversation about the books that were read. Weekly trips to the library as a family were made to choose books to read. Everyone would often come away from the library with numerous books, which would all be read by the end of the following week. Reading was a fun activity that everyone in the family engaged in with great enthusiasm. These first experiences with reading had a positive effect on personal beliefs about reading and books.

Personal experience as a Reading teacher has revealed there are many students who have not been so fortunate as to experience books and reading in such a positive manner. Some students’ experiences present a stark contrast with reading and books to the extent that they do not find reading easy or enjoyable. Reading becomes a difficult, unpleasant task to be avoided as much as possible.

Aside from the enjoyment of reading, another one of the contrasts of concern at present is socioeconomic class. This researcher’s socioeconomic status is middle-class, while many of the students are of a lower socioeconomic class. As a member of the middle-class, this status often creates a contrast to the socioeconomic status of some students and families and it becomes difficult to fully understand their challenges. Also, this researcher does not hail from this area of the country and does not possess the rich background knowledge and shared experiences of the community going back through childhood that can help build a more complete understanding of the students, families and teachers in the area.

Briscoe’s (2005) concern about the appropriation of the other is another concern, which describes the situation when someone powerful takes advantage of those less powerful. As with
any research, there is the potential for the research to provide benefits to the researcher at the expense of the participants. To counteract this potential issue, communication of goals, process and results will help confirm to participants they have not been misrepresented in any way. Also, student participants will be chosen from those students who will not be assigned to this researcher’s classes currently or in the future. The teacher participants are not influenced or supervised by this researcher in any way, however as departmental colleagues willing to help out, the teachers may feel obligated to participate in the study. The consent documents emphasize that the study is strictly voluntary.

**Role of the researcher.** This case study was conducted by this researcher from a scholar-practitioner perspective. As a result, the research questions were developed in a way that was likely to provide practical results to inform classroom practice. The researcher crafted these questions to reflect the qualitative and constructivist-interpretivist paradigms and to focus on the experience and opinions of individuals. The researcher’s role in this study was to uncover the participants’ personal construction of knowledge by encouraging researcher-participant dialogue. The researcher's role was to facilitate dialogue, narrative and reflection and to record, analyze and interpret what was shared. As a researcher using the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, the focus was on bringing out the participants' opinions, observations and insights (Ponterotto, 2005).

**Site and Participants**

The participants of this study were English Language Arts teachers from grades nine through eleven and twelfth grade students, aged 18 or older. Twelfth grade students were chosen as the ideal grade level to provide survey data because these students have the most school experience and have developed expectancy-beliefs and task-values according to expectancy-
value theory over the course of their K-12 education. Surveying these students could provide an in-depth and insightful perspective of their developed expectancy-beliefs and task-values developed by their experiences and through their former teachers. Also, these students had almost completed their K-12 education and could have achieved a higher level of maturity than other grade levels. As a result of this maturity, students may be better able to look back on their educational careers and reflect upon their personal experiences. The students, being at least eighteen years of age, may be more able to think critically, metacognitively, and deeply, regarding the abstract ideas surrounding personal reading motivation and reading attitude. At the time of the data collection, there were one hundred fifty-six twelfth grade students. Of that twelfth grade population, seventy were eighteen or older by the time the surveys were administered.

As a result of the decision to use twelfth grade students, English Language Arts teachers for grades nine through eleven were recruited for the study. Purposeful sampling determined the grade levels of teacher participants in that the teachers who had previously taught the current twelfth grade students would be sought to provide input on their experiences. Teachers at lower grade levels were ruled out as most are based at other school sites. Twelfth grade teachers were eliminated from consideration to prevent students from feeling they must respond in a certain way to the surveys in order to please their current teachers and to prevent twelfth grade teachers from feeling pressured to change the way they teach to influence students’ survey responses.

The potential English Language Arts teacher participants for grades nine to eleven came to a total of five. The smaller number of teacher participants was appropriate in that the consenting teachers were interviewed regarding their observations, opinions and experiences in student reading motivation and attitude concerning the current twelfth grade class. These
interviews were the primary data set for analysis and were informed by the student surveys.
Since the research conducted was an embedded single case study, a smaller pool of participants for interviews means that interviews could be of greater depth and detail, providing rich, thick description and insight into the effect teachers have upon the motivation of adolescent students to read.

**Research site.** The research site was a public high school consisting of approximately nine hundred students and seventy-six teachers located in a northeastern state. There were five administrators and numerous support staff. The superintendent acts as gatekeeper for research approval and it is through this individual that approval was initially sought. Approval was then discussed with the high school building principal. Teacher participants from grades nine through eleven were recruited within the English Language Arts department at the high school and twelfth grade student data were collected from volunteers in the existing twelfth grade class.

**Informed consent from students and parents.** Informed consent was obtained from students and their parents, using letters and forms written at an appropriate level (Appendices A and D). Student consent was obtained through an online survey unsigned consent form provided at the time of the survey. Written letters to parents explained that the study was strictly voluntary and students and/or parents could opt out of the AMRP and SARA surveys at any time before or during the administration of the surveys. The potential date of administration was provided. Contact information was provided to parents and students so concerns and questions may be addressed before, during and after research. Copies of all consent forms were provided for students and parents to keep. Parents and students were able to view the survey instrument by appointment, for a period of one week prior to survey administration.
Informed consent from teachers. Informed consent from teachers was obtained through a consent form and letter (Appendix B). It was explained that the study was voluntary and may be discontinued at any time. Contact information was provided to create opportunities to voice questions and concerns. Teachers were provided copies of the consent form to keep.

Only participants over which the researcher had no power were selected. For example, only twelfth grade students were surveyed. These students will not be assigned to any classes taught by this researcher in the future. This researcher does not hold any supervisory position or power over teachers.

Data Collection

Data collection included teacher interviews and the student survey administrations of the AMRP and SARA. The primary data set included teacher interview data recorded on a digital voice recorder (DVR), in Word, and in MaxQDA qualitative analysis software. The two student data sets included the responses to the AMRP and the SARA surveys collected through the electronic survey composition tool, Survey Monkey.

Yin (2014) discussed the importance of the use of a logic model to guide case study methodology. The process of data collection included two collection stages with three data sets being collected. Between the student data collection and the teacher data collection, a period of analysis was necessary to determine patterns and to develop questions for the teacher interviews based on the gathered student data. The teacher interviews were followed by a period of data analysis and synthesis which resulted in findings that included recommendations for instruction. This study used a linear logic model.
Student surveys. Students took part in the administration of the AMRP and SARA surveys electronically. Permission and licenses to use these surveys for research purposes, to administer these electronically, and to amend the AMRP as needed for this site was granted by the publisher, John Wiley and Sons, on May 16, 2016, via Copyright Clearance Center. Through the initial conversation concerning the feasibility and permissibility of research at this site, the superintendent was asked to grant permission to use these surveys to gather information about students, provided that the students and their parents provide informed consent. After review, permission was granted by the superintendent.

The surveys were administered to students within their regular classrooms, during their regular Activity period classes, during the regular school day. This time period was chosen as it was the time least likely to result in a disruption in a student’s or a teacher’s regular activities. A predetermined series of dates spanning a week were chosen for administration, with students and homeroom teachers receiving the dates in advance. This researcher met with the participating students to provide instruction on accessing and completing the survey on the day of administration, but left the room after the surveys commenced.

The AMRP is an approximately ten minutes in length motivation to read survey and the SARA is an approximately ten minutes in length reading attitude survey. The surveys were
combined into one survey administration of approximately twenty minutes in length. After the student unsigned consent, the AMRP appeared first, while the SARA appeared second (Appendix D). The students were asked for minimal demographic data, but not for personally identifiable data. Names were not requested or collected on the survey screens.

The AMRP survey consists of twenty questions using four point Likert scale responses. The survey was originally developed by Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzoni (1996) using the expectancy-value theory framework for use with elementary school age children and titled the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP). The survey was adapted by Pitcher et al. (2007) for use with adolescent students and became known as the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP). The survey opens with three demographic questions corresponding to three potential sample populations: grade level (6-12), gender, and ethnicity. The survey then proceeds to the twenty questions pertaining to reading motivation. This research project used the adapted AMRP to measure reading motivation.

For this research site and application, the first question pertaining to student grade level was eliminated and the third demographic sample question (ethnicity) was replaced. The grade level question was eliminated because it was unnecessary, given that only twelfth grade students were surveyed. The ethnicity question was replaced because the ethnicity of the twelfth grade students is minimally diverse and to ask students to identify one’s race would mean those students of minority ethnicities may be easily identified. The purpose of the replacement question was to record the course in which students were enrolled: AP English, Academic English, Standard English or Co-Taught English, as there may be differences in students’ experiences with reading motivation for different classes. As a result of these changes, the demographic data collected only consisted of students’ gender and the English Language Arts
course taken. These changes to the survey do not affect the reliability of the survey and modification for specific sites is recommended by the survey’s authors (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 394). Aside from the changes to demographic data collected, there were no other changes to the questions, content or structure of the surveys.

Both the MRP and the AMRP also feature an interview component with students, but the authors of the AMRP state that the survey may be successfully given independently to monitor students’ valuation of the importance of reading and their perceptions of reading (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 388-391). The data obtained may then be used to customize instruction for groups of students to further develop their strengths and to address their weaknesses (p. 395). The interview component will not be utilized for this site and application.

The AMRP survey is especially pertinent for use in this research in that it aligns with the expectancy-value theoretical framework and the research questions of this study. The survey consists of ten questions related to reader self-concept and ten questions related to valuation of reading, which correspond to the two components of expectancy-value theory (Gambrell et al., 1996; Pitcher et al., 2007). Specifically, data concerning students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for reading were gathered and then questions regarding the teachers’ perceptions of these results were then integrated into the teacher interviews and analyzed. Data for the central research question and sub-question a were collected using this instrument.
Table 1

*AMRP Survey with Corresponding Research Questions*

**Central Research Question:**

How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?

**Sub-question a:**

How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectancy-Value Theory</th>
<th>Phenomenon Measured</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reader Self-Concept</td>
<td>Manifestation of reader</td>
<td>Students’ confidence in taking on and completing a task successfully (Eccles &amp; Wigfield, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expectancy-belief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Reading</td>
<td>Manifestation of reader task-value</td>
<td>Students’ value placed on the task and importance assigned to the task (Eccles &amp; Wigfield, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second survey to be administered to students, the Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitude, (SARA), consists of eighteen questions using six point Likert scale responses. It was developed by Conradi et al. (2013) and by McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, and Meyer (2012) for classroom use by teachers to measure adolescent attitudes toward reading by measuring student preferences for print text and for digital text when engaged in academic and recreational activities. The survey responses record students’ preferences which can then be useful to examine teacher perceptions of student reading attitude through the lens of the
expectancy-value theory framework. Teachers’ choices and preferences for instructional activities to motivate students to read and reading attitude survey results may reveal student-teacher harmony or mismatch in practice.

The survey in its current form has its origins in previous research done by McKenna et al. (2012), when the authors began to develop and field tested potential questions. The SARA is based on the attitude theory of Fishbein and Ajzen (1975, as cited by McKenna et al., 2012) who theorized that attitude is acquired through repeated exposure. An individual obtains a specific attitude through experience, through the process of changing the individual’s beliefs about the experience and by the influence of any “social norms” that are present for the experience (McKenna et al., 2012, p.284). Researcher Michael C. McKenna was the first researcher who applied Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) model specifically to reading (McKenna et al., 2012).

The SARA by Conradi et al. (2013) is useful to measure reading attitude, which applies to expectancy-value theory. Reading attitude has recently been recognized by researchers to have an effect upon adolescent reading motivation and reading achievement (Conradi et al., 2013). How adolescents feel about reading certainly affects their motivation to read. Reading motivation decreases as students progress through school (Applegate & Applegate, 2010; Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997; McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012; Stanovich, 1986). To stem this decrease, it is imperative that teachers learn students’ attitudes about reading, so methods of improving reading attitude may be strategically crafted and applied. The results of the survey may assist in creating instruction designed around the preferences of students, leading to higher levels of reading motivation (Conradi et al., 2013, p. 567). This is especially pertinent in that researchers such as Ivey and Johnston (2013) and McKenna et al. (2012) have found that one of the causes of reading motivation decline might stem from teacher
instructional methods that do not target or capitalize upon the interests and attitudes of students, thus leading to an increase in student disinterest.

The central research question and sub-question b are addressed through the use of the SARA survey. Reading attitude is a measure of an individual’s positive or negative predisposition for reading activities based on context and reason for reading (Conradi et al., 2013). Often, students have preferences about certain modes of reading, such as print text or digital text. They may also have preferences about purposes for reading and may prefer certain modes for certain purposes as well. Student preferences often affect their willingness and ability to learn and remain engaged in reading (Conradi et al., 2013). Reading attitude analysis is essential to understanding reading motivation. Research sub-question b concerns reading attitude and how students feel about reading. Teacher interview questions also are based on student and teacher perceptions of reading attitude.
Table 2

SARA Survey with Corresponding Research Questions

Central Research Question:
How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?

Sub-question b:
What are students’ attitudes toward reading?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Attitude Measures</th>
<th>Phenomenon Measured</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Print (AP)</td>
<td>Student preference for AP</td>
<td>Print text used within the classroom or for academic purposes, for example: reading a book for an assignment (Conradi et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Digital (AD)</td>
<td>Student preference for AD</td>
<td>Digital text used within the classroom or for academic purposes, for example: researching on a website or reading an e-book for an assignment (Conradi et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Print (RP)</td>
<td>Student preference for RP</td>
<td>Print text for recreational purposes, for example: reading a magazine or a book about a favorite hobby (Conradi et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Digital (RD)</td>
<td>Student preference for RD</td>
<td>Digital text for recreational purposes, for example: reading a website or an e-book about a favorite hobby (Conradi et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher interviews. Through the initial conversation concerning the feasibility and permissibility of research at this site, the superintendent was asked to grant permission to interview a purposeful sample of English Language Arts teachers, provided informed consent was obtained from these participants.

The teacher interviews were semi-structured in-person interviews of approximately thirty to forty-five minutes in length, scheduled off-campus at the convenience of the participant and
researcher. The interview protocol consisted of ten open-ended questions designed to target teachers’ observations, insights, opinions and recollections concerning reading motivation and attitude of the current twelfth grade students. Questions that specifically address the student data from the AMRP and the SARA surveys were integrated (Appendix C).

The interview protocol was designed by the researcher in such a way as to state that the participants’ information would remain confidential and any identifying data would be removed during transcription. The protocol also clearly indicated that the participant had the right to withdraw from the study at any time and that he or she could decline to respond to one or more questions during the interview, simply by stating his or her choice. Through member-checking, participants were presented with a transcription of the interview and asked to provide any feedback, corrections and adjustments necessary for clarification.

The teacher interviews were built upon the expectancy-value framework and provided a method of categorizing and understanding teacher attempts and strategies to motivate students to read, as teacher motivation strategies may correspond with features of the theory, such as attempts to increase expectancy-belief or to increase task-value, or perhaps both. The findings could provide insight for teachers into what techniques are more effective and lead to increased success in matching teacher motivational strategies with student reading motivation levels and reading attitude (Conradi, Jang, Bryant, Craft, & McKenna, 2013; Pitcher et al., 2007). In turn, this could result in increased reading motivation, attitude and learning in English Language Arts.

The interview protocol included questions pertaining to reading motivation, reading attitude, expectancy-value theory, teacher characteristics, teacher perceptions, and the results of the two student surveys (Appendix C). The central research question was the overarching question of how twelfth grade students are motivated to read. The central research question
pertained to all interview questions, but especially correlated with interview questions 5, 6, and 8. These three interview questions were contingent on the results of the student surveys. The researcher developed three sub-questions relating to this central question that branch out into three areas of exploration. Sub-question a was written to explore twelfth grade students’ reading motivation and how teachers think about students’ reading motivation according to the expectancy-value theoretical framework. Sub-question a correlated with interview questions 3, 4, 5, and 6. Sub-question b helped this researcher explore twelfth grade students’ reading attitudes and how teachers understand students’ reading attitudes according to purpose for reading (educational or entertainment) and the mode employed to read (print or digital). Sub-question b correlated with interview questions 7 and 8. Sub-question c was developed to investigate teacher strategies and observations of student reading motivation and how teachers navigate their students’ strengths and weaknesses regarding reading motivation in the English Language Arts classroom. Sub-question c corresponded with interview questions 1, 2, 9, and 10.

**Data Storage**

Electronic data, such as transcripts, recordings, documents, and survey data were stored securely and password protected and/or encrypted. Audio recordings of interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder and then transferred as soon as possible to a secure computer for transcription. Recorded interview material was transcribed by the researcher and pseudonyms used. Identifying names, situations and references were removed upon transcription. The data, including printed and electronic documents, recordings, survey responses, and any other related items, will be destroyed securely after five years from the completion of the research. There will be no additional research projects done utilizing or building upon the data gathered for this research.
Data Analysis

The case for this study was bound within this specific high school location, and the time period for data collection. The unit of the case was reading motivation in English Language Arts. Embedded subunits of analysis were twelfth grade students and English Language Arts teachers for grades nine through eleven. Two anonymous data sets were collected from students and aggregated. Student data was also disaggregated according to gender and course attended. The primary data set, consisting of several anonymous individual units, was collected from teachers.

Student surveys. The twelfth grade students were surveyed using the AMRP (Pitcher et al., 2007) and SARA (Conradi et al., 2013) surveys. The survey data was collected through Survey Monkey. The results of the analysis were analyzed and then utilized to develop questions for the teacher interview protocol and presented in the findings of the study.

To analyze the student surveys, scoring guidelines were available. The AMRP reading survey had a total of eighty possible points, with a total of twenty questions that contained four possible responses to choose from, each worth a certain number of points each (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 389). Most lists of answer choices began with the least positive response being assigned one point, the second being next positive and worth two points, the third being slightly more positive and worth three points and finally the last response option being the most positive and worth four points (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 389). To prevent students from anticipating a pattern, some questions presented the possible answer choices in the opposite manner, with the most positive offered first on the list, and the least positive being last. The questions in which this switch occurred were indicated on the scoring guide with a star and a note to “recode.” meaning that to score these items, the points values must be reversed (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 389).
Question numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 18, 20 were labeled as recode questions (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 390).

The AMRP survey was built on expectancy-value theory, therefore the questions are written according to the two components of the theory. The two categories are “Self-Concept as a Reader” and “Value of Reading” and each category contains a total of forty points (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 389). Each of the questions on the survey corresponds to one or the other category of the survey. Odd numbered questions are intended to measure Self-Concept as a Reader, while even numbered questions are intended to measure Value of Reading. To arrive at a score, one would score each question for points, and place the points within either the Self-Concept as a Reader column or the Value of Reading column. Then, one would add the points for each column to arrive at a raw score for each of the two columns. At that point, raw scores can be calculated and percentages for the two categories, as well as the full survey, can be determined.

The AMRP survey was expected to yield information useful to determine the reading motivation status of the twelfth grade group as a whole and according to the demographic groups corresponding to gender and the English Language Arts course in which the student was enrolled. This data is useful for instructional planning and also to determine the reading motivation status of the students at one particular point in time. This data was expected to provide insight into the level of reading motivation the students achieved through their final year. For example, if the overall scores were low for Valuation of Reading, then it was clear that certain students did not place great importance on reading and perhaps did not see its relevance to everyday life. The breakdown according to demographics may be used in determining causes of areas of weakness in student reading motivation. In this case, curriculum planning can target certain classes or all classes with additional authentic tasks leading students to understand that
reading is important to their futures, as it is an activity useful in everyday life. The data, on the other hand, may have shown high scores in Valuation of Reading. This status would have demonstrated that students understand the importance of reading in everyday life and see it as a valuable task to be undertaken.

Alternatively, if the score for Self-Concept as a Reader were low, this means that students did not feel they were successful readers and that most reading tasks are difficult. Once again, the demographic breakdown of data may be useful to pinpoint problems in certain groups, if it is not an overall trend. Curriculum development may require the insertion of classroom activities that boost students’ confidence in reading and help them find more success as readers. High scores in Self-Concept as a Reader should be interpreted as meaning that students are confident in their ability to read and feel that they will be successful in reading-related activities. It was expected that most students at this survey site would score highly in both areas: Valuation of Reading and Self-Concept as a Reader.

The SARA survey also provided scoring guidelines and was designed to measure reading attitudes using four subsets: digital and print modes, and academic and recreational purposes. The SARA scoring guidelines therefore, were organized according to these four features of reading attitude. The survey consisted of a total of eighteen questions with answers on a six-point scale, with six being most positive (Very Good) and one being most negative (Very Bad). The scoring of the completed surveys was simple. Certain questions within the survey were assigned to each of the four subsets. The Academic Print (AP) subset consisted of questions 3, 6, 14, 17 and 18. The Academic Digital (AD) subset consisted of questions 1, 5, 7, 12 and 16. The Recreational Print (RP) subset was comprised of questions 2, 8, 9, 11, and 13, while the Recreational Digital (RD) subset contained questions 4, 10, and 15 (Conradi et al., 2013, p. 570).
To calculate scores for each individual who completed the survey, the average score of the responses for the questions within each subset was taken. The result was a number between one and six inclusive.

The survey results can be interpreted in a few different ways. As this survey was meant to be a classroom tool, the first method of analysis is simple and probably the most useful for a classroom teacher. The results for individual students may be scored by simply taking the average score per each of the four subsets of questions and applying the final average score to the same six-point scale that the questions are based on. So, for example, if a student achieves an average score of 5.5 in the AP subset, the student’s reading attitude can be interpreted as “Very Good” toward Academic Print purpose and mode (Conradi et al., 2013, p. 570).

The data from the SARA survey can then be analyzed by and interpreted according to subsets. The results in the subsets may be analyzed to uncover certain weaknesses or strengths in purpose or mode. For example, the subsets related to the same purpose may indicate that one or more students has a particularly positive attitude toward academic digital reading but not toward academic print reading, or toward recreational digital, but not recreational print. Therefore, the print attitude weakness should be taken into account when designing curriculum and the more positive purpose or mode should be used as a bolster to encourage the development of a more positive attitude.

The demographic questions that appeared in the administration of the combined AMRP and SARA surveys were analyzed according to responses by gender and any trends in the data were noted. The data was disaggregated by gender and course enrolled in to search for additional trends. This helped identify reading attitudes and reading motivation trends specific to each of
the courses and also by gender within these courses. This disaggregation process was achieved through the use of filters available within the Survey Monkey research tool.

**Teacher interviews.** The teacher interview data was transcribed and coded using MaxQDA data analysis software through two coding cycles. Saldana’s (2013) description of coding methods was used to determine appropriate methods for analysis and coding. First cycle coding iterations were expected to include in-vivo coding, structural coding and evaluative coding. In-vivo coding was used to capture interesting verbatim statements made by the teacher participants (Saldana, 2013). Structural coding was used in order to match data to the predetermined codes for specific research questions from the semi-structured interviews (Saldana, 2013). Evaluative coding was necessary to code statements of negativity or positivity of teachers’ perceptions of students’ attitudes and effectiveness of teacher strategies for reading motivation (Saldana, 2013). As first cycle coding came to a close, some expected themes emerged and some unexpected codes emerged from the data as well. These were coded as appropriate according to Saldana (2013), (Appendix F).

Second cycle coding consisted of pattern coding to sort first cycle codes into themes (Saldana, 2013). Pattern coding made relationships among codes more apparent and facilitated the formation of inferences (Saldana, 2013). New themes and codes were explored and developed as themes emerged in the pattern coding. The final codes and emergent themes were transformed into a narrative that subjectively described the experience, opinions, and ideas of the teachers in regard to their specific experiences with adolescent reading motivation through codeweaving (Saldana, 2013).

Throughout the data analysis process, analytic memos were created by the researcher to explore and pursue divergent or convergent data in the research and to reflect on the analytic
process so far. These memos were useful as field notes to help write the narrative and create meaning from the final codes and themes.

**Development of codes and themes by research question.** The semi-structured interviews with teachers were coded and analyzed for patterns, common themes, and convergent and divergent data related to teachers’ impact on student reading motivation. The codes for analysis were developed in response to each of the research questions. There were five predetermined themes provided that correspond to each of the research questions. Reading Motivation Success corresponded with the central research question, Expectancy-Value Theory corresponded with sub-question a, Reading Attitude corresponded to the sub-question b and Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Responsiveness corresponded with sub-question c. These initial broad themes were those expected to emerge upon analysis of the codes.

**Central Research Question:** How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read? Since the purpose of this research was to determine how twelfth grade students are motivated to read in English Language Arts classes, all of the data and analysis associated with this research was directed toward answering this central question. The data gained from the surveys reflected the students’ reading motivation and reading attitude at the precise moment in time the surveys were administered. For this research question and its corresponding interview questions, teachers were asked to share their perceptions of the results from the student survey data for the AMRP and the SARA. Teachers’ perceptions and reactions to students’ reading motivation and attitude status provided useful insight into how twelfth grade students are motivated to read.

There were two codes contained within the theme Reading Motivation Success: Teachers’ Reflection of Students’ AMRP Results and Teachers’ Reflection of Students’ SARA
Results, which corresponded to the two surveys administered to students. The AMRP measures students’ reading motivation and the SARA survey measures students’ reading attitudes. The two codes that were developed were used to ask teachers their perceptions of the analysis of the students’ AMRP and SARA survey results. The resulting data was expected to consist of teachers’ reflections upon past teaching practice that affected twelfth grade students’ reading motivation.

The theme of Reading Motivation Success was expected to emerge from the codes for this question. The reasoning behind this decision was that it is likely that the students’ responses to the AMRP and to the SARA surveys will result in data that can be interpreted overall as positive, negative, or indicates weakness or strength in certain areas. The Reading Motivation Success theme for the central research question was expected to emerge as a result of teachers’ reactions to the students’ survey results for the AMRP and the SARA surveys. It was expected that teachers were able to recall some of the strategies they used to motivate the current twelfth grade students to read and that the teachers would see a connection between the results, which were expected to be mostly positive, and the strategies chosen for use with that set of students.

Teachers were asked to respond to interview questions including the survey results with their reactions, perceptions, insights and commentary. The initial survey data analysis and then the overlapping analysis by the teachers of the data provided an opportunity for teachers to reflect on their experiences and their perceptions of the students’ experiences as well. These two perspectives, that of the teachers and that of the students, was expected to not only be useful in and of themselves, but also in comparative analysis.

*Sub-question a: How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?* This research question was specifically intended to examine the reading
motivation of students according to expectancy-value theory. The AMRP, built using the lens of expectancy-value theory, was administered to students and responses were evaluated to determine the status of reading motivation in the twelfth grade student population. Then, teachers were asked to share their perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-value for English Language Arts related assignments.

The codes developed correspond to the two parts of expectancy-value theory: expectancy-beliefs and task-values. The teachers were asked for their personal observations on each of these two components with the expectation that teachers would have observed students’ behavior related to their willingness to undertake the work involved in classroom assignments and the value that the students placed upon completing the assignments. The first code, Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs, was expected to be seen in the data as teachers described their experiences with students and their willingness to engage in and complete English Language Arts assignments. It was expected that teachers would have experience with students who possessed the confidence and experience to engage with and complete many assignments successfully, while also having experience with students who lacked the confidence in their ability to complete assignments. The second code, Students’ Task-Value, was expected to appear in the data when teachers described their students’ willingness or unwillingness to engage in English Language Arts activities according to the students’ evaluation of the worthwhile nature of the activity. It was expected that teachers would have experience with students who see English Language Arts activities as being worthwhile and others who do not. A continuum of task-values was expected to be seen with certain students valuing some assignments highly while finding others less valuable. It was anticipated that this information would provide additional insight into how teachers shape and respond to students’ preferences.
The theme of Expectancy-Value Theory was anticipated to emerge from these codes and research question. As teachers reflected on students’ self-concept as readers and task-value for English Language Arts assignments, it seemed likely that teachers will have responded within the context of this theory, whether or not they were familiar with the theory.

Sub-question b: What are students’ attitudes toward reading? This research question was specifically intended to examine teachers’ perceptions of students’ reading attitudes and the attitudes of the students themselves. The SARA measures adolescents’ attitudes toward reading digital text and printed text, as well as attitudes toward these modes of text in academic and in recreational settings. It was expected that data corresponding to the four areas of reading attitude would emerge based on the administration of this survey to students and that the data would be sufficient for analysis to determine an overall attitude for the class and attitudes for the two demographics requested.

The first four codes developed for this research question corresponded to the four areas measured in the SARA survey. Teachers were asked to provide their personal perceptions of students’ reading attitudes as they observed it in their classrooms, specifically relating to students’ preferences and behaviors in the four areas of the SARA survey. Each of the codes that addressed this research question corresponded to the four areas of the SARA and were created to isolate teacher responses for each of the SARA categories. It was anticipated that this information would provide the researcher with additional insight into how teachers shape and respond to students’ preferences.

The first code, Academic Digital (AD), was expected to be seen in the data when teachers discussed students’ preferences regarding digital text in the academic context, meaning text in the classroom or for completion of classroom assignments. It was unknown whether the data
would indicate positive, negative, ambivalent or mixed attitudes toward digital text for academic purposes. The second code, Academic Print (AP), was expected to be seen in the data when teachers described their experiences with students engaging with printed materials for academic purposes inside and outside the classroom. The data for this code was expected to yield similar types of results in that there may have been positive, negative, ambivalent of mixed attitudes toward printed text for academic purposes as well.

The third and fourth codes corresponded to the recreational purpose for reading in both the print and digital modes. Data for the third and fourth codes, Recreational Print and Recreational Digital, were expected to be revealed as teachers discussed the behavior of students they have observed reading text for fun and whether the text was printed or digital in nature.

The final two codes for this research question related to teachers’ own personal text mode preferences and how these modes influenced the motivation of the students in their classes. The fifth code, Teachers’ Print Text for Assignments, and the sixth code, Teachers’ Digital Text for Assignments were intended to discover the preferences of teachers in the classroom and to provide data to compare against student preferences.

The theme of Reading Attitude was expected to emerge as teachers responded to the interview questions concerning their ideas about the reading preferences of students and of themselves. A more complete picture was anticipated to be built from the responses of teachers and then compared against the survey responses of students. As the teachers responded to the interview questions built from the foundations of the SARA survey tool, a greater understanding of students’ reading attitudes and teachers’ perceptions of students’ reading attitudes was hoped to be acquired and then analyzed. These codes for this research question were expected to lead to
reading attitude related data useful to consider both student and teacher perspectives of reading motivation.

**Sub-question c: How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?**

This question was key to the purpose of this research in that the results were useful to help determine the specific ways in which English Language Arts teachers motivated students to read for class. The codes related to this question were based in the practice of teachers and how their practices impacted students’ reading motivation and in teachers’ perceptions of their practice in the classroom.

The first two codes, Teachers’ Strategies that Work and Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work were developed to explore teachers’ ideas concerning which strategies, activities and assignments were effective at motivating students and which strategies were ineffective. Teachers have years of experience developing and implementing curriculum for students. This experience is likely to have led to an understanding of which strategies and activities would be successful and which were not successful.

The next two codes, Reading Motivation Success Stories and Reading Motivation Non-Success Stories were expected to result from teachers’ willingness to share personal experiences of student reading motivation successes and failures. These successes or failures may have been defining moments in their careers or merely the story of a memorable student’s case where a teacher learned something important about student reading motivation. The expectation was that this information would provide useful examples to analyze as positive and negative samples of motivation that could be further broken down according to positive or negative characteristics for reading motivation.
The next code was anticipated to emerge as teachers attempted to relate to their students’ experiences. Teachers often are required to think like the very students they teach to understand what will work and what will not in the classroom. The code entitled Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences was expected to arise from the data as teachers attempted to make connections to students’ experiences, both positive and negative, as teachers reflected on classroom practice and attempted to empathize with the students they saw struggle and those they saw succeed. The data was expected to provide further insight into how teachers made sense of the effect they have upon students’ English Language Arts classroom experiences.

The next two codes, Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation, and Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude were developed to capture data related to a more general sense of reading motivation and reading attitude, perhaps ideas and observations that did not obviously align with expectancy-value theory or with the areas measured in the AMRP or the SARA surveys. Developing questions that only featured expectancy-value theory, AMRP-based or SARA-based interview questions might have been too limiting for teachers. It was anticipated that teachers might have developed their own, more personal understanding of students’ reading motivation that may not align directly with the perspectives underpinning the two surveys or expectancy-value theory. Although the questions for these codes were not phrased using expectancy-value theory language, this data was still analyzed using the expectancy-value theory framework. These codes were expected to provide another option to analyze data from teachers who expressed their more personal understanding of reading motivation.

The final code, Reading Assignments Students Enjoy, was expected to provide data relating to successful reading assignments in a way that encouraged teachers to think about
reading motivation without thinking of expectancy-value theory. Teachers’ curriculum development skill is dependent on their ability to predict responses to and adapt curriculum to include assignments that students will be more likely to readily engage in. If the emphasis were placed on the enjoyment of students, rather than the theory, then this may have been an easier task for teachers, who likely would be more practically inclined. This data was also to be analyzed using the expectancy-value framework.

The theme expected to emerge from the data sorted according to these codes was connected to Teachers’ Responsiveness to students’ needs. The research question tied to this set of codes and theme was developed to probe the ways that teachers directly influenced the reading motivation of their students and the strategies they may have employed to achieve this purpose. As the teachers responded and provided data concerning their practice, it was expected that unique and insightful data concerning the multitude of ways that teachers influence students’ reading motivation through crafting of curriculum and through teaching experience would have emerged.

**Relationship of codes to teacher interview questions.** The predicted codes related directly to the teacher interview questions. The teacher interview questions were developed to learn how teachers responded to their perceptions of student reading motivation in the English Language Arts classroom. Teachers’ personal insight into their everyday practice in reading activities was expected to provide valuable ideas, successful strategies and pertinent observations concerning students’ reading motivation and how to maximize motivation in the classroom (Appendices G and H.)

**Limitations.** The findings of the study may be transferable in many cases because it was of the common or typical case study variety, so it may be transferable to similar schools and
districts. Limitations included that the study results may not be transferable to all school districts or grade levels. The study findings were likely to be transferable to future classes of adolescent students, particularly at the high school level within this school district.

Additional limitations lie within the very nature of this and any twelfth grade class at this site. In surveying the students of this particular group, responses were representative of students who have persisted throughout their K-12 educational careers.

Surveys have specific limitations. Although the AMRP and the SARA have both been tested for construct validity and reliability, researchers find that self-reported responses have certain limitations. With Likert scale surveys, students may only choose options presented on the survey. If none of the options truly fits, students must decide which option fits best. There are no opportunities to clarify for meaning or to ask for elaboration.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

There were minimal anticipated risks to participants in this study. This research fully complied with the requirements and recommendations of the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board (NU IRB) and the school district administration. The author of this research successfully completed the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Office of Extramural Research certification for Protecting Human Research Participants in October, 2014.

**Complete anonymity.** When dealing with participants directly, they were protected by anonymity at all times. Identifiable characteristics of teachers were removed and pseudonyms provided for all teacher participants before analysis proceeded. Names and other identifying information were not collected for student AMRP and SARA surveys. School, district, region, state and other identifying information were omitted. Although disaggregated by gender and
class attended, student demographic data were aggregated within those categories and, aggregated as an entire class and the data were individually unidentifiable.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness was established through dependability, credibility, confirmability and transferability procedures. Continuous study reevaluation through researcher reflection and data analysis was also used to ensure research integrity and cohesion (Creswell, 2013).

**Dependability.** Dependability was established through a variety of procedures. Yin suggests establishing a chain of evidence, which includes developing a case study protocol, creating a case study database, and the use of multiple data sets (Yin, 2014).

**Chain of evidence.** Yin (2014) suggests that a chain of evidence be established to increase research dependability by maintaining researcher focus and integrity between the research questions and case study methodology. Used in conjunction with a case study database, and a case study protocol, an evidence chain allows a reader to follow easily from the case study write-up, back to the case study database, to the evidence cited within the database, back to the case study protocol, which finally leads directly back to the research questions (Yin, 2014, p. 128). This establishes a trail that can be followed by a reader and can help establish the integrity of the research study. The chain of evidence requires careful notation and citation of evidence, methodology, and sources concerning thought processes and inferences related to the evidence and data (Yin, 2014). This will also require the careful construction of the research study in order for all components to link together in such a way as to support its purpose and research questions.
Case study database. The creation of a case study database provides a method of examining prior research conducted by allowing the opportunity for independent analysis (Yin, 2014). In the case of this study, the collected data will not be used for any other purpose or any additional studies, but will be stored and available for future reference if the need arises. A case study database contains all data sources in their raw state and is maintained separately from its final analysis presented within the case study narrative, although the initial analysis will exist separately within the database as well (Yin, 2014). In this research study, teachers’ interview data and student survey data will be maintained for a period of five years from the time the final research has been completed. The data will exist in an anonymous state, as all identifying information will be removed prior to analysis. The analysis of the data will be present to examine as well, but will not be integrated with the narrative, as in the final case study itself.

Case study protocol. The case study protocol, including a logic model, consists of the strategic plan to conduct the research using a preset series of steps to accomplish the tasks pertaining to research (Yin, 2014). Adherence to the protocol means that the researcher has stayed true to the carefully crafted, predetermined plan. This increases the integrity of the research as the procedures of the study have been carefully stated and researchers wishing to replicate the study may do so by following the procedure.

Logic model. A logic model is a dependability procedure specific to the case study design. The use of logic models develops dependability through the development of a predicted
causal or sequential chain to be followed throughout the research process (Yin, 2014). The logic model of a case study helps a researcher maintain the integrity of the research by setting out the case study protocol, a research strategy developed before research activities begin. The logic model graphic below shows the procedure for this research study.

Figure 3. Basic logic model for this study.

The procedure of this study began with the collection of two sets of data from twelfth grade students: the AMRP and the SARA. Once these data sets were collected, the two surveys were aggregated to provide overall data for the class, then disaggregated according to course enrollment and gender, then analyzed and interpreted. Teachers’ interviews were then developed using predetermined questions, including questions that arose from the data analysis of the student surveys. The interviews and surveys were then analyzed, synthesized and interpreted with the final result being recommendations for teachers.

Pattern matching logic. Pattern matching increases dependability through comparison. Pattern matching refers to a researcher’s prediction of patterns that will be seen within the data. The prediction, when matched to any patterns detected in the collected data can help guide the research (Yin, 2014). The comparison of the collected data against the originally predicted patterns and themes may reveal additional insight into the case. When the predicted pattern matches the pattern seen by the researcher in the data collected, dependability is strengthened as it is an indication that the researcher maintained integrity to the intended research design (Yin, 2014).
Table 3

*Pattern Predictions for This Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Prediction</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If student levels of reading motivation are high, increasingly positive attitudes will be seen, likewise lower levels of motivation will reveal more negative attitudes toward reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Higher or lower task-values for reading activities will correspond with higher or lower reading motivation in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher or lower expectancy-beliefs for reading activities will result in corresponding positive or negative attitudes and higher or lower reading motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers have a variety of flexible instructional strategies to increase reading motivation and attitudes of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers have a good sense of students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Credibility.** Credibility is the use of multiple methods to confirm the accuracy of data gathered in research. Triangulation of data, member-checking, a positionality statement and ethical conduct are all methods to ensure the credibility of data collected.

**Triangulation.** To ensure the trustworthiness and credibility of the study, triangulation of three converging data sources was utilized (Yin, 2014), including: teacher interviews, the AMRP survey data and the SARA survey data. The data from the three sources were triangulated to produce findings responding to the research questions. The AMRP survey was designed to measure student perceptions of their personal reading motivation and the SARA was designed to measure student reading attitudes. The interview protocol was designed to measure teacher
perceptions of how to motivate and cultivate readers in their classrooms and teacher perceptions of students’ responses in regard to the survey data. The teacher data set built upon the other two sets. The AMRP and SARA surveys combined provided a detailed snapshot of student reading motivation and attitude at the time the survey was conducted. The AMRP and the SARA each informed the researcher’s development of the interview questions for the teachers. All three data sets were compared and contrasted.

Figure 4. Triangulation of data.

**Teacher member-checking.** Interview transcripts and initial copies of interpretations were offered to teacher participants providing an opportunity to clarify meaning to further ensure credibility (Yin, 2014). Written member-checking was used to determine whether researcher interpretation of participants’ words was accurate and sufficient to convey the meaning intended. Alternative interpretations, conclusions and meanings were sought from the teacher participants where possible (Creswell, 2013). Participants were also provided the option to receive a copy of the completed thesis.

**Confirmability.** Confirmability measures ensured that the interpretation of the research is true to its source. In addition to providing dependability, member-checking also served the purpose of providing a means of confirmability. The teachers were asked to examine and verify the researcher’s transcription of their interviews for accuracy. Corrections and suggestions were requested and applied to the finished transcripts. The involvement of participants in evaluating
the accuracy of the researcher’s interpretation means that the words and ideas of the participants were less likely to be misunderstood and the integrity of the research was maintained.

**Transferability.** Transferability to other contexts was enhanced through the use of rich, thick description. The use of a single case study design offers the opportunity to gather a detailed description of the study’s context, participants and procedures. Increased use of description provides future researchers more opportunity for the findings of the study to become transferable to other, similar contexts. This examination and description of a common or typical case among school districts means that transferability is more likely, as other cases are more likely to be similar.

**Conclusion**

Academic achievement is dependent upon one’s motivation to complete academic coursework. Reading motivation and attitude play a particularly important role in the success of students in secondary school, as students make the shift from learning to read toward reading to learn (McKool, 2007; Stanovich, 1986). Unfortunately, researchers have noted a decline in reading motivation and attitude that occurs in many adolescents and that often begins around fourth grade (Applegate & Applegate, 2010; Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997; McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012; McKool, 2007). This decline is poorly timed, in that adolescence is precisely when the demands for skillful, active reading become strongest, as academic success increasingly depends upon students’ ability to read well. Academic progression and future careers may be jeopardized as academic achievement suffers (Brozo, Shiel, & Topping, 2007; Reschly & Christenson, 2013). In addition, students who become disengaged from school may not persist in their studies long enough to graduate (Reschly & Christenson, 2013), further compounding the problems, as the economic futures of students with
less than a high school diploma are bleak (Fine, 2005; Iyengar, Ball, & National Endowment for the Arts, Office of Research & Analysis, 2007).

With these issues in mind, and the recent emphasis on implementation of best practices and research-based instruction, the exploration of how reading motivation in the classroom operates and can be developed and nurtured within the constraints of the secondary English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum becomes ever more important. Over the past decades, overall attempts to improve reading motivation and attitudes of adolescents, particularly twelfth grade students, and to stem the adolescent decline in reading have met with minimal success (Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997; Iyengar et al., 2007; McKool, 2007). Adolescent reading motivation nationwide and internationally is low and also continues to decline (Brozo et al., 2007; Cuevas, Russell, & Irving, 2012, p. 446; McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer, 2012). Strategies to increase reading motivation and attitude that can be effectively, yet easily used within the secondary classroom by ELA teachers would be especially valuable to increase historically lagging engagement (Guthrie et al., 1997; Ivey & Johnston, 2013; McKenna et al., 2012).

This study was designed to explore the reading motivation of twelfth grade students and to explore the ways that current ELA teachers successfully encourage reading motivation. The purpose of the study was to use this data to develop viable strategies that increase the reading motivation of adolescent students. To achieve this purpose, this study utilized student reading motivation and attitude surveys and teacher interviews. These data sets were expected to produce findings that could then be useful to transform the current ELA curriculum into an even more effective learning experience for students that encourages students to achieve their potential, so that all students will have the best opportunities for future economic success.
Chapter 4

Introduction

This case study was conducted during the winter of 2017. Its purpose was to explore the ways in which high school English Language Arts (ELA) teachers perceive reading motivation and how high school seniors are motivated to read and complete ELA assignments. The four research questions for this study were constructed around a theoretical framework based in expectancy-value theory. The central research question was followed by three closely related sub-questions: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read? a) How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully? b) What are students’ attitudes toward reading? c) How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read? These four research questions guided the data analysis and interpretation through the lens of an expectancy-value theory based framework. Chapter 4 is a presentation of the data collected during this case study research.

The problem of practice that inspired this research is that current researchers have bemoaned the fact that today’s adolescent students are less motivated to read and engage in reading and ELA activities than ever before. This decline in motivation has placed these older students in a precarious situation, as they are close to graduation from high school and are therefore planning on embarking on new paths to their chosen careers. As competitors in the global job marketplace, these young adults may fall behind or even fail to achieve their goals as their competitors who are more motivated readers are awarded higher paying jobs. Young adults who cannot or will not read skillfully have limited futures in this competitive workplace, and in pursuit of their chosen career paths, and as active, productive participants within their
communities. Young adults without the ability to read skillfully may be incapable of achieving their full potential.

Expectancy-value theory, as described by Eccles and Wigfield (2002) is a valid and reliable lens with which to examine this problem of practice. The theory is that students’ reading motivation occurs upon the achievement of a certain level of expectancy-belief and a certain level of task-value. An adequate expectancy-belief is seen when a student feels confident that he or she has the ability to complete an activity or an assignment successfully. An adequate task-value is when the student feels the activity or assignment will provide enough value and benefit as to become a worthwhile activity. A student can see how this task can and will be important to his or her future, whether it be immediately useful or useful in the long term. The teacher interview questions and the student surveys were both based in expectancy-value theory to provide a measure of both teachers’ perceptions of reading motivation according to expectancy-value theory and students’ perceptions of their own reading motivations and attitudes according to expectancy-value theory. This was designed specifically so that the three data sets, the student SARA survey, the student AMRP survey and the teacher interviews, could be compared and analyzed separately and against each other.

This qualitative research project was designed as a single, embedded case study because of the benefits provided through this methodology. The research process was designed thoughtfully, in the manner that would most likely result in the collection of data most pertinent to an exploration and analysis of students’ reading motivation and teachers’ perceptions of and effects on students’ reading motivation at the research site. The design of the study’s process is best represented by a logic model, as recommended for use in case studies by Yin (2014). The logic model is useful as a guide for the researcher to follow as the research unfolds. The logic
model presents a series of predicted, sequenced steps within the research process that illustrates not only a plan for the researcher to follow, but also how the steps in the process relate and connect with each other to produce an end result.

**Overview of research process.** The research process for this study is essentially a series of three analysis cycles. The first cycle consists of an analysis of twelfth grade students’ SARA and AMRP survey data, which in turn informs the teacher interview questions. The second is an analysis of the teachers’ interview data, while the third is a synthesis of the two data sets from students’ surveys and the primary data set from the teachers’ interviews, resulting in a series of recommendations for use at the research site. For clarity, the collected data is presented sequentially in Chapter 4, according to a logic model (Figure 4).

![Figure 5. Detailed logic model.](image)

Twelfth grade students who were eighteen years of age or older were surveyed using the Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitudes (SARA) and the Adolescent Motivation Reading Profile (AMRP) to develop a more complete profile on students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes at the site. A total of seventy students were eighteen years of age or older, and of those students, there were a total of seven, of varying ability levels, who volunteered to participate. All seven students completed both surveys. The students’ data were analyzed and
provided material to formulate three customized interview questions for the teachers’ interview protocol.

Out of five available teachers in grades nine through eleven, there were a total of three who volunteered to participate, each at a different grade level. One teacher’s practice was focused on special education ELA students at all high school grade levels, while the other two teachers taught career track (“Standard”) and college track (“Academic”) students. For purposes of anonymity, the teachers will be referred to as Teacher 1, Teacher 2, and Teacher 3.

The teacher interviews were semi-structured interviews designed to be about thirty to forty-five minutes in length, focused on the perceptions of teachers regarding students’ expectancy-beliefs, and task-values, reading attitudes, teachers’ experiences with motivation and attitude, and teachers’ observations concerning motivational strategies that were successful or unsuccessful within the classroom. The teachers’ interview data was coded, initially with Structural and In-Vivo coding. Pattern coding in the second cycle brought first cycle codes together as Emergent Themes as per Saldana (2013). Analytic memos were recorded during the coding process, which further helped the development of themes.

The research site is a common or typical rural public high school in a northeastern state. The site houses approximately 76 teachers and 900 students, 156 of which were twelfth grade students. There are five administrators and numerous support staff. It is a school district that encompasses a wide area of 295 square miles and extends over two counties. The included areas in the counties are rural. The site shares some characteristics in demographics with neighboring school districts. As the site is similar to some other local school districts, it is likely that the findings generated by this research will be transferable.
Data Collection and Analysis

Student surveys. In January, 2017, student surveys were conducted. Students who provided signed consent from their parents were given a survey link to the Survey Monkey online research tool that they could access on their laptops. Students accessed the survey as they sat in their regular activity period classrooms. The survey consisted of three parts: an online consent form, the AMRP and the SARA (Appendix D). It consisted of a total of forty questions plus the initial question providing consent. The entire survey was expected to take no more than twenty minutes, but none of the students surveyed required more than ten minutes.

After all students had completed the surveys, data was organized into an Excel spreadsheet and individual students’ data was scored according to established scoring guidelines for the AMRP and the SARA. In the survey, the first question asked for consent, while the following two questions provided demographic information. These three questions were not scored. The consent question merely granted access to the students who agreed to participate. The results of the two demographic questions were tabulated and noted for later disaggregation of responses by gender and course enrolled. The students were numbered one through seven, with each student being assigned a separate Excel scoring sheet. Demographic information for each was recorded at the top of each sheet. Each student’s survey responses were assigned numbers based on positivity or negativity for both surveys. The SARA and the AMRP surveys were each scored separately on each student’s Excel sheet. Finally, the AMRP and the SARA survey data were aggregated and an overall score and percentage were determined for all students and recorded on a separate sheet (Appendix I).

Finding #1: Overall, twelfth grade students hold high expectancy-beliefs for activities involving reading, and possess lower task-values for activities involving reading.
Data collected from students in the AMRP provided the researcher with evidence of student reading motivation at this site, at this moment in time. The data was useful for answering research sub-question *a) How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?* The AMRP was based in expectancy-value theory and resulted in data points focused on the two aspects of that theory, expectancy-beliefs and task-value. The Self-Concept as a Reader data offered insight into students’ expectancy-beliefs and their expectations as far as their ability to be successful in reading and ELA-related activities. Students’ responses also provided insight into task-value through their Value of Reading responses and data supporting how the students regard the value of reading and ELA activities.

*Finding #2: Overall, twelfth grade students feel highly positive about Recreational Digital (RD) text mode and purpose, and significantly less positive about Academic Print (AP) especially, but also Academic Digital (AD), and Recreational Print (RP) text modes and purposes. However, students do not feel negatively about any of the text modes or purposes; rather, they show varying degrees of ambivalence.*

The SARA survey provided data points for answering research sub-question *b) What are students’ attitudes toward reading?* Students’ attitudes toward reading, and especially their attitudes toward reading in certain modes and for certain purposes is a critical component that shapes reading motivation. There were four possible categories, Academic Print (AP), Academic Digital (AD), Recreational Print (RP), and Recreational Digital (RD), one of which was assigned to each question. Many students seemed to have strong opinions about the text they encounter on a day to day basis.

*Aggregated survey data.* The data collected reflect important characteristics of the twelfth grade student population surveyed. Overall, the most striking characteristic of these
students is that the overall average score for the Self-Concept as a Reader column is markedly higher than the overall average score for the Value of Reading column. This is true not only in the aggregate, but also for most of the individuals as well. Student 3 is the exception, where the Value of Reading score of 62.5% was slightly higher than the score of Self-Concept as a Reader with a 57.5%. Value of Reading scores, for the other six students, ranged from 2.5% to 25% lower than Self-Concept as a Reader. In the overall average, Value of Reading scores were 10% lower than Self-Concept as a Reader scores.

Table 4

\textit{AMRP Student Data Totals by Student Number}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
<th>Full Survey Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>26.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another method of examining this data is to convert the percentages within the data table to correspond to the four-point scale from the survey. For example, an average student response of 1 would equal 25%, an average response of 2 would equal 50%, an average response of 3 would equal 75%, and an average response of 4 would equal 100%. None of the students scored
average responses at the high end or at the low end of the scale, so averages of 1 (25%) and 4 (100%) can be eliminated.

Placing the average responses by percent on the scale for the AMRP survey, a remarkable difference between students’ Self-Concepts as Readers and their Value of Reading was observed.

For Self-Concept as a Reader, most students scored between a 3 (75%) and a 4 (100%), which is at the positive end of the scale. The overall average percentage was a 77.1%. Students 3 and 7 scored between a 2(50%) and 3 (75%). For Value of Reading, however, only two students, students 1 and 5 scored between 3 (75%) and 4 (100%), while the rest scored between 2 (50%) and 3 (75%). The overall average percentage for Value of Reading was 67.1% The scores for this category are only slightly above the middle on the scale.

The SARA data also revealed remarkable characteristics of twelfth grade students’ attitudes. Examining the averages of each category, AP, AD, RP, and RD, the highest numbers, indicating the strongest preferences, were in the RD category with an average of 5.37 out of 6 possible points. AD and RP scores overall, were exactly the same, with an average of 3.97 out of 6. The lowest score was an average of 3.37 out of 6 for AP.
Table 5

**SARA Student Data Totals by Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 3.37  3.97  3.97  5.37  4.17

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.

There were four students who favored RD mode and purpose with a score of 6 out of 6, the highest possible score. There was one student who chose RP as a 6 out of 6. These were the highest scores on the table. The lowest scores in all categories were seen in AP, having four students who scored the category near the lowest end of the scale, with the lowest scores between 2.00 and 2.80. RP also had two students who scored low in the category with a 2.00 and a 2.60. The rest of the scores were significantly higher, with scores ranging between 3.20 and 6.00. There was one student who scored a 2.20 in AD, while the rest of the scores were significantly higher, with scores between 3.20 and 5.40. Finally, the overall reading attitude scores of the students ranged from the lowest average score of a 2.95 to the highest average score of a 5.63. This score corresponds with student reading attitudes. Most of the students’ scores would correspond to the higher end of the scale, indicating a positive reading attitude overall.
**Figure 7.** Overall SARA raw scores by mode/purpose, averaged and placed on the survey scale.

AP = Academic Print; AD = Academic Digital; RP = Recreational Print; RD = Recreational Digital.

Based on the analysis of the overall attitudes of students by mode and purpose, students show a clear preference for RD. The overall average for students 1 through 7 is a 5.37, which is the highest of all four categories. Questions for each category are shown in Table 5.
**Table 6**

*SARA Questions by Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. How do you feel about doing research using encyclopedias (or other books) for a class?</td>
<td>1. How do you feel about reading news online for class?</td>
<td>2. How do you feel about reading a book in your free time?</td>
<td>4. How do you feel about doing research using encyclopedias (or other books) for a class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How do you feel about reading a newspaper or a magazine for class?</td>
<td>12. How do you feel about working on an Internet project with classmates?</td>
<td>11. How do you feel about reading a book for fun on a rainy Saturday?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Disaggregated survey data.** The data also highlighted differences in the demographic groups that were surveyed. Students were asked two demographic questions: their gender and which course they were enrolled in for ELA. Students were provided with two options for gender and four options for course enrolled. The courses enrolled corresponded with the four types of classes offered in the senior year of high school. Advanced Placement (Adv. P.) was for students...
planning to attend college, who possess above-average abilities in reading and writing. These students may pass a test at the end of the school year to determine if they may use their Adv. P. experience for credit at their chosen college. The Academic level was also for college-bound students who possess above-average ability in reading and writing, but were not looking for the challenging content or test of the Adv. P. class. The Standard level is for students who are moderately skilled at reading and writing and is generally for students who plan to begin their careers immediately upon graduation, or who plan on studying for a career at a vocational or career preparatory program or college. Co-Taught and/or Learning Support is a class for those students who experience difficulty with reading and writing and generally plan on graduating from high school and immediately begin work or training for a career without college.

According to the demographic questions, the survey participants were representative of each gender and course enrolled. Although there were not males and females at each level of course enrolled, there is at least one representative from each course.

Table 7

*Demographic Data by Student*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Course Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Advanced Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Advanced Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Co-Taught (Learning Support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The AMRP scores disaggregated by gender provided insight into the differences between perspectives of males and females. For example, two of the three females (Students 2 and 5) had the highest Self-Concept as a Reader scores overall. Student 5, a female, scored by far, the highest in both categories. Two females (Students 1 and 5) scored the highest on Valuation of Reading. Two out of four of the males (Students 6 and 7) scored lowest in Valuation of Reading.

The AMRP scores disaggregated by course enrolled provided insight into the differences in perspective of those students enrolled in Advanced Placement (Adv. P.), Academic, Standard, and Co-Taught and Learning Support classes. Five of the students, whether enrolled in Adv. P. (Student 6), Academic (Student 3), Standard (Student 4) or Co-taught and Learning Support (Student 7) showed similar Value of Reading scores. Five of the seven students across the courses enrolled, scored highly for Self-Concept as a reader (Students 1 and 2 in Academic, Student 4 in Standard, Students 5 and 6 in AP). Only one of the two Adv. P. students scored the highest in both categories overall, with the other Adv. P. student (Student 6) scoring more similarly to the Standard student (Student 4). The Co-Taught and Learning Support student (Student 7) scored lowest of all for Value of Reading, while one of the Academic students (Student 3) scored lowest for Self-Concept as a Reader.
The SARA data disaggregated by gender reveals similarities and differences between the genders in reading attitude. For example, all three females (Students 1, 2, and 5) enjoyed the RD mode and purpose. Females show that they favor recreational reading activities, whether they be in the digital or print modes. The females showed that they also enjoyed the RP mode and purpose more than the males did, as the female scores for RP were: Student 1 with a 5.20, Student 2 with a 4.60 and Student 5 with a 6.00. These scores are markedly higher than the scores for males with Students 3, 4, 6, and 7 scoring 2.00, 3.20, 4.20 and 2.60 respectively. Conversely, three out of four males (Students 3, 4, and 6) show enjoyment of the AD purpose and mode with scores ranging from 4.00 to 5.20, while two out of three females (Students 1 and 2) scored low for AD, with scores of only 3.40 and 2.20.

The SARA data disaggregated by course enrolled also reveals similarities and differences among students enrolled in the different courses. For example, the two Adv. P. students
(Students 5 and 6) enjoyed three of the four modes and purposes: RD, RP, and AD. The Academic students (Students 1, 2, and 3) all scored low for AP, as did the Co-Taught and Learning Support student (Student 7). Unexpectedly, one of the Adv. P. students (Student 6) also scored low in AP. Only the Standard student (Student 4) and one of the Adv. P. students (Student 5) scored highly for AP.

In examining Figure 9, if these graphical representations are interpreted to indicate relative reading attitudes of students, the most positive reading attitudes would belong to the Standard student (Student 4) and one of the Adv. P. students (Student 5). The least positive reading attitudes would belong to the Co-Taught and Learning Support student (Student 7) and one of the Academic students (Student 3).

![Figure 9. SARA category averages by student.](image)

AP = Academic Print; AD = Academic Digital; RP = Recreational Print; RD = Recreational Digital.

**Conclusion.** The student surveys provided data that, when analyzed, yielded insight and perceptions of students’ reading motivation that were unexpected. The AMRP was built around
expectancy-value theory. In the AMRP, Self-Concept as a Reader correlates with expectancy-beliefs, while Value of Reading correlates with task-value. While the aggregated score corresponding to levels of reading motivation was relatively high 72.14%, which would match up with a little less than a 3 out of 4 on the scale used for the AMRP, students’ survey data revealed that overall, students held high-expectancy-beliefs for reading, but students’ task-values were significantly lower. Also, the students’ SARA data shows that students’ overall reading attitude average is 4.17, which, on a 6 point scale with 6 being most positive, is in the upper third, indicating a mostly positive attitude toward reading. The AD and RP categories scoring the same in the surveys was also surprising in that there are two purposes represented here: academic and recreational. Most students scored RD the highest, showing that this is their favorite purpose and mode, while AP was scored lowest by most students, indicating that this was their least favorite purpose and mode. Overall, this would place digital mode and recreational purpose (at a 4.67 average over AD and RD and then also across RP and RD) well above print mode and academic purpose (at a 3.67 average over RP and AP, and then also across AP and AD). When interpreted, these data indicate that students prefer recreational purpose and digital mode over academic purpose and print mode.

As the student survey data were analyzed and interpreted, teacher interview questions were formed from this data to gather information from teachers regarding their reaction and perceptions of the AMRP and SARA results. Three questions on the Teacher Interview Protocol (Appendix C) were drawn directly from the results of the questions. These questions were questions five, six, and eight. The teachers were then able to reflect upon and provide unique perspectives regarding this data through the interview questions that were informed by the student surveys. The data collected in the teacher interviews helped develop answers to this
study’s research sub-question c) How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?

Teacher interview data. In February 2017, teacher interviews were conducted by the researcher. Data obtained from the teacher interviews showed a variety of perspectives, insights and strategies for students’ reading motivation and reading attitudes. The three teacher participants, for purposes of confidentiality, will be referred to as Teacher 1, Teacher 2, and Teacher 3. The three teachers were all ELA teachers at the research site and agreed to participate in a digitally recorded, semi-structured interview designed to be about 30-45 minutes in length. The interview questions were designed to elicit responses from the teachers that align closely with the research questions and focused on the teachers’ perceptions, observations and insights into their everyday practice as it applies to reading motivation (Appendix C).

Upon completion of the teacher interviews and after transcriptions of the recordings were made, the data were imported into the MaxQDA data analysis program. The interviews were labeled as Teacher 1, Teacher 2, and Teacher 3. Initial coding began with Structural coding using the anticipated codes. The three transcripts were analyzed and text was matched with the corresponding codes.

Finding #3: ELA teachers motivate students to read by striving to understand students’ reading motivation through constant observation, awareness of and instructional adaptations to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for ELA activities.
Table 8

Teacher Characteristics Theme and Codes from Teacher Interviews, Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Length of Teaching Experience (in years)</th>
<th>Length of Time in District (in years)</th>
<th>Certificate Held</th>
<th>Grade Level Experience (in years)</th>
<th>Classes Taught Currently</th>
<th>Class Experience (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Secondary English, Special Education K-12</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>English, Reading</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Secondary English</td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Secondary English</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers’ qualifications and experience.** Structural coding provided a starting point to begin analysis. The data in the table was provided through responses to the teacher interview question used for collecting the background data on teachers’ qualifications and experience.

The data presented by the teachers offers insight into the qualifications and experience of the three teachers interviewed. All three teachers are experienced, with the least experienced being Teacher 2, who has taught for ten years, then Teacher 1, who has taught for fourteen years, while the most experienced teacher has taught for twenty-six years. All three teachers spent all but one of their years of experience within the district where they teach. All three teachers are certified in Secondary English (grades 7-12), with one having an additional certification in Special Education K-12 (Teacher 1). Teacher 1 has taught all grades from K to 12, while Teacher 2 has taught grades 9-11 and Teacher 3 has taught grades 8-12. Teacher 1 currently teaches high school Reading and English and has taught these courses for five and four years respectively. Teacher 2 currently teaches high school English and has taught this current class for five years.
Teacher 3 also currently teaches high school English and has taught this course for the past six years.

Specific grade levels and specialties of the teachers are withheld wherever possible to protect the confidentiality of the teachers, as each grade level generally has only one or two teachers and to specify the grade levels would make the teachers readily identifiable to their colleagues. The data presented suggests that these teachers are experienced and likely to be knowledgeable about their subject areas and are able to make high-quality observations about student reading motivation and attitude in their everyday practice.

*Teachers’ perceptions of reading motivation and attitude.* Structural coding analysis of the interview transcripts continued with the predicted theme of Teachers’ Responsiveness. Teachers provided data as to their conceptual understanding and perceptions of reading motivation and reading attitude in general and the importance of these concepts to teaching ELA. In-vivo coding was also used to highlight the thoughts and perspectives of the teachers. All three teachers showed an in-depth knowledge of reading motivation and reading attitude and the application of these concepts to the behavior of the students in their classrooms.

The data strongly suggests that ELA teachers understand reading motivation and reading attitude and are skilled in assessment of students. The codes for Teachers’ Perceptions of Reading Attitude, Teachers’ Perceptions of Reading Motivation, Teachers’ Classroom Observations of Reading Motivation, and Teachers’ Classroom Observations of Reading Attitude provided pertinent data for Table 9.
Table 9

Codes and Data for Teachers’ Perceptions of Reading Attitude and Reading Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Structural Code: Teachers’ Perceptions of Reading Motivation (using In-Vivo codes)</th>
<th>Structural Code: Teachers’ Perceptions of Reading Attitude (using In-Vivo codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motivation, I think, is more the desire to not only become a better reader, but to gain knowledge from what they read, not just to read and get through it, but to actually learn something from it.</td>
<td>Reading attitude is more how they feel about it, regardless of their ability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working with mostly struggling readers, I have seen that motivation is highly important.

| 2       | At first glance, I saw a lot of similarities between [reading motivation and attitude], but then I thought the longer I've taught, I've realized that attitude reflects motivation. So, in other words, if I, as the teacher, portray a positive reading attitude, the student motivation for reading increases. | [Reading motivation] is vital. |

3 I would describe reading motivation as the reason someone reads. I would describe…reading attitude as the feeling someone has about reading.

The teachers recognize that reading motivation is important and is dependent upon reasons important to the students. Teacher 1 provides several reasons why a student might choose to read (“to become a better reader”, “to read and get through it”, and “to gain knowledge from what they read”), while Teacher 3 just states that there is a “reason someone reads.” All three teachers also recognized that reading attitude deals with emotion and “feelings.” Teacher 1 commented that “Reading attitude is…how they feel about it, regardless of their ability.” The teacher recognizes that students’ reading attitude and ability are somewhat disconnected. For example, a student can have an extremely poor attitude toward reading, yet have adequate ability to read. Teacher 2 saw that reading motivation and reading attitude are closely intertwined and cannot be separated. Teacher 2 originally remarked that reading motivation and attitude are similar ideas, but later decided that “attitude reflects motivation.” In other words, reading attitude
can act to raise or lower reading motivation and has a direct effect on students’ willingness to read.

*Expectancy-value data.* Structural coding and analysis for expectancy-value theory components resulted in data that reveals that teachers are keenly aware of students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for reading and ELA activities and are actively trying to make sense of their observations.

*Teachers’ observations on task-value in general.* Structural codes for the theme Expectancy-Value Theory provided additional insight into teachers’ perceptions of students’ expectancy-value theory related behavior in the classroom. Teachers’ observations regarding students’ task-values for reading and ELA activities were essential to the study.

At this particular research site, task-value seems to be the issue of concern as noted earlier with students’ lower survey scores for task-value, and from teachers’ observations as well. The teachers offered many task-value observations that brought students’ priorities into perspective.

Teacher 1 provided several salient points concerning students’ task-values and systemic issues within education that could contribute to the low task-values observed. Teacher 1 pointed out that many newspapers are written at a third-grade level and that much of the material that a student has the desire to read, they can read without difficulty (Appendix M, Table 17). As a result, some students do not want to achieve growth beyond what they can already do. Students just do not see any point in continuing to work hard on reading and writing. Teacher 1 suggests that part of the task-value problem could lie within the ELA course progression from middle school to high school, where students notice that there is a change in emphasis and focus. Teacher 1 makes sense of their behavior, saying, “We have no reading courses after eighth grade,
so it's like, ‘Well, if it's not important enough to have a reading class after eighth grade, then how important can it possibly be?’” At the ninth-grade level, students and teachers alike no longer focus on reading and indeed, time is no longer designated during the school day devoted specifically to the study of reading. Students notice this shift in focus and make sense of this change by reasoning that an eighth-grade skill level is the end goal of reading instruction.

Teacher 1 noticed that students tend toward this belief, “Because in their mind, eighth grade stops at the eighth-grade reading level. Everything I need to know in life I can do now, because I'm an eighth-grade reader.” Students just do not seem convinced of the utility of being able to read beyond the basic level that indicates students are proficient readers for eighth grade.

Teacher 1 has attempted to impress upon students the importance reading has upon their lives, with mixed success. Teacher 1 states,

You would think that just even reminding them that you need reading in all areas of life, not just to graduate high school or to pass eighth grade, but I don't know, because I'm struggling with motivating them as well.

Teacher 1 has had difficulty raising students’ belief in the utility of reading, despite attempts to demonstrate to them its importance to their futures. The students’ reluctance and even denial that reading is important is frustrating and perplexing.

Nevertheless, Teacher 1 has observed certain types of assignments that students value. For example, Teacher 1 observed that students enjoy creating multimedia presentations and that the process can “consume” them more so than a traditional reading and then writing type of assessment where they would have to sit and focus intently on the writing (Appendix M, Table 17). The planning and development of a presentation using multimedia sound and image files is
an activity students enjoy. The students place a greater value on these assignments, expending greater thought and effort toward their creation.

Teacher 2 has also provided detailed observations regarding students’ task-values. Teacher 2 observes that students display less motivation through the years and that increasingly, “very smart” college bound students in class are not putting forth the effort to complete assignments with care and must be removed from the college-level class after multiple failures (Appendix M, Table 17). Teacher 2 also observes that the students are capable, and that “confidence is [not] the issue…they’re lazy, or unmotivated.” The students just do not wish to complete the assignments.

Similar to Teacher 1’s students, these students also seem to have difficulty understanding the importance of reading to their futures. Teacher 2 states, “I tell kids, you don’t understand, you need to be a reader for the rest of your life because you will read for the rest of your life…many of them are like, ‘Nope, not going to happen.’” These college-bound students that Teacher 2 is speaking with have not realized reading is an essential skill for their futures. Teacher 2 observes students’ beliefs that once school is over, there will not be any need to read anymore. At least some students have decided that reading is for school only, and not for real-life activities and to accomplish future goals.

Yet, Teacher 2 has pinpointed certain groups of students who value reading as important and certain instances where students have attempted to explain why ELA activities can be less valuable. Teacher 2 observes, “The readers, the kids who I would call life-long readers who are already established and those interested in art, always do value those assignments more. That's what I see.” The students who have already demonstrated a love for reading and writing and students who are “interested in art” usually value ELA activities highly. Artistic students are
generally the students who value creativity and imagination, while “life-long readers” have
developed that identity as successful readers. The students who find ELA activities to be less
valuable are those who prioritize other assignments as more important. Teacher 2 described an
interesting conversation overheard in class. Teacher 2 said that a student had admitted she enjoys
reading outside of class, yet when it comes to ELA assignments, math assignments always come
first. Teacher 2 asked why the student felt this way and the student replied that "I complete my
math assignments first and foremost because of those definitive answers and having to show the
steps, and there's math homework every single night." The student would rather budget less time
toward ELA assignments than math assignments, seemingly because math assignments have a
prescribed series of steps to follow and only one right answer (Appendix M, Table 17).

Teacher 3 says that students do not value reading in the classroom to the point where they
actively avoid it where at all possible. Teacher 3 states, “[Students] rush through reading
assignments, they skim and scan for information, they ignore written instructions and directions,
and they don't even read popups and warnings on computers before hitting the 'Next' button”
(Appendix M, Table 17).

Finding #4: Many twelfth grade students do not see the utility of reading outside of
academic pursuits and have difficulty understanding the necessity and benefits of skillful reading
to everyday life and careers.

The teachers interviewed describe several examples of instances where students
demonstrate they do not understand that reading is important to their future lives. This data was
useful to answer the central research question: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts
students motivated to read? It was also useful to answer the sub-research question a) How do
students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully? The data provided by
teachers indicate that students have decided that reading is purely an academic skill useful mainly for the purpose of achieving grades and for reading for pleasure. Students’ low task-values for reading have led to the development of a dependency on extrinsic motivation for some students, who have set their goals for reading in the short-term, that is, to pass a course in school, rather than in the long-term.

**Students’ task-values and future selves.** Teacher 3 states that the students’ behavior related to task-value carries over into how they view themselves in the future. When asked specifically whether she believes students will use reading as a skill for their careers, Teacher 3 states, “Honestly, no. I think they think they will use it in college to continue education, but not once they get into their selected career.” Students have given Teacher 3, as well as the other teachers interviewed, the distinct impression that reading is only for school.

These responses regarding careers and outlook about students’ future selves are also directly tied to teacher interview question six, regarding the AMRP survey question for task-value. These segments were coded as Structural and fall under the theme of Reading Motivation Success, with the code of Teachers’ Reflection on AMRP Results. Eventually, a Pattern code emerged to indicate that students, particularly Academic students, do not see reading as a useful activity for their future careers. Question six revealed the student data to the teachers that was collected regarding the significant difference in students’ overall task-value (67%) and students’ overall expectancy-belief (77%). These results indicate that students do not value reading and ELA activities highly, despite their high expectancy for completion of these activities.

Teachers seemed unsurprised by this result and offered additional examples of how they feel students demonstrate low task-value for reading. Teacher 2 particularly, struggled with students’ task-values and offered examples about students who would like to become doctors or
have chosen other high-paying or prestigious career tracks and do not expect to be reading and writing daily. Many students do not expect that literacy skills are integral to the careers they have chosen, regardless of what they have chosen (Appendix M, Table 18). Teacher 2 is concerned and surprised that the Academic (college-bound track) students often do not see reading as useful beyond achieving their degree. They just do not see reading as career-related. In the experience of Teacher 2, no amount of convincing will provide a student who does not value reading with a higher task-value for reading (Appendix M, Table 18). Despite continued attempts at persuasion by Teacher 2, these students just cannot be convinced by mere words. Teacher 2 struggles to make students understand that reading will be useful in their everyday lives after they graduate. The Academic students not only do not see reading as career-related, they also do not see that it will be necessary to achieve their career and life goals.

*Aliteracy and extrinsic motivation.* Some students display considerable adversity to reading altogether, and therefore have a low task-value for reading. A Pattern code called Aliteracy emerged after examining several segments of text from the interviews. Teacher 1 offers this example of aliterate students, or those who possess adequate ability to read, but refuse to engage in reading in the classroom

> I have students who read at or above grade level who fight and resist their Language Arts assignments on a daily basis. They receive a failing grade due to their unwillingness to complete the assignments and not actually reading ability.

This teacher observed that students frequently are considered proficient readers, or even above, but refuse to complete any reading assignments or ELA activities because of their dislike for reading and writing. These students fail their classes despite possessing the necessary ability to complete their assignments. These students will sometimes also possess a high expectancy-belief
as well. Teacher 1 points out that these students have made a conscious decision to avoid reading and other ELA activities as well. These students admit that they “could do it if the wanted to,” it is just that they do not want to do the assignments (Appendix M, Table 19). And so, they do not, and they fail their ELA class.

Presumably, these aliterate ELA students do not progress to the twelfth grade and graduate with a negative reading attitude. Either the students change their ways and discard or exchange their aliterate behavior, or they do not proceed beyond their current grade level. Some interesting observations concerning extrinsic motivation are noted by the three teachers. Teacher 3 describes the behavior of the Standard and Academic students as “reluctant to enjoy” classroom assignments (Appendix M, Table 19). These students that Teacher 3 observes are extrinsically motivated to achieve their grades as they “are motivated to read to pass the class or pass the test.” Extrinsic motivation has provided these students with a reason to read, which in this case, amounts to nothing more than reading to pass a test and a class. Teacher 3 also notes that “the Academic…they're more driven by the grade” than the Standard students. If this population of students is able to develop an extrinsic motivation to read and use this motivation to successfully pass tests, seek “perfect completion” and pass courses, there is the possibility that this behavior could also be seen elsewhere in the Standard or Co-Taught Learning Support levels.

Extrinsic motivation could be the answer for the aliterate students seen by Teacher 1. Other Pattern codes observed in the data are Extrinsic Motivation, and also Intrinsic Motivation. Teacher 2 provides additional support for aliterate students who are deficient in extrinsic motivation while describing some Academic students who are aliterate and fail classes, much like the younger students Teacher 1 has noticed. Teacher 2 has noticed that these Academic
students are failing, not because they are incapable of completing the work, but because of their inability to motivate themselves to complete assignments (Appendix M, Table 19). The data suggests there seems to be a failure in these students’ ability to motivate themselves to work. Since extrinsic motivation is somewhat easier for teachers to develop in their students, and could potentially develop into intrinsic motivation in some cases, development of extrinsic motivation could be the answer. If these students could somehow tap into the extrinsic motivation that seems to work for their peers, then perhaps these aliterate student failures could be avoided.

**Struggling students’ extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.** Teacher 1 also describes struggling readers’ levels of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Teacher 1 notes that the struggling students are generally easier to motivate to read. Teacher 1 observes the struggling students are “a little bit more intrinsically motivated” than their higher performing peers, but also notes that these students are intensely concerned with their progress as compared to their better-performing peers (Appendix M, Table 20). Achieving the proficient reading ability of these peers has become a goal for them and provides a certain amount of extrinsic motivation as well. These students want to fit in with these peers. As long as these struggling readers cannot read proficiently, they are different, and therefore do not fit in with the group, which is an extrinsically motivating factor for them.

The Academic students as well, seem to have developed a goal-based attitude toward reading that extrinsically motivates them to achieve their high grades and pass classes, but not to develop any in-depth knowledge about the ELA subject area. Teacher 3 also states that the Academic students often “want to have a perfect completion of the assignment.” The wording of this statement by Teacher 3 is interesting. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines learning as “knowledge or skill acquired by instruction or study” (Merriam-Webster.com, 2017). Based on
the evidence provided by the teachers, some students do indeed seem to be looking toward “completion” of learning, rather than toward development of knowledge or skill in a subject or genre of literature.

**Students’ expectancy-beliefs.** Structural coding for the theme of Expectancy-Value Theory also yielded data for Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs and an Emergent Theme titled Students Feel High Expectancy-Beliefs. Teachers provided support for the students’ expectancy that they will complete their assignments successfully and therefore have a high expectancy-belief about their reading and ELA activities. The teachers interviewed agreed that most students are confident in their ability in reading and ELA activities.

It is interesting to note that Teacher 3 teaches upperclassmen, and the highest grade level of the three teachers interviewed. Students, by this time, may have worked out issues of illiteracy and extrinsic motivation seen by teachers in the younger students’ behavior. Teacher 3 states “that very few of my students in both the academic and standard classes do not complete their ELA activities.” However, teachers noted that sometimes it is hard to tell who is confident about completing assignments and who is not (Appendix M, Table 21). Teacher 3 feels students who ask whether they are completing an assignment correctly are the students who care about successful completion. This teacher looks for behavior that confirms students’ intentions to complete assignments successfully. Teacher 3 says, “I know who is confident and who is not by the amount of times I'm asked, "Am I doing this right?" These are students who are not confident, but who I know will successfully complete the assignments.” These students are the ones that Teacher 3 knows will “successfully complete the assignments.” But, this leads one to wonder, what about the students who do not ask about the assignment? Sometimes students appear to be capable because they do not ask questions, but are actually struggling with their
assignments. Teacher 1 commented that it is sometimes difficult to determine which students need help because for various reasons, they do not ask questions. Teacher 1 states,

I struggle with the knowing who's confident...Just because I observe a student who reads for pleasure does not mean that they are completing the assignments. Just because they do not ask me for help does not mean they are completing their assignments.

Often students may enjoy recreational reading, but not enjoy academic reading, and therefore avoid academic reading. Other times, students will not ask for help, but not because they are progressing well in their work, but rather they will not ask because they just are not doing the work and do not want their teacher to know.

Teacher 2 takes a different approach when thinking about confidence and motivation by stating, “The confident students are the ones who are motivated students.” This is an interesting point in that Teacher 2 feels the students who are motivated enough to complete an assignment are the same ones who are confident enough to continue working on the assignments. Teacher 2’s statement about “motivated students” also indicates that it is the serious students, the ones who expect to succeed, who are confident in their ability to complete work.

**Reading attitudes.** Structural coding also provided insight into teachers’ perceptions of reading attitude by purpose and mode. Several of the codes from the Teachers’ Responsiveness theme combined to form a Pattern code indicating a preference for academic printed text, then to an Emergent Theme for Teachers and Students Prefer Print Text.

The data show teachers’ strong and distinct preference for printed text in the classroom. When asked whether Teacher 1 prefers printed text for use in the classroom, Teacher 1 states, “I do. I prefer the print text in class, but maybe it's the population of students that I deal with.” At another point in the interview, Teacher 1 explains, “Maybe [Academic Print is] just my
preference, too. I've seen too many kids become distracted by the digital text.” The experience of Teacher 1 has been that printed text is better for use in the classroom, as students can easily become sidetracked with the availability of diversions on a laptop, and lose focus. Teacher 2 also states a strong preference for printed text, even though Teacher 2 occasionally enjoys reading on a Kindle (Appendix M, Table 22). Teacher 3 also states a preference for printed text, due to some disadvantages with digital text (Appendix M, Table 22). There is a certainty of student participation with printed text that Teacher 3 can count on, as opposed to digital text, where Teacher 3 feels uncertain about student participation to the point where Teacher 3 becomes “distracted.”

Teacher 2 makes printed copies for the students to use in class, even though digital versions are readily available, sometimes even making printed copies directly from a digital text. This is a recent development in the classroom of Teacher 2. Teacher 2 recognizes the students’ need for active reading and text annotation, to aid reading comprehension. Teacher 2 does not feel that the same level of active reading is possible with digital text, as students are forced to “scroll, scroll, scroll,” a much more passive activity than thinking through and writing a notation in the appropriate location of the text (Appendix M, Table 22). Teacher 2 observed that students recognize this drawback to digital text and when important grades or scores are required in the digital mode, “[Students ask] repeatedly, "Why do we have to take tests online?" Which I don't even do anymore. I don't make tests online.” Teacher 2 responds to the needs and preferences of her students by providing their testing mode of choice, making classroom tests on paper, instead of on the school-wide Canvas Learning Management System (LMS).

Teacher 3 has offered additional support for the idea that students prefer to work with printed text: “When I have something I really require annotations, I'll just copy and paste the
page from the PDF version and give them a printed copy so they can highlight or mark.” While Teacher 3 has also observed that students do not want to use technology because it provides an obstacle to quick location of a specific section of text for analysis (Appendix M, Table 22). Teacher 3 says that printed text is easier to use when the class needs to examine a specific excerpt of text.

All three teachers interviewed reported not only that they strongly preferred printed text over digital text, but that they also found digital text to have several serious drawbacks. These disadvantages are enough to dissuade teachers from providing digital text in the classroom. These drawbacks range from distraction caused by the digital text, malfunctioning digital text platforms, and the seemingly superficial nature of scrolling through text, to awkward and difficult manipulation of digital text that impedes discussion and learning in the classroom. One teacher reported that instruction was affected since there was always the concern that students were not actually paying attention to the text at all, but may be involved in other, less productive activities while using a laptop. Teachers, overall, shared a strongly negative attitude toward digital text in the classroom.

This same pattern seemed to carry over into the teachers’ observations of students’ attitudes toward academic digital and printed text, with few exceptions. In examining the data, students’ academic preferences were observed by teachers to be in favor of printed text, rather than digital text. Teachers reported that students almost always preferred a packet of paper pages of a text over a digital text because of the disadvantages to text discussed previously that have been observed in the classrooms. Teacher 1 reported that the students enjoyed the “brighter” pictures available in digital text (Appendix M, Table 22). However, once the pictures are
removed, students for Teacher 1 no longer are interested in the digital mode of presentation; the students want the printed text.

There is also a concern that students do not “take digital text seriously” within the classroom. Teacher 1 states, “Yeah, they probably tell you they prefer digital, but to actually take it seriously, I still think they prefer printed, but it could be that population of students. I don't know.” Teacher 1’s observation is that if asked, some students might say they would rather read digital text in the classroom, but when work needs to be completed, their preference will actually be for printed text because it is easier to work with. Teacher 1 seems to feel that students are not quite sure what they really want unless they actually see the assignment. They enjoy the unique features of digital text, yet when it comes down to the actual work, they find it easier to work with the printed text (Appendix M, Table 22). Teacher 1 has seen examples of times where students would say they enjoy the digital text, perhaps because they are thinking of all the positive aspects of colored photos and the electronic text features, but when a paper packet is passed out for work in class, they would rather work with that mode of presentation.

Teacher 3 noticed similar behavior with digital text, “Even using the computers within the classroom, they prefer the books, they prefer the papers. It's just a toy to them at this point. They want the actual hard copy books, papers.” Teacher 3 has observed that the students do not regard the digital text seriously, it is a “toy” whose novelty has worn off, and they tend to feel they cannot work with it as effectively as they can with printed text.

Teacher 2 observes students have a need to touch and manipulate the papers; that they want to “lay them out in front of them and see it” to complete work. Teacher 2’s students want to see each page individually, spread them out to work with them, write on them and quickly reference separate areas of text (Appendix M, Table 22). Students want to engage in active
reading, yet the technology seems to impede their ability to read actively. Computer-based standardized testing is also an issue, in that the students feel that they cannot manipulate, annotate and organize the text the way they like to and are used to doing, and therefore begin their testing session at a disadvantage, and with a negative attitude (Appendix M. Table 22).

Teacher 2 also said that when digital text is offered, most students choose the printed text. Teacher 2 cites an observation that “90% of them would rather have the [print] booklet. [Students complain] ‘Why don't we have the story so that we can underline things and flip back through it?”’ In Teacher 2’s experience, students will request the printed text if offered digital text, which is telling in that students often want materials that they find easiest to work with and to use in class. Teacher 2 observed, “Out of 63 students, I had two that preferred reading [the classroom text] on the computer.” Only 3% of students preferred digital text over printed text.

Teacher 3 offers similar data to Teacher 2. This teacher has also had students make similar types of requests for printed text (Appendix M, Table 22). Teacher 3 distributes online textbook and document access, but students specifically request the printed texts. Based on the data from both teachers, students find printed text more user-friendly than digital text, and will go so far as to request to use printed text, if possible.

Teachers observe that students tend to read printed books over digital versions. But, Teacher 1 does speculate that the students would probably enjoy recreational reading in the digital mode, “because it's all done on things that we associate with recreational, checking texts, checking their Facebook pages, any other kind of social media.” These are activities that many students enjoy outside of school, and some even attempt to do at school. However, these activities are all activities that are not allowed at school. Indeed, Facebook and other social media are blocked by the school district’s web filter, therefore these activities have not been
integrated into the ELA curriculum in any way and are not likely to be seen at school in an academic or even a recreational context. So, it is not likely that the teachers would see a lot of recreational digital activity, in any event.

Teacher 1 does not see students bring books in either mode to class for recreational reading. Teacher 1 asks, “Do they really like independent reading, or am I missing that?” Without seeing the books on their desks, it is difficult to tell if students are reading outside of class, and whether they are reading printed text or digital text when they read recreationally.

Teachers 2 and 3 report that they have observed students bringing printed text to class, but have not seen any students reading digital copies of their books. Teacher 2 has not provided any data concerning recreational digital use of text by the students, which is a significant observation, yet reports “I talk about books every day with kids, whether it's something I just see with someone's stuff and I ask them about their book.” Only the books that are brought by students and seen by Teacher 2 are discussed. But, Teacher 2 notices that students bring print books to class. Teacher 2 watches for the books in order to seize upon opportunities to speak with students about books: “I always watch what kids bring novels to class with them that they're reading outside of class.” Discussing outside reading with students is one of the ways that Teacher 2 tries to demonstrate to students that reading outside of class is worthwhile and fun.

Overall, as reported through the observations of the teachers, recreational purpose, whether in print or digital modes, mirrors the students’ attitudes toward academic purposes.

Teacher 3 also sees that students prefer to read printed books for recreational purposes over digital books. Teacher 3 has concluded, “I feel that students' preference is print text for both classroom and recreational reading.” Part of the evidence used to draw this conclusion is based on the observation that, “I see many students reading for pleasure and I witness few to none who
are reading a digital version of their book.” Students in Teacher 3’s classes are not reading on Kindles or other e-readers, but are bringing actual printed books into the classroom as reading material for entertainment.

**Conclusion.** Teachers’ observations and perceptions of students’ reading motivation and attitudes benefitted teachers in that teachers were enabled to develop strategies for use in the classroom to motivate students. These strategies were developed as a result of teachers’ abilities to make sense of students’ reading motivation and attitudes and arose as a method to affect their students’ classroom motivation. These strategies are directly associated with research sub-question: c) *How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?* The teachers offered many strategies that work with students and even a few that did not work with students.

**Finding #5:** ELA teachers use their keen observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes to develop reactive and proactive strategies to encourage motivation of students in ELA activities.

Some data generated through Structural and Pattern codes developed into an Emergent Theme called Teachers Developed a Variety of Ways to Motivate Students, that provided data to answer research sub-question: c) *How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?* The theme of Teachers’ Responsiveness included a variety of Structural codes related to teachers’ ability to respond to students needs including: Teachers’ Strategies that Work, Reading Motivation Success Stories, Reading Motivation Non-Success Stories, Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work, Reading Assignments Students Enjoy, and Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences. Several Pattern codes indicating specific successful strategies, including: Novelty, Teachers’ Perceptions of Technology as a Distraction, Teachers Feel That Connection and Reflection Motivate Students, Modeling Positive Reading Attitude and Motivation Works,
Creativity and Sharing Ideas Motivate Students and Teachers Create Situational Interest.

Eventually, these codes merged into an Emergent Theme called Teachers Developed a Variety of Ways to Motivate Students (Figure 11).

![Pattern codes: Novelty, Teachers' Perceptions of Technology as a Distraction, Teachers Feel that Connection and Reflection Motivate Students, Modeling Positive Reading Attitude Motivates Students, Creativity and Sharing Ideas Motivates, Teachers Create Situational Interest](image)
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*Figure 10.* Pattern and Structural codes that form an emergent theme to answer research sub-question c.

The Pattern code titled Teachers Use Variety and Novelty to Help Motivate Students contained several examples from all three of the teachers. The use of something new or novel to teach a subject or an activity, is sometimes referred to as the “novelty effect.” The novelty effect has been known to spark interest in students as they see something new, and they become fascinated with it. For example, Teacher 1 keeps up a quick pace that presents new types of literature often. When asked why the variety works so well, Teacher 1 said that the students quickly become bored and tired of the activities and materials they see again and again (Appendix M, Table 23). The students that Teacher 1 sees are kept active and interested through the constant novelty and variety presented, so Teacher 1 has made it an important part of
instruction. This way, students do not have time to “tire” of a topic or a genre, as there is always something new to think about in class.

Teacher 2 also attempts variety and novelty whenever possible, but for a slightly different purpose. Teacher 2 likes to search out new genres to try with the students in the classroom. Teacher 2 feels that presenting a variety of genres, authors and topics may be a way to encourage students to “branch out” and develop new areas that interest them (Appendix M, Table 23). Teacher 2 wants to introduce variety into the class to encourage students to think about new “perspectives” and to experience a variety of different styles. This approach may present more opportunities for students to find something to enjoy and therefore engage more students in class.

For example, Teacher 2 tries to provide a balanced spectrum of literature that includes different genres to keep the classes fresh and interesting for the teacher and for the students. Teacher 2 comments that, “[One book I chose is] like an action adventure…we don't have many action adventure stories in our literature book or in our other novel options.” Teacher 2 has chosen this genre as it represents one that is not found often in the curriculum, or even in school, because it is a genre that students enjoy, but is not considered a standard in the literary canon.

Teacher 3 has a slightly different approach with variety and novelty in instruction. Teacher 3 likes to provide a wide variety of unusual activities for students to participate in. Teacher 3 says, “I plan instruction that hopefully maintains and improves student reading attitudes by using groups, audiobooks, contemporary companion texts, modern film clips.” This teacher provides variety in activities presented and often novelty carries over into the way material is presented, saying “I almost, at times, bring the characters to life. I'm goofy and pretend they're my friends.” Teacher 3 introduces variety in instruction to keep students interested in the material.
Teacher 3 has also noticed that there are some activities that are no longer considered novel or unusual. The electronic discussion board is one example. Teacher 3 says that the students in class are no longer fascinated with discussion boards; saying, “By the time they're [an upperclassman], it seems as if the novelty of the discussion board has worn off and they don't like the restrictive requirements.” The use of discussion boards is unusual in Teacher 3’s classroom and just because the activity is different from the others presented in this particular classroom, does not mean that it will be well-received or produce desirable results. Students demonstrate that they are tired of working with discussion boards and the novelty effect has worn off.

Teacher 3’s comments show an understanding of how technology is used at the lower grades and the drawbacks of similar assignments from year to year, even if they are not based in technology. Similar to the view of Teacher 1, Teacher 3 feels that students tire of the same types of assignments from year to year and begin to develop shortcuts around thoughtful completion of these types of assignments (Appendix M, Table 23). Study guides, reading checks, and discussion boards are standard assignments from year to year in the lower grades. As students progress toward senior year, they begin to become tired of them. They have been completing the same types of assignments for so long, that they have developed ways of avoiding the real work at hand, and they “buffalo their way through” as Teacher 3 says. As a result of staleness in the curriculum, students may not engage deeply enough to derive meaningful learning from the text.

The Pattern code Teachers Model Positive Reading Motivation and Reading Attitude to Motivate Students offers examples of how teachers rely on this strategy to demonstrate that reading is fun, interesting and a worthwhile activity. Teacher 2 especially feels this strategy is important in the classroom. Teacher 2 states, “So…if I, as the teacher, portray a positive reading
attitude, the student motivation for reading increases.” Teacher 2 believes that it is necessary for a teacher to model positive reading attitude and that if a teacher does not model positive reading attitude, students will respond negatively (Appendix M, Table 24). Students are perceptive to the feelings and actions of their teachers and they often understand when a teacher is not enthusiastic about a subject or a piece of literature. If the item is merely a checkpoint on that year’s curriculum that must be completed, students will react to this treatment. Teacher 2 remarks that, “I would say when I'm not motivated about what we're reading, then they're not going to be as motivated.” Enthusiasm is contagious in the classroom, and so is ambivalence.

Teacher 2 has certain methods to use in the classroom to promote a positive reading attitude and strong reading motivation. One of the ways Teacher 2 involves and intrigues students is by talking with them about the books they or their peers are reading. Teacher 2 says “I talk about books every day with kids, whether it's something I just see with someone's stuff and I ask them about their book.” This teacher draws students into conversations about books daily, showing them that books are something to consider every day and modeling constructive discussion about a book. The teacher takes care that students understand this dialogue is authentic and not just because it is a teacher speaking and that the conversation is taking place in an educational environment. Presenting the good aspects of books as well as some of the bad aspects offers students a chance to participate in a discussion about the positive and negative qualities of a book while in an academic setting (Appendix M, Table 24). This is particularly important in that students do not often hear discussions about books that are not a part of the curriculum due to their lack of literary value. It also shows the students that criticism and evaluation of literature is a healthy part of a reader’s attitude.
The teachers also provided interesting data for the Pattern code Creativity and Sharing Motivates Students. This data shows that teachers rely on students’ often naturally sociable and creative behavior in class can be utilized to motivate students to read and complete ELA writing assignments. Teacher 2 feels that there are certain students who would be more willing and quick to take up a creative writing assignment, but that eventually, most of the students would get involved. Teacher 2 cautions that there are only certain conditions under which students would participate (Appendix M, Table 25). Teacher 2 says that most students would be willing to share their work and ideas with other students, but only with students which they are familiar and comfortable. This is also true for pre-reading activities (Appendix M, Table 25). If students are presented with a choice of working collaboratively with a trusted peer or on their own, they will be more motivated to participate.

Teacher 3 provided journal activities for students that encouraged creativity. These reflection journals were private and only shared with the teacher. Students felt safe to create personal poems based on poetry learned in the classroom with this type of limited sharing. Students looked forward to creating new works of poetry and sharing ideas in this way. Students were inspired by the poetry learned in class and attempted to imitate the genres they had learned about. This type of sharing and creative outlet led to a greater increase in active participation and motivation.

Teacher 3 provided students with the opportunity to write reflection journals, which promoted creativity. This teacher noticed that some of the Academic level students sometimes did not feel comfortable sharing their ideas with anyone in the class and therefore appreciated the privacy offered by a reflection journal that only the teacher would read (Appendix M, Table 26). It was a safe place to share their personal thoughts. Teacher 3 said that the results were
promising, as the students began to internalize the poetry being studied and even attempted similar works of their own. Teacher 3 states that the students appreciated the chance to share their own personal attempts at the poetry studied in their reflection journals in an almost risk-free environment (Appendix M, Table 26). Teacher 3 even commented that the students tried harder on this particular assignment, since the creativity captured their interest, more than any other activity previously assigned.

The Pattern code titled Teachers Provide Opportunities for Reflection and Connection revealed a strategy that teachers use to motivate students. Teacher 3 also noted an increase in reading motivation and attitude when students were asked to connect as well as reflect on the text they were reading. The teacher introduced the reflection journal as a part of that effort to increase the frequency of close reading and to motivate students to read. The students were required to make text to text connections to complete the assignment, which is a skill that most students have not yet mastered at this level (Appendix M, Table 26). Teacher 3 says that the students realized quickly that they could not take any shortcuts with this reflection journal. Knowing that shortcuts were not available motivated most students to participate more fully. Teacher 3 said that students completing this type of assignment must make the effort to read more deeply than what they may otherwise do, therefore close reading by students was encouraged. Most students seemed to realize this early on. Teacher 3 felt that this was a successful strategy, although some students still attempted to find shortcuts (Appendix M, Table 26). Some students seemed determined to find an easy way to avoid thinking deeply about the text by looking up material by “Googling” and consulting other sources.

Since this reflection and connection type of assignment was so successful and students enjoyed and benefitted from the activity, Teacher 3 continues to use this type of reflection
journal in the classroom because it promotes attentive close reading behavior that students need to be able to master for their futures.

The interview data also provided an example for the Pattern code Teachers Create Situational Interest. Teacher 2 particularly, tries to spark situational interest in students and has been successful in doing so. Teacher 2 tries to present students with a variety of genres, not just for the purpose of the novelty effect, but also to expose them to many unusual genres and texts that may spark situational interest. For example, Teacher 2’s students read a novel that is not part of the standard literature canon and some students wanted to learn more about and read other, similar books (Appendix M, Table 27). Teacher 2 tries to pique students’ interest with the unusual genres and titles introduced into the classroom. Something unique and different might entice students to try something new and maybe think about something familiar in a slightly different manner. If students can take one of these unusual offerings in the classroom and become interested in even one tangent from that offering, then situational interest may begin to form. Teacher 2 also tries to get students to connect to a text, which will help create the situational interest for students (Appendix M, Table 27). Teacher 2 even goes as far as offering positive aspects of the books that she suggests, which helps students see the positive aspects more clearly and helps them to imagine how they may enjoy the book, even if they feel it will not be a book they would enjoy.

The Pattern code titled Teachers Customize Curriculum to Fit Students’ Needs, and the Structural code called Reading Motivation Success Stories, provided examples of the ways in which teachers adapt the methods and materials they use to teach more effectively. Teacher 2, for example, polls the students at the beginning of the year to discover their likes and dislikes as they pertain to reading. Teacher 2 says, “I always survey my students to see what their
preferences are. I surveyed them after we finished this novel. That's how I learned those other results, and that's just what I'm going to continue to do.” Teacher 2 has found that asking students about their likes and dislikes has provided useful information for planning successful curriculum in the future. Teacher 2 says, that collaboration with other English department colleagues provides additional input that is valuable in maintaining a vibrant and engaging curriculum (Appendix M, Table 28). That additional input from colleagues, combined with the input from the students themselves, help Teacher 2 make appropriate decisions about literature to include in a successful curriculum.

Teacher 3 adapts instruction to achieve even more successful results each year. Adaptations include additional methods of assisting students to visualize text. For example, Teacher 3 says that students experience difficulty imagining settings and characters from the distant past, “Especially the old…literature and the medieval romances because a lot of them can't even think of that time.” Teacher 3 responds to the need for scaffolding lessons through the use of role-playing games, explaining “I almost, at times, bring the characters to life. I'm goofy and pretend they're my friends.” This added playfulness to instruction that not only seems to entertain students, but also pulls these characters from the past and places them in more familiar settings, making them more accessible to students. Often, when students still cannot engage in the visualization necessary for comprehension, Teacher 3 provides a visualization for them. For example, Teacher 3 explains, “That's where I find video clips that are maybe portions of old films or something that's a modern retake on something, and [it] kind of pulls them in a little more.” The video clips transform the text that may be beyond students’ comprehension abilities into a more easily accessible text, so students can then work on the more difficult aspects of the textual analysis.
Sometimes, teachers need an even more customized approach for students. Teacher 1 discusses one instance where a student was not responding to her teachers’ reading interventions, so additional changes beyond the scope of a classroom teacher were employed. Teacher 1 explains the success of this process, where Teacher 1 was able to initiate a process where the curriculum of this particular struggling student was adjusted to a more manageable and appropriate level to promote increased reading motivation and a better reading attitude (Appendix M, Table 28). The student’s outlook improved dramatically and she is becoming more successful.

**Synthesis of students’ data and teachers’ data.** The interview data was triangulated with the survey data from the students and the three data sets supported one another strongly. When combined, the data of the students and the teachers provides a detailed view of students’ reading motivation and attitude and teachers’ strategies to encourage positive reading behaviors. This data helped answer the central research question: *How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?*

The two data sets from students and the primary data set from teachers supported the conclusion that overall, students have developed a low task-value and a high expectancy-belief over the course of their K-12 studies. The students have developed significant levels of expectancy that they will be successful in their efforts in reading and ELA activities. They do not doubt their abilities. However, teachers provided several observations of students’ significantly lower task-value related behavior. For example, the teachers observed students’ unwillingness to engage in text deeply, a preference for superficial reading and ELA activities, statements and responses by students that indicate many are not planning to engage in reading outside of academia, reluctance to read strategically and even resistance to reading and ELA activities
altogether. Students provided survey data that demonstrated a significant disparity between students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values. Despite relatively high expectancy-beliefs, students do not feel as strongly about the utility of reading and ELA in everyday life.

The student data sets and the teacher data set also concur with one another in the area of students’ reading attitudes. Overall, the data indicates that teachers and students both prefer printed text, for both academic and recreational purpose. Teachers all stated that printed text was their favored mode. At first glance, the students’ data would appear to show that academic print is their least favorite of the modes and purposes, with the survey scores for the SARA survey lowest for the Academic Print category. However, the teachers’ data informs this student data in several ways. All three teachers provided examples of students’ explicit and stated preference for printed text. Despite the students’ low Academic Print and Recreational Print SARA scores, all three teachers provided examples of many students rejecting digital text and requesting and accepting printed text in the classroom (Appendix M, Table 29). Teacher 1’s comments also seem to indicate that there may be a discrepancy between students’ behavior and their stated preferences (Appendix M, Table 29). This discrepancy may be indicative of students’ perceptions of reading in general, for example, which activities actually constitute “reading” and also their perceptions of the academic purpose in general. Teacher 3 also made a very interesting point, when this teacher commented on students’ perspectives toward reading in the classroom, which indicate that students regard reading and ELA activities as “work” (Appendix M, Table 29). Students may have scored academic print text low because they see reading as work since it results in an earned grade. The students see reading as an unpleasant activity when it is required in the classroom. It would not matter in which mode it was presented, it might receive the same negative rating.
The students also presented a better attitude toward recreational print than toward academic print, which may indicate that the printed text is not the problem. The reason for this may be, as one teacher remarked, that reading outside of school for recreational purpose is “on their own terms,” there are no restrictions or requirements and they can read the text in any manner they choose. Two teachers remarked that they would often observe students carrying printed books with them to class and numerous students reading printed books for pleasure.

The teachers’ observation that despite scoring the academic print category low, students asked for and provided explanations about their preference for print text was remarkable. All three teachers explained that students have a desire to have the text in hand, to be able to move it, mark it and manipulate the pages in ways that could not be replicated on an electronic device. One teacher noted that the students wanted to lay all the pages on the desk in front of them to see at once and that inactively scrolling through text prevents students from truly connecting with the text. All three teachers remarked about the students’ lack of ability to take digital text seriously, noting that it is also perceived as a distraction and a temptation.

**Discussion and Analysis of Case Study Pattern Predictions**

Pattern matching logic is an integral part of developing trustworthiness in a case study. The pattern predictions created before the study was conducted were useful to compare against the case study results. There were five pattern predictions for this study (Chapter 3, Table 3).

1. **If student levels of reading motivation are high, increasingly positive attitudes will be seen, likewise lower levels of motivation will reveal more negative attitudes toward reading.**

2. **Higher or lower task-values for reading activities will correspond with higher or lower reading motivation in the classroom.**
3. Higher or lower expectancy-beliefs for reading activities will result in corresponding positive or negative attitudes and higher or lower reading motivation.

4. Teachers have a variety of flexible instructional strategies to increase reading motivation and attitudes of students.

5. Teachers have a good sense of students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for reading.

Although all of the pattern predictions made before proceeding with the research may not have been supported by the data, the predictions did serve as a reminder of pre-research beliefs and expectations.

Pattern predictions 1, 2, 3 were only partially supported by the data. The student survey data revealed that high levels of reading motivation (high expectancy-belief and high task-values) do not necessarily coincide with positive attitudes across all modes and purposes. Most students indicated they held high expectancy-beliefs for reading, lower task-values for reading and mid-range to highly positive attitudes for reading for various modes and purposes. The result of students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values when averaged together was high and all well over the midpoint (Chapter 4, Table 4, and Chapter 4, Figure 6). The students’ overall reading motivation is high. Despite the high reading motivation scores, students reported midrange scores for reading attitude in the academic purpose and the highest scores for recreational digital mode and purpose. The generalization that higher reading motivation would correlate with higher reading attitudes did not hold true after analysis of the data, partially because the connection between motivation and attitude is more complex than expected. This pattern prediction provided data to support the complexity of the concepts of reading motivation and attitude and the difficulty that may be experienced when attempting to affect the concepts in the classroom.
The end result of pattern prediction 2 was that twelfth grade students who were surveyed provided data indicating lower task-values than expectancy-beliefs for reading. The data provided by the teachers has suggested that the students’ higher expectancy-beliefs combined with lower task-values seem to correspond with higher levels of extrinsic motivation. This observation does not necessarily mandate that students experience low reading motivation, rather they experience a different and very specific type of reading motivation than anticipated. Another surprising data point collected from teachers indicates that students do not see reading or ELA activities as useful skills and activities to learn to prepare for careers or everyday life.

For pattern prediction 3, higher expectancy-beliefs may or may not affect motivation of students to complete assignments successfully. Some students held high expectancy-beliefs and completed assignments, some had lower expectancy-beliefs and required reassurance from their teachers during completion, while others felt confident and expectant that they could successfully complete assignments, yet refused to engage anyway, demonstrating aliteracy. Although this pattern prediction also was not supported by the data, it was useful to bring into focus the significance of the presence and interaction of the many factors of reading motivation that work together to create a motivated reader.

Some of the pattern predictions, such as numbers 4 and 5, were supported by the data. The interviews with teachers demonstrated that teachers were intensely concerned with and aware of students’ reading motivation and engagement in ELA activities, as predicted. Over time, the teachers had observed the behavior of their students and developed strategies to encourage reading motivation and positive attitudes toward reading in their students. Teachers offered a variety of strategies that they had used successfully in practice. These strategies included providing students with opportunities for connection and reflection, opportunities for
creativity and sharing, integrating variety and novelty into the curriculum, and modeling a positive reading attitude.

The pattern predictions were an integral component to this study. They emphasized that reading motivation is a complex, personal phenomenon, that is comprised of and interacts with many aspects of an individual and his or her environment, experiences, beliefs, culture and personality. The relationships of expectancy-belief to task-value and motivation to attitude is not as direct a relationship as it may seem, and these areas can vary significantly between individuals. But, teachers are capable observers of students and are successfully able to affect their students’ levels of reading motivation and positive reading attitudes in many cases, and have developed effective strategies for these purposes.

Summary of Findings

This single, embedded case study at a rural high school in the northeastern United States was conducted over a period of one month and a half in the winter of 2017. The purpose was to explore the perceptions of teachers on reading motivation and reading attitude of the students in their classrooms, and to examine the reading motivation and attitude of twelfth grade students within the framework of expectancy-value theory. Following the structure of the case study logic model, this chapter presented the data collection processes and analysis in sequential order.

The study resulted in five findings, as the study explored students’ reading motivation and attitudes through expectancy-value theory, while based on the perceptions of teachers in high school ELA classes.

1. Overall, twelfth grade students hold high expectancy-beliefs for activities involving reading, and possess lower task-values for activities involving reading.
2. Overall, twelfth grade students feel highly positive about Recreational Digital (RD) text mode and purpose, and significantly less positive about Academic Print (AP) especially, but also Academic Digital (AD), and Recreational Print (RP) text modes and purposes. However, students do not feel negatively about any of the text modes or purposes; rather, they show varying degrees of ambivalence.

3. ELA teachers motivate students to read by striving to understand students’ reading motivation through constant observation, awareness of and instructional adaptations to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for ELA activities.

4. Many twelfth grade students do not see the utility of reading outside of academic pursuits and have difficulty understanding the necessity and benefits of skillful reading to everyday life and careers.

5. ELA teachers use their keen observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes to develop reactive and proactive strategies to encourage motivation of students in ELA activities.

Teachers and students alike provided thought-provoking data on the topic of reading motivation, including reading attitude. Students’ AMRP data overall demonstrated a high expectancy-belief for reading, while the data provided also demonstrated a lower task-value for reading. Teachers offered anecdotes and examples of students’ behavior related to both high expectancy-beliefs and lower task-values. Students’ SARA data provided high scores for the Recreational Digital category, with lower scores for Recreational Print and Academic Digital, with the lowest rated category being for Academic Print. Teachers provided data in interviews that offered explanations and observations supporting students’ survey results and even contradicting them at times. While teachers did not note a difference concerning male and female
students’ reading motivation and attitudes, the students’ demographics indicated that females were slightly more likely to have a positive attitude toward the academic purpose than males. In addition to the wealth of information on students’ perceptions that was provided, the survey data was useful material to compare and contrast against the responses of the teachers.

The teachers provided rich, thick data in their descriptive observations of students’ reading and ELA related behavior. A wealth of expertise in subject matter, teaching and knowledge about their students resulted in a vast array of data from teachers on which strategies students respond to positively and negatively. The five findings developed from both the student and teacher data were instrumental in providing answers to the central research question and the three sub-questions.

The data collected during this study may not only provide confirmation of the results of previous studies, but may also expand upon and add to the body of current research. Previous research on adolescent reading motivation, including expectancy-value theory, situational interest, extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation, aliteracy, digital literacy, and e-readers are all areas with pertinent data gathered during this study. Although there is an abundance of studies in these areas of reading motivation, there is an urgent need for research done in the everyday school environment that adolescents encounter in their average day and particularly in the affective areas of reading, rather than the cognitive areas (Wigfield, Gladstone, & Turci, 2016).

The data also may have important implications to the teaching of ELA to adolescents at the high school level. Since this case study was conducted utilizing the perspectives of and input from average students and teachers, the data may be especially significant in its transferability and application to other similar sites, with similar populations. A discussion of the unmet needs of adolescent readers that relates to and builds upon previous research and this current research
study may help determine classroom practices that improve student reading motivation and attitudes.
Chapter 5

Introduction

Chapter 5 provides an analysis and discussion of the findings that resulted from this study. In this chapter, a discussion of outcomes of student surveys, teacher interviews and their synthesis is provided. Case study pattern predictions made in Chapter 3 are discussed and compared to the results and findings. The findings as they relate to expectancy-value theory and then to existing literature are discussed. The implications and significance of the findings are discussed as they may affect the classroom, teacher preparation, and future research. Finally, recommendations for implementation of strategies to increase reading motivation and attitude at the research site are provided before a final conclusion.

This single, embedded case study utilized a process presented as a linear logic model to explore twelfth grade students’ reading motivation and attitudes and the perceptions of English Language Arts (ELA) teachers regarding the reading motivation and attitudes of their students. The site was a typical rural high school in a northeastern state. The study was developed to explore four research questions through the lens of a theoretical framework based in expectancy-value theory. The central research question and three closely related sub-questions developed for the study were: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read? a) How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully? b) What are students’ attitudes toward reading? c) How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read? The data sets for the study included two surveys, the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) and the Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitudes (SARA), which were administered to students, and semi-structured interviews that were conducted with ELA teachers. The case study logic model guided the research process through several stages.
Figure 11. Detailed logic model.

Through the process of exploration which was set out in the logic model, the study resulted in five findings.

1. Overall, twelfth grade students hold high expectancy-beliefs for activities involving reading, and possess lower task-values for activities involving reading.

2. Overall, twelfth grade students feel highly positive about Recreational Digital (RD) text mode and purpose, and significantly less positive about Academic Print (AP) especially, but also Academic Digital (AD), and Recreational Print (RP) text modes and purposes. However, students do not feel negatively about any of the text modes or purposes; rather, they show varying degrees of ambivalence.

3. ELA teachers motivate students to read by striving to understand students’ reading motivation through constant observation, awareness of and instructional adaptations to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for ELA activities.

4. Many twelfth grade students do not see the utility of reading outside of academic pursuits and have difficulty understanding the necessity and benefits of skillful reading to everyday life and careers.
5. ELA teachers use their keen observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes to develop reactive and proactive strategies to encourage motivation of students in ELA activities.

Case Study Logic Model, as Related to Research Questions and Resulting Findings

The case study logic model provided a linear process through which the researcher could explore twelfth grade students’ reading motivation and attitudes and the perceptions of ELA teachers toward students’ reading motivation and attitudes. The findings correlated with certain phases of the logic model and provided data pertinent to each of the research questions. In following the linear process outlined in the logic model, the study progressed through each stage, producing important outcomes at each phase. At the end of each phase, a period of analysis and reflection resulted in new insights, interpretations and new and additional connections among the phases became apparent.
Table 10

Findings and Corresponding Logic Model Phases and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Logic Model Phases</th>
<th>Research Questions Addressed (Central Research Question: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, twelfth grade students hold high expectancy-beliefs for activities involving reading, and possess lower task-values for activities involving reading.</td>
<td>AMRP</td>
<td><strong>Central Research Question Sub-question a:</strong> How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall, twelfth grade students feel highly positive about Recreational Digital (RD) text mode and purpose, and significantly less positive about Academic Print (AP) especially, but also Academic Digital (AD), and Recreational Print (RP) text modes and purposes. However, students do not feel negatively about any of the text modes or purposes; rather, they show varying degrees of ambivalence.</td>
<td>SARA</td>
<td><strong>Central Research Question Sub-question b:</strong> What are students’ attitudes toward reading?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA teachers motivate students to read by striving to understand students’ reading motivation through constant observation, awareness of and instructional adaptations to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for ELA activities.</td>
<td>Teacher Interviews</td>
<td><strong>Central Research Question Sub-question c:</strong> How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many twelfth grade students do not see the utility of reading outside of academic pursuits and have difficulty understanding the necessity and benefits of skillful reading to everyday life and careers.</td>
<td>AMRP and Teacher Interviews</td>
<td><strong>Central Research Question Sub-question a:</strong> How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ELA teachers use their keen observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes to develop reactive and proactive strategies to encourage motivation of students in ELA activities.</td>
<td>Teacher Interviews</td>
<td><strong>Central Research Question Sub-question c:</strong> How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes of the student surveys and analysis.** The student surveys yielded data revealing reading motivation and reading attitude characteristics of the twelfth grade students in
answer to the central research question and sub-questions a and b (Table 10). The AMRP measured students’ behavior related to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values. The SARA measured students’ reading attitudes in the domains of purpose and mode. The two surveys together provided data useful for determining the ways in which students were motivated to read.

**Reading motivation.** The data from the AMRP survey helped provide answers for the central research question and sub-question a, which became Finding 1 (Table 10). The results of the students’ AMRP surveys were that the students possessed a high level of reading motivation overall. The averaging of the expectancy-belief scores with the task-value scores resulted in somewhat misleading data in that there is actually a significant difference in students’ expectancy for success in ELA activities and their belief that these activities are valuable to their lives and futures. It appears that many students may be engaging in ELA activities, and completing these successfully, but without a convincing belief in their value.

**Reading attitude.** The data from the SARA survey helped answer the central research question and sub-question b, which were summarized and transformed into Finding 2 (Table 10). The reading attitude of the twelfth grade students is a crucial piece of their overall reading motivation which can help answer the central research question. The data revealed that students held strong opinions about the modes and purposes, which will affect the motivation of the students to read.

The results of the SARA surveys overall were positive, but became less positive as the results were broken down by purposes and modes. The students enjoyed recreational digital text, as this was the category that contained anything done through social media, email, reading e-text and browsing the Internet for the purpose of recreation. The recreational mode and digital purpose is the category not seen at a school setting. The least favorite purpose and mode was
academic print which scored in the middle of the range of 1-6, meaning that although this was not students’ favorite mode and purpose, they certainly did not show a strong dislike toward it, either. This is the mode and purpose most frequently seen in school, although at times, academic digital is seen as well. After analysis, it seems that students prefer the mode and purpose that is rarely, if ever, seen in school, yet show the lowest positivity toward the mode and purpose commonly seen in school.

**Outcomes of the teacher interviews and analysis.** Interviews were conducted with three ELA teachers. The data from the teacher interviews were useful in answering the central research question and sub-question c (Table 10). The findings associated with the teachers’ outcomes are Findings 3, 4, and 5 (Table 10). The teachers were adequately certified, experienced, knowledgeable and observant of students’ levels of reading motivation and reading attitude and provided descriptions of the nature of reading motivation and attitude and their perceptions as to why these concepts are important to ELA success. Teachers recognized high and low levels of reading motivation and positive and negative attitudes and were able to develop and share the strategies they felt were useful in affecting readers in a positive manner.

**Reading motivation.** Teachers provided examples of expectancy-belief and task-value behavior observed in their students that helped answer the central research question and sub-question c, as well as helping in the development of Findings 3 and 4 (Table 10). Teachers demonstrated that they were capable and accurate in their observations of student motivation levels according to expectancy-value theory. Teachers’ observations of students’ low task-values especially, helped pinpoint the problem that students do not value reading now or for the future.

Expectancy-belief related behavior reported by the teachers coincided with students’ survey results in that teachers reported students were confident they would successfully complete
ELA assignments. Teachers reported that even students who typically displayed aliterate behavior, where a student has the ability to read, yet refuses to do so, admitted that they could complete the ELA assignments, if they wanted to do so. Most of the students observed and described by the teachers did not lack in confidence for successful completion of their ELA assignments, indicating students held high expectancy-beliefs. It seems the students were more likely to question whether they wanted to complete their assignments, indicating the students held lower task-values.

In the area of task-value, the three teachers described students who refused to fully engage in reading and ELA activities, despite the teachers’ attempts to convince students of the importance of reading to everyday life and to their futures. In the analysis of the data, problematic areas described by teachers included aliterate behavior, and also students who exhibit strongly extrinsic motivation. The teachers describe the behavior of students who appear to be motivated only to achieve a grade, or even at times, to merely complete an assignment. These students often hastily complete assignments in a superficial manner. The teachers report that students who engage in this behavior appear more frequently as time progresses and it is a growing problem. A notable observation is that the teachers of younger students seemed to report more aliterate behavior, while the teachers of older students reported more extrinsically motivated behavior.

As aliteracy seems to occur more often with younger adolescents, it might be that aliteracy in this case, is a part of a developmental stage for some early to mid-adolescent students who are moving from their childhood-held outlook that includes expectancy-beliefs and task-values independent from one another, toward a more mature belief that includes expectancy-beliefs and task-values that are interdependent and positively related to each other. (Eccles &
Wigfield, 2002, p. 121). In other words, as students move from the belief that all or most tasks assigned in school are important to their futures, students start to experiment with alternative outlooks. They start to look at themselves and their world in greater depth and ask themselves whether every activity and assignment and/or subject area in school is actually important, or how much importance should be placed in each area. It is a time for questioning prior beliefs and values and experimenting with different approaches toward school. Students at this stage may not lose their positive expectancy-beliefs, but they may temporarily discard positive task-values for ELA activities in their reevaluation of their outlooks.

As it seems, most students settle upon some degree of positive expectancy-beliefs and positive task-values going forward from eighth grade in order to continue their educations successfully, although there are some students who never seem to rise above the idea that ELA and sometimes school itself, is no longer important to their futures. These students may become disinterested and lose their motivation in continuing to attend school.

The teachers reported several instances of students who attempted to take “shortcuts” to complete their assignments and failed to spend enough time in the completion of assignments, and therefore suffered the consequences of low grades. Teachers reported they noticed students seemed to want to complete assignments as quickly as possible. Some students told their teachers they left ELA assignments for last, implying they might take more time and effort to complete and that they were the least enjoyable of their assignments. Low task-value was an area of concern for these teachers, since students often demonstrated their negative regard for the importance of reading and ELA activities through haphazard completion and failure to engage in text deeply and thoughtfully.
The data used to develop Finding 4 show that some students at this site do not appear concerned with learning additional skills and improving their reading and writing skills. Teachers report that students have not yet been convinced that reading is important to their futures, especially their careers, and they report that students, no matter how often it is discussed, continue to fail to see the importance of reading to everyday life.

**Reading attitude.** Teachers described their observations of students’ reading attitudes that helped in answering the central research question and sub-question c, as well as in the development of Finding 5 (Table 10).

Students’ reading attitudes were described by teachers as favoring printed text. This was contrary to the results of the SARA survey that indicated students showed the least positivity for the academic purpose and printed mode. The teachers were surprised by this result and offered many instances of students’ preference for printed text. Teachers concluded that students wanted to work with printed text for the main reason that it is easier to work with than digital text. Teachers said students complained about the difficulty of text manipulation in digital formats, as well as speed and ease of referencing the material, marking and notating copies, sluggish or malfunctioning technology platforms, and the inability to “touch” the pages of a digital text and organize the pages quickly as necessary. The teachers commented that students also tend to become sidetracked by other functions and features on their laptops and lose focus on assignments, which in turn is distracting for teachers as well. One teacher commented that reading online is too passive, that students become bleary-eyed as they scroll endlessly from page to page and that printed text encourages the use of more active reading skills and comprehension.
Teachers’ awareness of reading motivation and attitude led them to develop a variety of strategies to encourage and promote positive reading behavior in and out of class. Teachers relayed several strategies they employed regularly, including: variety and novelty, opportunities for sharing and discussion, activities requiring connection and reflection, modeling positive reading attitude, and opportunities for student input for curriculum decisions.

**Outcomes of the synthesis of student surveys and the teacher interviews.** Students provided their own perceptions of personal expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes. Teachers provided their perceptions and observations concerning students’ expectancy-beliefs in reading, task-values for reading and reading attitudes. The synthesis of student survey data and teacher interview data helped to answer the central research question and sub-question c (Table 10). This data intersected in such a way so that it pertained to material used to develop Findings 3, 4, and 5 (Table 10). Because of this, the data in the teacher interviews provided clarification for the data collected in the student surveys in additional areas, such as the utility beliefs of students toward reading and print versus digital text mode preferences of students.

**Reading motivation.** Teachers indicated in their interviews that students felt reading was not important to their lives beyond educational purposes. Students also indicated that they possessed lower task-values for reading. The confluence of these two data sets, when combined with teachers’ observations that students do not seem to value reading as important for careers and work beyond their educations, led to the development of Finding 4 (Table 10). Students possess low-task values for reading activities and coupled with teachers’ observed devaluation of reading by some students means that it is possible that some students are not actively seeking to improve their literacy skills for the future. This may be because students possess inadequate information about the literacy demands and rigors of the careers they have chosen. It may also be
that some students feel that since they have achieved success so far in school, there will not be any reason to learn anything more than they already know, and therefore regard ELA activities as unimportant.

**Reading attitude.** Teachers agreed that students would be likely to enjoy recreational digital text, although teachers also mentioned that they normally do not see recreational digital activities at school, since these activities and platforms (Facebook, cell phones, et cetera) are not allowed during school.

Teachers commented on the mixed reactions of students to academic digital text. The teachers’ comments included positive comments concerning students’ interest and focus on creating digital presentations involving graphics, and colorful photos and graphics in digital text to be read. Negative comments included the difficulty navigating text quickly, malfunctioning technology, and inability to mark, highlight, and see a work in its entirety easily.

Teachers noted that they often saw students carrying printed books with them to class for the recreational print mode and purpose. Some teachers spent time and effort looking for these books that students brought, in order to engage students and the class in conversations. Teachers reported that they saw numerous students with books for recreational reading and did not see any students who were reading their recreational books electronically.

As a result of teachers observing students’ enjoyment of printed text in class and recreationally, and the students’ observed disdain for digital academic text, teachers were surprised that students rated academic printed text so low in the SARA. Of the four modes and purposes, academic print rated lowest. With this conflicting data from the teachers in mind, the low preference indicated by students in the survey could be merely a result of reference to the
academic purpose in general. It may simply be the case that the students do not particularly regard academics as an enjoyable activity and the print mode is most often associated with work.

**Discussion of Findings in Relation to Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework of this study was modern expectancy-value theory. Modern expectancy-value theory, as presented in The Expectancy-Value Model for Achievement developed by Parsons, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, et al. (1983), as cited in Eccles and Wigfield (2002), postulates that a student’s expectancy-beliefs and task-values combine to form a concept known as achievement motivation, which presents uniquely in each individual student. This achievement motivation is comprised of a variety of experiences from the student’s past, including previous experiences in school and out of school from the affective, cognitive, cultural, social, and personal domains. A student’s prior experiences with success, failure, emotional reactions, memories, subjects, and activities, all combine over the years to form the expectancy-beliefs and task-values of the student. As school years progress, these various components interact to develop a student’s achievement motivation. This achievement motivation can be directly related to reading motivation and this is a reason why expectancy-value theory is often applied to reading motivation. As the adolescent students who are the oldest within the K-12 public school system, twelfth grade students have built their lives upon a wealth of experiences and have been molded and shaped through their years of interactions with the people around them, including school personnel, particularly teachers.
Table 11

*Low Task-Value-Related Findings for Students’ Reading Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding #</th>
<th>Text of Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall, twelfth grade students hold high expectancy-beliefs for activities involving reading, and possess lower task-values for activities involving reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Many twelfth grade students do not see the utility of reading outside of academic pursuits and have difficulty understanding the necessity and benefits of skillful reading to everyday life and careers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task-value discussion.** Finding numbers 1 and 4 arose from the data concerning the manifestation of low task-value in students at this research site. Task-value at this site is a key concern and can be broken down further for further analysis. According to the model presented by Parsons, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, et al. (1983), as cited in Eccles and Wigfield (2002), there are four types of values that comprise the larger construct of task-value. These values are: attainment value, intrinsic value, cost, and utility value. These four areas offer additional opportunities to analyze the larger area of task-value. Attainment value is described as a means to express one’s personal identity through the completion of a task, and one’s significance placed upon the completion of that task (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). The intrinsic value of a task is when one is independently driven to complete a task because of one’s enjoyment of and interest in that task (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Cost is the sacrifice expended to undertake a task, which may be loss of time, opportunity, resources or any other negative aspect that results from undertaking a task (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Utility value is one’s belief that a task, although it may seem unimportant in the present, will be important to one’s future (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). These four components of task-value can help researchers understand task-value more clearly.
**Task-value deficiencies reported to be displayed by students.** Teachers provided data which demonstrated students’ unrealistic assessments of the future utility of reading and writing in their intended careers. Goals pertaining to careers and future educational opportunities can be categorized as part of the utility value of a task (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). According to the results of the AMRP, which is aligned to expectancy-value theory, students at this site display a low utility value for reading and ELA activities. As evidenced by the results of the three data sets in this study, students’ task-values are significantly lower when compared to students’ expectancy-beliefs. Teachers report that many students are unaware that reading well will be a task necessary to achieve success in life and in their career endeavors. Although there are some students who demonstrate their understanding that reading is a necessary task to continue through their college educations, many are unaware of the importance of reading to their chosen careers.

The study data shows that many students display low intrinsic value and expect a high cost value for reading and ELA activities. Teachers report that many students demonstrate a low intrinsic value as they are interested in successful completion of ELA activities, although they do not seem as interested in successful learning through engagement with ELA activities. The teachers who reported that students leave ELA assignments for last and that students hurriedly rush through assignments to complete them quickly, may be presenting evidence of an expectation of high cost value for ELA activities. Students are trying to save time and effort.

High cost values, in addition to low intrinsic values for ELA activities may indicate that students do not regard these activities as those they may enjoy and feel that the energy and effort required to expend in their completion may be too high to justify careful and thoughtful completion (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). Students do the work to receive a grade, not to learn or
practice a skill. In the end, the students may feel that the higher-complexity work that they are extrinsically motivated to complete is too time consuming to complete as intended for the amount of reward provided, which in this case is a grade. Although the students realize assignments must be completed, the students do not feel that the end result is worth the amount of effort, especially for assignments in which they find minimal enjoyment. The students want to, in one teacher’s words, “buffalo their way through” just to complete an assignment quickly.

Task-value and students’ extrinsic motivation and aliterate behavior. Levels of expectancy-beliefs and task-values vary by individual. The data obtained from students in the AMRP survey indicated that six out of seven students held high expectancy-beliefs for reading, while the same number reported lower task-values than their reported expectancy-values. While the task-values recorded in the surveys cannot be said to be low, it is middling, at best, there is a distinct and significant gap that exists between the higher expectancy-beliefs and the lower task-values of these students. This low task-value seems to have manifested in certain students as an increase in extrinsic motivation. Teachers were observant of this trend, with all three teachers remarking that students in general just do not seem to understand the importance of reading.
Findings Concerning Teachers’ Perceptions and Responses to Students’ Reading Motivation and Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding #</th>
<th>Finding Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ELA teachers motivate students to read by striving to understand students’ reading motivation through constant observation, awareness of and instructional adaptations to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for ELA activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ELA teachers use their keen observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes to develop reactive and proactive strategies to encourage motivation of students in ELA activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers’ perceptions of students’ reading motivation and attitude.** Teachers’ observations of their students’ expectancy-value related behavior and reading attitudes help them effectively teach students to read and write. Teachers show an understanding of what strategies motivate students and the ways in which students respond to their attempts to increase students’ motivation. Teachers spend a substantial amount of time with their students, and as a result, are able to observe students’ trends in expectancy-beliefs and task-value behavior and respond accordingly. Teachers have come up with a variety of successful strategies that help them remain flexible enough to navigate the multitude of various expectancy-belief and task-value levels of students. These strategies often directly address either expectancy-belief or task-value deficiencies. Teachers have expressed concern that at times, they wish there was something more they could do to motivate the particularly difficult students, such as the aliterate students and the students who wish to complete assignments quickly, yet superficially.
Table 13

*Finding Related to Students’ Reading Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding #</th>
<th>Finding Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overall, twelfth grade students feel highly positive about Recreational Digital (RD) text mode and purpose, and significantly less positive about Academic Print (AP) especially, but also Academic Digital (AD), and Recreational Print (RP) text modes and purposes. However, students do not feel negatively about any of the text modes or purposes; rather, they show varying degrees of ambivalence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading attitude.** Reading attitude and reading identity are two aspects of a student’s outlook that interconnect to help determine a student’s reading motivation. Parsons, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala, et al. (1983), as cited in Eccles and Wigfield (2002), theorized the importance of the degree to which a student perceives himself or herself as a reader affects the student’s outlook on reading achievement. A student who perceives himself or herself to be a good reader has a very different outlook on school than those students who perceive their reading identities to be that of a poor reader. The addition of reading attitudes to reading motivation provides additional facets of complexity in that some students perceive themselves as voracious readers of recreational digital text, while some students find that they prefer the printed mode for recreational reading, while yet others dislike reading for pleasure and enjoy the variety of challenging genres in the academic purpose in the print mode. Then there are the students who dislike certain modes and purpose exclusively and some who dislike and refuse to read altogether. In short, one’s ability to read and one’s confidence in their ability mean nothing to a student who hates to read, since attitude and willingness to engage are the key to participation. Reading attitudes are an important component of reading motivation that can help researchers decipher the complex nature of adolescent reading decline.
Importance of expectancy-value based research to the problem of practice. The problem of practice for this study was that decreased reading motivation in adolescent students results in lowered reading ability, decreased academic achievement and an inability to successfully engage in literacy activities in everyday life. Many students do not work up to their potential in reading and ELA activities in high school and diminish their abilities to achieve in college and careers. Expectancy-value theory is significant to reading research in that the experiences of the students through the years have occurred in such a way as to shape the reading motivation in this distinctive manner. Reading attitudes are an important component of reading motivation. Although students at this site have developed strong expectancy-beliefs through their experiences, their experiences, in turn, have not brought about a robust task-value for reading. Prior experiences affect achievement motivation, reading motivation and reading attitude.

Discussion of Findings in Relation to Existing Literature

Expectancy-value data and the utility of reading. The Central Research Question and Sub-question a were addressed in Findings 1 and 4. Finding 1 has directly to do with the results gathered from students for the AMRP, while Finding 4 emerged after analyzing the transcripts of the teachers’ interviews.

Table 14
Research Questions and Associated Findings for Students’ Expectancy-Value Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions Addressed</th>
<th>Central Research Question: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read? Sub-question a: How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding #1</td>
<td>Overall, twelfth grade students hold high expectancy-beliefs for activities involving reading, and possess lower task-values for activities involving reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding #4</td>
<td>Many twelfth grade students do not see the utility of reading outside of academic pursuits and have difficulty understanding the necessity and benefits of skillful reading to everyday life and careers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finding 1 noted the level and discrepancy between the data gathered from twelfth grade students concerning the two components of expectancy-value theory that comprise the survey. Students registered high scores for expectancy-beliefs, while students registered significantly lower scores for task-value. These results were echoed by the teachers, as they commented on students’ abundance of confidence when undertaking an ELA task, while their perception of students’ valuation of reading was even more negative in that they perceived that students saw little reason to engage with literacy activities for any reason beyond a grade or completion. This agreement between the students’ data and the teachers’ data led to the development of Finding 4.

In accordance with prior research, Findings 1 and 4 are actually closely related. Teachers at this site have remarked that students are willing to complete their assignments for grades and scores, while students report high expectancy-beliefs in their surveys. Teachers report that students do not find their assignments valuable enough to engage with rigorously, while students report lower task-values for reading. The results of the surveys and the data collected from teachers support each other in that the behavior reported by teachers is symptomatic of the high expectancy-beliefs and lower task-values reported by students. According to previous research, such as that of Eccles and Wigfield (2002) and recent research by Rosenzweig and Wigfield (2017), grades and achievement in reading are significantly tied to students’ expectancy-beliefs. Students at this site have high expectancy-beliefs and achieve high grades. Additionally, task-value has been associated with students’ academic achievement in that it affects students’ decisions concerning how much emphasis to place on reading for courses and which courses are selected for enrollment (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Rosenzweig & Wigfield, 2017). At this site, students have decided not to place very much emphasis on reading and seem to demonstrate negativity according to teachers’ accounts.
Anecdotes from Teacher 2 concerning students’ preferences for ELA assignments were especially perceptive in regard to task-value related emphasis on reading by students. Teacher 2 describes a time when homework completion was discussed with a student in class who admits a love of reading, particularly outside of school. Teacher 2 said,

I overheard a student saying…”I love to read." She's like, "I read anything and everything. I read outside of school. I'd rather read outside of school." But, she said, "I complete my math assignments first and foremost because of those definitive answers and having to show the steps, and there's math homework every single night" (Appendix M, Table 17).

Reading outside of school does not have restrictions and requirements placed upon the reading, so the student can read on her own terms, without interference from teachers or educational purposes. The student also stated that even though she loves to read, math assignments are always completed first. The student provided an interesting reason why her math always comes first. She says that the math requires showing “steps” and “definitive answers” (Appendix M, Table 17). If a student follows the correct algorithm, the student will arrive at the correct answer by the end of the problem. The student prefers to do these types of assignments first because of the linear nature of math.

Examination of this student’s statements ties into a discussion of Bloom’s Taxonomy, a tool developed by Dr. Benjamin Bloom in 1956, to help teachers design assessments that encourage higher order thinking skills in education. Prior to the development of this theory, rote learning was often used in school. It was found that rote learning did not provide the levels of skill necessary for students to achieve success in life, as they were not as likely to develop analytic, creative or evaluative skills without practice and instruction. Bloom’s Taxonomy is
usually depicted as a pyramid, indicating a hierarchy that moves from the least complex skills at the bottom of the pyramid, to the most complex skills at the top. To develop higher order thinking skills, students should be working more often at the higher levels of the pyramid.

In Bloom’s Taxonomy, following a prescribed sequence of steps equates with Apply, a skill at the bottom half of the pyramid. Many times, ELA activities are leveled at the highest order thinking skills at the top end of the pyramid, in the areas of Analyze, Evaluate and Create skills (Flinders & Thornton, 2013). These skills are significantly more taxing to student time and energy than the lower order thinking skills. This student’s statement leads one to speculate as to whether she prefers to complete math first and to read outside of school on her own terms essentially for the same reason; that she prefers to work at the lower end of Bloom’s Taxonomy.

![Bloom's Taxonomy Diagram](image-url)

*Figure 12. Bloom's Taxonomy (Revised, 2001).*

Teacher 3 also has observed behavior consistent with low task-value for reading. Teacher 3 states that “Students do not display that reading is important in my classroom.” In support of this statement, Teacher 3 provides examples of students who fail to complete assignments with care. Teacher 3 says, “They rush through reading assignments, they skim and scan for
information, they ignore written instructions and directions, and they don't even read popups and
warnings on computers before hitting the 'Next' button”” (Appendix M, Table 17). The students
seem to be in such a hurry to finish, they disregard anything that tells them how to complete the
assignments correctly.

Teacher 3 says that students “value objective assignments more than subjective
assignments.” Students, in this teacher’s experience, seem to want to arrive at the “right answer”
rather than form and describe their own personal viewpoints. The subjective assignments would
likely require deeper thought and reflection to craft a personal point of view, therefore more time
and writing. Subjective assignments would likely be placed highly in Bloom’s Taxonomy, as
well, since a subjective assignment requires that students develop, create, and express their
personal opinions with support. Instead, the students are in a hurry to complete assignments as
quickly as possible, thus the skimming, scanning, ignoring and rushing behavior described by
Teacher 3 (Appendix M, Table 17). The ELA tasks and activities appear to be interpreted by the
students as unpleasant tasks that nevertheless must be completed, and so they try to complete
them with a minimum of time and effort expended.

One possible explanation for these examples of avoidance lies in how the cognitive and
behavioral domains work together to form reading motivation. Guthrie and Klauda (2014)
offered the term dedication as an important factor in behavior related to reading engagement. In
successful reading motivation, dedication is a behavioral engagement that can be paired with
cognitive engagement (p. 390). Dedication means that the student is in fact, dedicated to
completing the reading, but if dedication exists without cognitive engagement, the result may be
a student who is merely “going through the motions” to complete an assignment, never intending
to actually learn or internalize any of the material. Dedication is a behavioral area that aligns
with expectancy-belief, task-value and with intrinsic motivation (Reeve, 2012, as cited in Guthrie & Klauda, 2014).

The teachers at this site seem to be describing examples of students who may be engaging with the ELA work in the behavioral domain, but not in the cognitive domain. The students understand and accept that the work must be completed and an attempt must be made at completion, and they are dedicated to this activity, however they are not committing to engagement cognitively and employing the rigor necessary to truly learn the material and sharpen their skills. They are merely doing the work in a superficial manner.

Rosenzweig and Wigfield (2017) conducted an empirical study through which they found four key patterns associated with reading motivation for informational science and language arts texts. There were five factors examined, including: self-efficacy, perceived difficulty, devalue, value, and dedication. Self-efficacy is similar to expectancy-belief in that it reflects a student’s belief that an assignment or activity can be successfully completed. Perceived difficulty is as it sounds, in that a measure of a student’s perception of difficulty for a task was rated (Rosenzweig & Wigfield, 2017). Devalue is particularly interesting in that it specifically concerns the student’s negative perception that reading is not a valuable activity, currently or in the future (Rosenzweig & Wigfield, 2017). Value is a student’s positive perception of the importance of reading and corresponds with task-value, while dedication is a student’s strength of devotion to completing reading assignments (Rosenzweig & Wigfield, 2017). Depending upon students’ responses to a survey, students could be placed within one of four patterns developed by the authors.

The pattern of interest in the research of Rosenzweig and Wigfield (2017) is the third pattern, known as the high-efficacy and devalue cluster. This pattern seems most applicable for
the present site, if the students were to be given the authors’ survey. This particular pattern group consists of students who believe that they will be successful in completion (high self-efficacy), that the reading is easy (low perceived difficulty) and that the value of the reading was low (low positive value) with high devaluation of reading (high negative value for reading). The authors state that this pattern was one of the two rare patterns in their study, as most students were one of two seemingly opposite patterns, high-affirming (high self-efficacy and low perceived difficulty) and low undermining (high value and low devalue) or low-affirming (low self-efficacy and high perceived difficulty) and high-undermining (low value and high devalue) (Rosenzweig & Wigfield, 2017).

Dedication to reading was not explored in this research study for this site, but the concept is applicable. Rosenzweig and Wigfield (2017) concluded that dedication of students was particularly affected by task-value level with a direct relationship. As task-value decreased or increased, so did dedication to reading. The teachers’ perceptions of students’ behaviors at this site are that students possess a lower task-value for reading, which would correspond with lower dedication to reading. This is interesting in that lower dedication to reading means that students do not exhibit rigor and follow through on their assignments. Teachers at this site reported that students rarely failed to complete ELA assignments, especially in the higher grade levels, but failed to complete assignments thoughtfully.

In general, the research is also supported by other studies such as Brozo, Shiel, and Topping, (2007) and Iyengar et al. (2007), that have concluded that adolescent students in the United States are less motivated in reading and therefore less prepared for careers. Indeed, at this research site, twelfth grade students’ task-values are low and students seem unaware of the skills required in the working world. Teachers report that students do not feel reading and ELA
activities are important to their futures. This research is supported at this current research site because of the lower task-value exhibited by students and observed by the teachers. Students who do not value reading tend to avoid reading intensive courses and careers (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Rosenzweig & Wigfield, 2017), although it is also possible that students are merely unaware of the intensity and rigor of reading that careers they have chosen will require.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions Addressed</th>
<th>Central Research Question: <strong>How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding 2</td>
<td>Overall, twelfth grade students feel highly positive about Recreational Digital (RD) text mode and purpose, and significantly less positive about Academic Print (AP) especially, but also Academic Digital (AD), and Recreational Print (RP) text modes and purposes. However, students do not feel negatively about any of the text modes or purposes; rather, they show varying degrees of ambivalence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading attitude.** Research by McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, & Meyer (2012) notes that adolescents’ reading attitudes in general are declining over the years without a ready explanation. Not only are students’ attitudes worsening throughout adolescence, but there is also a decline across cohorts of students. Students with lower reading ability as well as higher ability are developing more negative attitudes toward reading. So, one would expect that by the time students have reached twelfth grade, their scores are lower than at any point of their educational careers.

However, at this research site, students’ reading attitudes are mostly positive. Students especially enjoy recreational digital text as they scored highest for this mode and purpose. Students also scored relatively highly for academic digital and recreational printed text. Students here do not feel as negatively about reading as some research has previously found. Even
academic printed text, the workhorse of the classroom, is rated at a middling, neutral score overall by the students who were surveyed. The research, by such researchers as McKenna et al. (2012) and by Brozo, Shiel, and Topping (2007) seems to be contradicted by the results of the SARA at this particular site.

In the gender demographic, there were also discrepancies between the site’s data results and the prior research of McKenna et al. (2012) and Brozo et al. (2007). For example, both females and males at this site emphatically prefer reading recreational digital text over the other three modes and purposes. McKenna et al. (2012) found that males preferred recreational digital, while females preferred recreational print. At the current site of research, females and males both enjoy recreational digital reading, although females did, in line with McKenna et al. (2012) score higher than the males surveyed in recreational print. Research by Huang, Liang, and Chiu (2013) also supported the more positive attitudes of females. In that study, not only did the females possess more positive attitudes, but they also reported higher comprehension and the ability to read faster. This was one of the few areas in the reading attitude strand of research where the data at the current research site and previous research seemed in agreement.

The disparity between the current research site and previous research may be due to a variety of differences. First and foremost, this research site is unique and this may have been a factor in the difference of the data collected. As the site of this research presents a one-to-one student to laptop high school scenario, it may represent a different set of circumstances than that of the research of older studies, such as the work of McKenna et al. in 2012. Laptops at this site are freely available and standard issue, required and provided by the school for classes and homework. The students are allowed to bring these computers home to complete work and to use recreationally as well. It may be that as a result of this one-to-one status, students are just more
comfortable and knowledgeable about the laptops than previously possible, and this has narrowed the gap between males and females in their digital preferences. Also, unlike in McKenna et al. (2012), none of the males presented an overall negative reading attitude at this site and the males in general scored higher for academic digital text. This may be due to the increased availability of laptops for students to read digital text and to take home for use to study and work. Digital platforms for reading and completing ELA activities, such as word processing have also improved and may be more reliable and user-friendly than these were previously.

Table 16
Research Questions and Associated Findings for Teachers’ Perceptions and Strategies

| Research Questions Addressed | Central Research Question: **How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?**
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sub-question c: **How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?** | Finding 3  
ELA teachers motivate students to read by striving to understand students’ reading motivation through constant observation, awareness of and instructional adaptations to students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-values for ELA activities. |
| Finding 5 | ELA teachers use their keen observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs, task-values and reading attitudes to develop reactive and proactive strategies to encourage motivation of students in ELA activities. |

**Teachers’ perceptions and strategies.** Findings 3 and 5 are directly related to teachers’ perceptions of students’ reading motivation and attitudes. These findings resulted from teachers’ descriptive comments concerning observations of their students’ expectancy-beliefs and task-value behaviors and their reactions to these observed behaviors and their adaptations to optimize student motivation. Teachers are remarkably adept at recognizing their students’ levels of motivation, positivity or negativity of attitude, preferences for mode and purpose, and the strategies that effectively improve motivation and attitude. This section describes the way in
which teachers at this site already use research-based strategies to try to motivate students to read and engage in ELA activities, and how previous research supports the teachers’ actions. These research-based strategies include: opportunities for student input into curriculum, utilization of variety and novelty, developing situational interest, creativity in connection and reflection with text, modeling of positive reading behaviors,

**Teachers offer students opportunities for input.** Teachers at this site have adopted research-supported ways to improve lowered reading attitudes. Many research studies such as that completed by Ivey and Johnston (2013), McKenna et al., (2012) and Pitcher et al. (2007) supports the idea that teachers should provide students the opportunity for input into curriculum decisions to support and encourage positive reading attitudes (Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Joint task Force on Assessment of the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, 2010; McKenna et al., 2012; McKool, 2007; Pitcher et al., 2007). Teachers at this research site have found that students are likely to be more interested and engaged in a text if it is something they have expressed an interest in or have taken some part in suggesting, as this input creates a sense of ownership for students. Student surveys regarding favorite genres and authors is a way to make students realize their voices are valuable within the school.

**Teachers use variety and novelty.** The teachers at this research site also noted that students thrive on variety and novelty, which is also supported by research. Researchers have observed that students respond positively to the novelty effect, to a certain point, and enjoy variety in the curriculum (Boeglin-Quintana & Donovan, 2013; Gabriel, Allington, & Billen, 2012). The opportunity to read a new genre not often seen in school, to engage in a new ELA activity, to dig more deeply and more meaningfully into a text, but in a slightly different manner than is usually offered, provides students with a change in routine that is welcomed. The teachers
at this site observed that the attention of students could be gained more effectively if something different is presented, which often resulted in an increase in participation, engagement and motivation to read text.

Sometimes, this novelty effect extended beyond the initial period of excitement and developed into an example of developing situational interest, where students began to seek out similar genres, works, authors, or activities to enjoy. This new and independently-driven interest marks the beginning of intrinsic motivation and is a desirable condition to encourage in students. Teachers at this site observed and understood the importance of getting students interested and frequently utilized variety and novelty to create situational interest in just this manner.

**Teachers use situational interest.** If situational interest could be harnessed as a resource for motivation in the classroom, there may be more students engaged in ELA activities to learn and develop skills, rather than to achieve a grade. Researchers such as Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, and Perencevich (2006) and Paige (2011), noted the success of situational interest in developing students’ reading motivation. Situational interest development is a viable strategy that could work for the most difficult students, such as the aliterate students.

Teachers at this research site noted that students respond positively to attempts at developing situational interest. For example, a teacher used a genre not often seen in school (action-adventure) and a detailed discussion about the book and its author. Students became captivated by the genre and some by the details about the inspiration of the author, and wanted to read other books by the same author, or in the same genre. The teachers reported students at this research site acted as researchers have observed other students acting; something in class caught their attention and inspired the students to explore on their own or made them want to know more. Situational interest can be a successful method to engage students in reading.
Teachers use creative connection and reflection to motivate. Teachers at this site remarked that creativity provides authenticity and purpose for assignments with opportunities for students to engage a personal flair, while thinking about the personal significance of a text. Connecting and reflecting to a text creates meaningful, personal products. This strategy is supported through existing research, such as research by Francois (2013), which concluded that students who can connect the text they read to the world around them are more likely to regard reading as valuable to their lives. The text presented to students must be meaningful and complete, without basis in excerpts and skill passages, so students can delve deeply into meaning. Students enjoy being offered the opportunity to take their own personal viewpoints and relate their experiences to a text while connecting with the world. Assignments where students can connect with and reflect deeply upon text and personal viewpoints were shown to help develop a positive attitude toward reading and to help develop a purpose for reading.

Teachers model positive behavior. Teachers at this site used modeling of positive reading behaviors and attitudes to encourage students to read. This strategy is supported by research, including that of Pitcher, Albright, Delaney, Walker, Seunarinesingh, Mogge, Headley, Ridgeway, Peck, Hunt, and Dunston (2007), which concluded that teachers’ modeling and attempts to engage students in positive reading discussions about books are positive experiences for students that help them develop as readers. Other researchers, such as Applegate and Applegate (2004), discovered that teachers can greatly affect their students’ outlooks on books and reading through the way ELA material is presented, particularly in the level of enthusiasm and authentic interest demonstrated by teachers. Administrators and school districts may need to provide professional development that supports teachers’ attempts to learn successful strategies
to model positive reading attitude and strong reading motivation (Applegate & Applegate, 2004) as many teachers never receive instruction in managing the affective area of reading.

*Teachers successfully determine intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation.* In agreement with recent research, such as that of Sweet, Guthrie, and Ng (1998), teachers at this site were adept at determining a student’s status as an intrinsically motivated or an extrinsically motivated reader. Teachers could provide detailed information, description and observations concerning intrinsically and extrinsically motivated students, drawn from a personally collected body of knowledge that has been built over the course of their careers and used by these teachers to make curricular decisions.

However, teachers did present observations that were contrary to previous research in this regard. Sweet et al. (1998), found that the highly intrinsically motivated students were also likely to be the highest achieving students. In contrast, teachers at this site reported that the highest achieving students were not more likely to be the most intrinsically motivated students, while the lowest achieving students were not necessarily the most extrinsically motivated students. At this site, the teachers noticed that it was frequently the Academic, or students in the college level courses, and also among the highest achieving group, who were most likely to be extrinsically motivated, as they continually pursue a grade without concern for learning the material. Teachers also commented about the high level of intrinsic motivation seen in the lower achieving students, such as Special Education students in Learning Support/Co-Teaching classes, who truly wanted to be better readers and were intensely concerned with their success in reading. The teachers were very capable at not only determining the type of motivation seen in their students, but determining the motivators that drove these students to achieve.
Contradictions to previous research. Teachers were well aware of certain strategies that would not work to motivate students. A few areas where previous research contradicted the findings developed from this study pertained mainly to increasing motivation through social activity through discussion boards, and the use of the features offered by e-readers.

Previous research, such as that of Jacobs (2012) and Grisham and Wolsey (2006) have shown that students enjoy self-directed activities on discussion boards and group work to complete assignments. This does not seem to be the case at this research site, which may be because this particular research site has been a one-to-one site for technology for numerous years. This familiarity and continuous access provides numerous opportunities for students to engage in discussion boards in their classes daily. Teachers interviewed for this study report that students begin to lose interest in the discussion board technology at the higher grades because they have used it so often. They also reject the restrictions and requirements often integrated into discussion board assignments and begin to see them as just another writing assignment. The novelty of these types of assignments has worn off.

Prior research concerning e-readers and digital text, such as that of Maynard (2010) and Enriquez (2013), has concluded that technology, specifically e-readers, help motivate students to read. Data collected from this research site leads one to conclude that technology is not as motivating as it may appear. Although these students were using laptops and not e-readers, teachers described students’ reluctance to utilize the features of digital text. All three teachers commented that students were much less likely to find digital text effective for learning purposes and each provided examples of students who requested printed text to work with as an alternative to digital text. Teachers reported that using technology does not lead to the use of good active reading strategies and text is not as easily manipulated as expected, and therefore students are
unable to utilize any advantages in comprehension that would have been offered to kinesthetic learners. Teachers observed that students like to feel the paper in their hands and manipulate passages and pages to suit their needs. They like the ability to write notes in the margins and highlight sections of text and view the text in its entirety by laying it out on the desk. As the students are so very used to working with digital text, it is interesting that it would not be the preferred mode for reading in class, as the issue is not likely that students are unfamiliar with digital text or unskilled in its use.

**Implications of Findings**

**Classroom**

**Careers and college.** Based on the data collected during research completed at this site, the way in which adolescent students consider their educations in relation to their careers and future selves needs reconsideration and evaluation by teachers and administrators. Students willingly engage in reading and ELA activities however, many engage without a clear purpose, reason for engagement or future utility for the assignments presented. Some students participate merely to complete an assignment, receive a score and move on to the next assignment. Students, especially the Academic students, are not spending the time necessary to engage deeply with text and to learn and develop new skills and to understand the world around them more fully. Despite the development and implementation of a mandatory career education program at this site, students are still unaware of the roles reading and writing take in their success in the workforce. Students understand they must complete ELA courses with passing grades to graduate and enter college, but they are unable to grasp the utility of these skills to everyday life and work.

**Implementation of reading motivation as a curricular component.** The consideration of motivation and attitude should become an integral, explicitly-stated and required component
of the reading and ELA curriculum. The teachers at the site are already knowledgeable, capable veterans who are successful in teaching their students to read and write, however there are a few students who do not participate or who perform unexpectedly poorly. These students may need additional support in reading motivation and attitude. Teachers need additional training and coursework on motivation and implementation of motivation remediation in the classroom to help these students. Although the teachers interviewed were experienced and capable at determining students’ motivation sources and levels, at times they expressed frustration at being unable to address students’ problems with motivation, such as in the case of aliterate students. If there were a way to identify the students experiencing issues with motivation more quickly, and then take measures to provide that student with help, it may be easier to address concerns before lasting damage is done.

**Professional development for reading motivation.** Teachers need to be offered new ways to help students develop motivation. Researchers such as Guthrie et al. (2007) have shown that intrinsic motivation often begins to decline in the middle school years. A destructive cycle may have already begun by the time students have begun high school. Students who are aliterate or who are not completing assignments may need intervention to develop extrinsic motivation. Prior research, such as that completed by Paige (2011), has shown extrinsic motivation can act as a stepping stone toward the development of intrinsic motivation. With this in mind, students who have established extrinsic motivation should then be encouraged to become more intrinsically motivated. Teachers want to be able to assist all of their students to achieve success in ELA assignments, but they sometimes feel there is no available solution to the difficult cases.

**Completion versus learning.** Professional development to learn how to engage students and encourage them to really invest in their futures is important. Too many students, especially
the academically talented, are making a deliberate effort to speed through assignments without reflecting deeply on the task presented. Students may not be interested in getting anything more out of an activity than a grade. Students need to be encouraged to complete assignments for their own benefit in learning and developing new skills and to learn to love to learn. Students need to be shown the ways in which analytical and critical thinking are important to life. It seems that many students are not understanding the importance or the purpose of the assignments they are asked to complete and therefore rush to complete these with as little effort as possible.

Students need to be encouraged to engage cognitively with the assignments at hand. An effort at discussion of purpose for ELA activities may help students develop task-value in ELA by encouraging them to analyze and reflect throughout the activity. For example, teachers may want to state each activity or assignment’s purpose clearly and relate that purpose in easily understandable terms to a skill or career students may engage in after graduation. Reflection activities may be one way to encourage students to think deeply about the task they have completed and relate what they have learned to a career or to everyday life.

**Novelty factor.** The novelty factor and variety may be a much more influential factor in motivating students to read than originally expected. Technology might work at certain times because it is new and different, but also new and different types of assignments in print form may invoke the novelty factor as well. Also, differentiation according to mode preferences may need to become more prevalent. For example, the reading attitude of students whose preferences are not addressed may become more negative when presented with text in a mode they do not enjoy or find cumbersome to work with, whether that be paper or digital text. There may be a need for more differentiation of text mode for the academic purpose to maintain or increase students’ motivation. To differentiate successfully, teachers may need to offer periodic surveys
to gather data related to the students’ preferred modes, genres, activities, and reading attitudes to develop a curriculum that can be customized, yet successful in obtaining the necessary objectives.

**Literacy technology education.** Another implication of the research is that students and teachers alike need to receive more in-depth training on the utilization of existing classroom technology such as e-readers, laptops, documents and program files more effectively and efficiently. The technology offered may need to be analyzed, assessed, adjusted and replaced to fit the needs of an ELA classroom. Technology that does not function well in completion of the tasks necessary for reading and writing increase frustration and waste valuable time. A seamless interface and technological experience may improve motivation.

**Teacher Preparation**

**Preservice teachers of literacy need to enjoy reading.** Preservice secondary teachers need to learn ways in which to relate reading to real life and careers. Adolescent students need to see that literacy is important in the real world. Teachers greatly impact the reading attitudes and motivations of their students through interactions with students in the classroom and the modeling of positive behavior. Teachers who have difficulty understanding the importance of reading and writing to the everyday world themselves will experience difficulty modeling enthusiasm for the subject to their students. Teachers who model a negative attitude affect the students around them and may decrease motivation of students to pass the class and reduce students’ interest in the subject. This may result in lasting harm for students if motivation decreases and attitudes becomes negative. The inner-workings of the affective areas of reading and ELA, as well as achievement motivation should be taught to preservice teachers, so they may be better able to encourage growth, progress and success of students.
Preservice teachers need to understand reading attitude. Reading attitude is a crucial component of reading motivation. Some researchers have observed a correlation among students’ reading attitudes, amount of time spent reading for recreation, and standardized test scores (Brozo, Shiel, & Topping, 2007). In regard to international PISA testing, Brozo et al., (2007) found students with more positive attitudes toward reading tended to achieve higher test scores, while those students with less positive attitudes toward reading achieved the lowest scores. This direct relationship also exists for students who read the most for recreation and those who read the least. As students with varying degrees of negative reading attitudes will fail to read as much as necessary to do well in school, it is imperative that teachers take reading attitude into account when designing lessons, since teachers are influential and instrumental in helping students develop positive attitudes toward reading and ELA in school.

Future Research

A reading motivation diagnostic useful for the classroom needs to be developed. There is a need to research and develop an easily implemented method to determine students’ basis (extrinsic or intrinsic) and level for motivation within the classroom setting and ways to be able to build upon it. If a simple motivation building protocol could be developed for teachers to implement and intervene when students are experiencing academic difficulty, more failing students may become passing students. If the protocol developed could move students from reluctance to extrinsic motivation, then to intrinsic motivation and also serve to strengthen existing intrinsic motivation, then an increase in reading motivation could be attained.

Another potential area for future research pertains to adolescent attitudes toward printed versus digital text for academic purposes. Students’ surveys and teacher interviews provided conflicting viewpoints. Teachers reported that teachers and students alike strongly preferred
printed text for academic purposes, as well as recreational purposes, while students reported high positivity for recreational digital text and a significantly lower, yet positive response for academic print text. It is unclear as to the reasons surrounding the lower score by students for academic printed text.

Continued study of adolescent students’ perceptions of ELA skills in the workforce and the effect of these beliefs on their career choices is needed to determine how best to help students prepare for the workforce. Reading motivation and attitude of adolescents, particularly older adolescents, needs to be studied in greater depth to determine what would make reading and ELA valuable enough for students to want to learn how to do it well.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations outlined below are a result of the analysis of the data and findings of this study and may help to increase motivation among ELA students at the site of this study. These recommendations should be undertaken as these are deemed appropriate by teachers and administrators. These recommendations may be implemented department-wide or on an individual, as needed basis.

1. Focus on nurturing extrinsic motivation in students, especially younger adolescent students, who appear to be aliterate or reluctant to engage in reading and ELA activities.

   Teachers have expressed frustration at their inability to improve the reading motivation of aliterate students and students who are consistently reluctant to engage in ELA activities. Students do not learn skills unless they engage with the lesson and practice. Situational interest may be used to spark imagination or interest, while opportunities to explore the new interest may be offered to expand the students’ developing interests. Another method might be through developing students’ extrinsic motivation through some type of reward, whether it be classroom
based or school based, which may encourage some of these students to participate more fully. The reward would depend on what a student regards as valuable and may require a survey or poll to determine what would be likely motivators. These rewards should be small items, such as a few minutes of free time or a few points toward an assignment on a weekly basis. Students’ assignments could be tracked daily over the course of a week and those who complete their assignments diligently or achieve an improvement in grades would be rewarded.

2. Increase and bolster the amount of and the approach to career education to increase relevancy to high school coursework, particularly in reading and writing.

School-wide or English department-wide focus on Language Arts in the workforce and in careers need additional attention. Students’ low task-values for reading and writing may be a result of their inability to see a reason for literacy and language beyond the basics after graduation. Some students, especially the college bound Academic students might feel that the skill level they currently have will be enough for them in college in beyond. Providing these students with additional support and reasons why they should work on increasing their reading and writing skills as they relate to jobs, careers and college may motivate these students to want to do more and to undertake assignments rigorously rather than superficially.

Several studies cited by Guthrie and Klauda (2014), support that students value an activity more when they can see an immediate benefit by describing the benefit offered clearly in the activity or text (Jang, 2008; Reeve, Jang, Hardre, & Omura, 2002, as cited in Guthrie & Klauda, 2014). Also, students who were able to define ways in which an assignment or activity would be useful and important in some way personally, were more likely to engage (Hulleman, Godes, Hendricks, & Harackiewicz, 2010, as cited in Guthrie & Klauda, 2014). So, another potential method to address low task-value of students is to offer a cogent and compelling
purpose for each assignment and activity and to explicitly discuss specific ways in which the current assignment will benefit each student. Requiring students to internalize and state the benefits he or she expects to gain from a task as part of each assignment, perhaps in the form of goal-setting, may also be a way to help students understand the importance of literacy.

3. Incorporate variety and novelty where possible in the ELA curriculum to spark interest and provide opportunities to students to try new genres of reading and writing.

One of the most successful of the strategies shared by the teachers interviewed was to incorporate variety and the novelty factor wherever possible. If something new or unique can be introduced into a lesson, this may lead to an increase in curiosity and participation. Students like to try new genres, unique writing prompts or activities, new technology or different activity in class. Often, variety and novelty will create situational interest and students may become engrossed in similar activities, genres or authors. Trying different approaches in class reduces boredom and predictability.

4. Opportunities for creativity and to connect with and reflect upon literature build authenticity in writing assignments and make reading and writing relevant to the future.

Another strategy that worked well for teachers was to provide students opportunities for creativity in response to literature. When teachers provided students with opportunities to become creatively engaged with the literature they are reading, students welcomed the opportunity. For example, some students enjoyed the opportunity to write poetry in the style of the poet studied in class, or to write a response to something read in class. Other students were inspired by creating a digital presentation about literature read in ELA class. The creativity gives students a chance to integrate their own thoughts and perspectives into what they have learned.
Connecting and reflecting upon literature also creates opportunities for students to engage in reading and writing. As students think about how two different pieces of literature connect to each other, they learn analysis skills and to think like an author. As students reflect on the author’s words or intended meaning, they may begin to ask themselves if they agree with the author’s message or whether there is anything that needs to be added to the message presented by the author. This connection may begin to extend not only from text to text, but also from text to self as students start to examine what this text means to themselves.

Conclusion

This case study was developed to provide insight into the problem of practice of adolescent students’ declining reading motivation. The research explored twelfth grade students’ reading motivation levels and attitudes as well as the perceptions and observations of teachers on adolescent students’ reading motivation and attitudes. The four research questions developed to guide this exploration were: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read? a) How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully? b) What are students’ attitudes toward reading? c) How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read? A case study logic model was created to guide the process of data collection and analysis. Five findings were generated from the analysis of collected data and four recommendations useful to the research site and others like it, were provided as a result of the study.

As the global economy increasingly demands that young graduates enter the workforce with essential communications, presentation and analysis skills, including the abilities to write, reason, to think deeply and critically, it is more important than ever that adolescents graduate from high school with a strong foundation in ELA. Although students perceive themselves to be
competent readers and writers, there are some students who do not see the value in ELA tasks and as a result, do not achieve their potential in these areas. As students move on to a career or to college, they place themselves at an unnecessary disadvantage. Determining a way to motivate students to read and to hone their skills in ELA courses to the highest levels possible should be a priority for teachers and administrators alike.
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Appendix A: Signed Informed Consent Document for Parents

Signed Informed Consent Document for Parents

| Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies, Department of Education |
| Name of Investigator(s): Dr. Margaret Dougherty, Principal Investigator, and Courtney A. Shepard, Student Researcher and Doctoral Candidate |
| Title of Project: The Impact of Past Language Arts Teachers on the Reading Motivation of Twelfth Grade Students |

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Dear Parents or Guardians,

We are inviting twelfth grade students at [this site] to take part in a research study. This research is being conducted by Courtney A. Shepard, Student Researcher, and Dr. Margaret Dougherty, Principal Investigator, as a requirement of the doctoral program at Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies. This form will tell you about the study. You may ask Mrs. Shepard any questions that you have. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, Mrs. Shepard asks you to sign and return this statement. She will give you a copy to keep.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

Twelfth grade students who are 18 years of age or older are being asked to participate in this study. We want to explore students’ feelings about reading and how their English teachers affected their past experiences with reading. Twelfth grade students were selected to participate because they are close to graduation and have had the maximum number of years of education at the high school.

Why is this research study being done?

The purpose of this research is to explore how twelfth grade students are motivated to read and the impact their former English Language Arts teachers may have had on their reading experiences. The results of the research may help teachers develop lessons and activities for English classes in the future. This research is required for Mrs. Shepard’s doctoral program.

What will I be asked to do?

If you decide to allow your child to take part in this study, we will ask students to complete one online “bubble-in” survey on Survey Monkey. The questions are related to your child’s feelings about reading.

Where will this take place and how much of my time will it take?

The survey will take place at school, in the student’s regular Activity period, between January 23-31, 2017. The survey is about 20 minutes in length and has 40 questions.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?
There is minimal risk associated with this research. Students will not miss assignments for class, since there are no assignments or classes scheduled for Activity period. Identities of students taking the survey will remain confidential. Students will be completing the surveys online anonymously.

**Will I benefit by being in this research?**

There are no direct benefits for your child for participation. It is hoped that the information learned from this study will help teachers develop curriculum that helps motivate students to read.

**Who will see the information about me?**

Your child’s identity as a participant in this study will not be known. That means no one, not even the researchers, will know that the answers your child gives on the survey are from your child.

Consent forms will only be seen by Courtney A. Shepard and Dr. Margaret Dougherty to confirm your child’s participation. All survey data and consent forms will be securely stored for a period of five years from the completion of research and then securely destroyed.

Official oversight or monitoring may be done by Northeastern University. In rare instances, authorized people may request to see research information about your child and other people in this study. This is done only to be sure that the research is done properly. We would only permit people who are authorized by the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board to review any documents related to the study.

**Can I stop my participation in this study?**

Your child’s participation in this research is completely voluntary. Your child does not have to participate if your child does not want to and your child can refuse to answer any question. If you consent for your child, he or she will ultimately decide if he or she wishes to participate. Even if your child begins the survey, he or she may quit at any time before he or she submits the survey. If your child does not participate or decides to quit, your child will not lose any rights, benefits, or services he or she would otherwise have as a student at [this site].

**Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?**

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Courtney A. Shepard, the person mainly responsible for the research, at shepard.c@husky.neu.edu. You can also contact Dr. Margaret Dougherty, the Principal Investigator, at m.dougherty@northeastern.edu.

**Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?**

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 490 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.4588, Email: n.regina@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

**Will I be paid for my participation?**

There will be no payment for participation.
**Will it cost me anything to participate?**

There is no cost to you to participate.

**Is there anything else I need to know?**

In order to take part, students’ parents or guardians must sign to indicate their child may participate. The survey will be available for review one week beforehand, by contacting Mrs. Shepard.

A separate unsigned consent form will be provided as the first page of the survey. Your child will have the option whether or not to participate at that time.

| I consent to allow my student to take part in this research. (Check one.) | No  | Yes |

---

**Signature of the parent/guardian responsible for this student**

| Date |

---

**Printed name of person above**

| Printed full name of child, 18 or older |

---

**Signature of Student Researcher**

| Date |

---

Courtney A. Shepard

**Printed name of Student Researcher**
Appendix B: Signed Informed Consent Document for Teachers

Signed Informed Consent Document for Teachers

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies, Department of Education

Name of Investigator(s): Dr. Margaret Dougherty, Principal Investigator, and Courtney A. Shepard, Student Researcher and Doctoral Candidate

Title of Project: The Impact of Past Language Arts Teachers on the Reading Motivation of Twelfth Grade Students

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

We are inviting you to take part in a research study. This research is being conducted by Courtney A. Shepard, Student Researcher and Dr. Margaret Dougherty, Principal Investigator as a requirement of the doctoral program at Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies. This form will tell you about the study, but the researcher will explain it to you first. You may ask this person any questions that you have. When you are ready to make a decision, you may tell the researcher if you want to participate or not. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, the researcher will ask you to sign this statement and will give you a copy to keep.

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

We are asking you to participate in this research because you are an English Language Arts teacher for grades 9-11. We are interested in the perspectives of English Language Arts teachers regarding student reading motivation and attitudes.

Why is this research study being done?

The purpose of this research is to explore how twelfth grade students are motivated to read and the impact their former English Language Arts teachers may have had on their reading experiences. The results of the research may help teachers develop lessons and activities for English classes in the future. This research is a required part of the doctoral program for Courtney A. Shepard.

What will I be asked to do?

If you decide to take part in this study, we will ask you to participate in one interview. There will be 10 questions related to your observations and perceptions of student reading motivation, reading attitude and the strategies you feel are effective at increasing students’ willingness to engage in reading for class. The interview questions will be provided to you before the interview date is set.

You will also be asked to take part in a process called member-checking. This process helps ensure trustworthiness and credibility in research. You will be given a copy of the transcript of your interview and the preliminary analysis related to it. You will be asked to provide clarification, feedback, or corrections where you feel they are needed. You may decide not to suggest any changes, if you wish. Your feedback will be included in the final analysis and findings of the research.
Where will this take place and how much of my time will it take?
You will be interviewed at a location you choose, off-campus. The interview is expected to be 30-45 minutes. Member-checking will take place through email, to your private email address as provided on this consent form. Member-checking may take approximately 15-30 minutes to complete.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?
There is minimal risk associated with this study. Your identity as a participant will not be revealed. Privacy and confidentiality will be maintained throughout and pseudonyms for participants will be used. All identifying names, including places and locations, including school and district names, will be omitted or changed. Transcripts and interviews will remain confidential and will be stored securely.

Digital audio recordings of the interviews will be stored on an encrypted, password protected flash drive and transferred to a secure location for storage after transcription. The drive and consent forms will be stored securely in a household safe. Audio recordings, transcripts and all related documents, including consent forms, will be securely destroyed after five years from the completion of research.

Will I benefit by being in this research?
There will be no direct benefit to you for taking part in the study, however, the information learned from this study may help you and the [site] English department develop curriculum to increase student reading motivation and improve reading attitudes for future students.

Who will see the information about me?
Your part in this study will be confidential. Only the Student Researcher, the Principal Investigator and Rev.com transcription service will see the information about you. No reports or publications will use information that can identify you in any way, as being part of this project.

Audio recordings of the interviews will be transcribed by Rev.com. This transcription provider pledges confidentiality and their transcriptionists have signed confidentiality agreements. The company uses 128-bit SSL encryption during transfer of files and for storage. Once the transcriptions are completed and delivered back to Courtney A. Shepard, Rev.com will be asked to delete the interview files.

In rare instances, authorized people may request to see research information about you and other people in this study. This is done only to be sure that the research is done properly. We would only permit people authorized by organizations such as the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board to see this information.

Can I stop my participation in this study?
Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to and you can refuse to answer any question. Even if you begin the study, you may quit at any time. If you do not participate or if you decide to quit, you will not lose any rights, benefits, or services that you would otherwise have as a teacher in this school district.
### Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Courtney A. Shepard, the person mainly responsible for the research, at shepard.c@husky.neu.edu. You can also contact Dr. Margaret Dougherty, the Principal Investigator, at m.dougherty@northeastern.edu.

### Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 490 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.4588, Email: n.regina@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

### Will I be paid for my participation?

There will be no payment for participation in this study.

### Will it cost me anything to participate?

There is no cost to you to participate in this study.

### I agree to take part in this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of teacher agreeing to take part</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person above</th>
<th>Private email address of participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Student Researcher, who explained the study to the participant above and obtained consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtney A. Shepard

Printed name of person above
Appendix C: Teacher Interview Protocol

Teacher Interview Protocol

Date:

Interviewer Name: C. Shepard

Participant Name:

Interviewer: You have been selected to interview today because you are a grades nine through eleven English Language Arts teacher. Our research project focuses on the experience, perceptions, observations and strategies of teachers who teach English Language Arts at the high school. Through this study, we hope to gain more insight into the reading motivation and attitudes of students. Hopefully this will allow us to identify ways in which we can increase student reading motivation and improve students’ attitudes toward reading.

Interviewer: Because your responses are important and I want to make sure to capture everything you say, I would like to record our conversation today via digital audio. Do I have your permission to record this interview?

[pause for response]

[BEGIN AUDIO]

Interviewer: All responses will be confidential and only a pseudonym will be used in the analysis and when quoting from the transcripts. Any identifying information, including names, places, district, schools, towns and state will be omitted. The principal investigator, the transcriptionist provided by Rev.com, and I will be the only people with access to the recordings. The recordings and the transcriptions will be stored securely after they are transcribed. They will be destroyed five years after the completion of this research.
After the interview is transcribed, I will provide you with a copy of the transcript via email for your review and feedback. Please review it and provide any feedback and/or suggestions within 10 days and let me know any changes you would like to make. This interview is designed to last no longer than about 30 to 45 minutes. Do you have any questions at this time?

1. How long have you been teaching? How long have you been in this district? What grade levels and subjects have you taught? What class and grade level do you teach now? How long have you been teaching this class? In what subject areas are you certified?

2. How would you describe the terms “reading motivation” and “reading attitude”? Describe the importance these concepts have to teaching English Language Arts.

3. How much importance do you feel students place on completing English Language Arts assignments? Are there certain assignments they value more highly than others? How do you know?

4. How confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments? How do you know who is confident and who is not?

5. The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high expectancy-beliefs, with an overall score of 77%. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results? How would you maintain students’ confidence in their ability to complete reading-related assignments?

6. The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high task-values for English Language Arts activities, with an overall score of 67%. The score is high, but is lower than the score for students’ confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities, but at times not
all of them are convinced. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students’ perceived importance of reading-related activities?

7. What preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text? Do you feel students prefer print or digital text for recreational reading? Which format do students seem to prefer in the classroom? Do you prefer print text or digital text for use within the classroom? Why?

8. The student reading attitude survey (SARA) results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward reading, scoring a 4 on a 6 point scale. Breaking it down, there was a clearly positive attitude for recreational digital activities (with a 5.4/6). The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation (both scoring 4/6). The results for students’ attitudes toward academic print-related activities was the lowest with a score of 3.4/6, meaning that while they did not have negative feelings, they also did not report positive feelings. What do you think of these results? What would you do to plan instruction that would maintain or improve student reading attitudes for class and for fun?

9. What strategies do you feel are least successful at motivating students to read for class?

10. What strategies do you feel are most successful at motivating students to read for class? Describe an example of a time where you felt successful at motivating students to read. Why do you feel your strategy was successful? How did you know you were successful?

**Interviewer**: Is there anything else you would like to add?

[pause for response]
Interviewer: Thank you for participating. I’ll email a copy of your transcript and the initial analysis to you later in February, 2017, so that you can review it and provide feedback or suggestions.
Appendix D: Student Unsigned Consent for AMRP and SARA Surveys Combined for Administration to Students

Student Unsigned Consent for Combined AMRP and SARA Surveys for Administration to Students.

UNSIGNED CONSENT DOCUMENT FOR WEB-BASED ONLINE SURVEYS

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies, Department of Education

Name of Investigator(s): Dr. Margaret Dougherty, Principal Investigator and Courtney A. Shepard, Student Researcher

Title of Project: The Impact of Past Language Arts Teachers on the Reading Motivation of Twelfth Grade Students

Request to Participate in Research

We invite you to participate in a web-based online survey. The survey is part of a research study whose purpose is to explore how twelfth grade students are motivated to read and the impact their former English Language Arts teachers may have had on their reading experiences. This research is a required part of the doctoral program for Courtney A. Shepard. This survey should take about 20 minutes to complete.

We are asking you to participate in this study because you are a twelfth grade student at [site name]. Twelfth grade students were selected to participate because you are close to graduation and have had the maximum number of years of education at the high school. You must be at least 18 years old to take this survey.
The decision to participate in this research project is voluntary. Although your parent has given his or her consent, you do not have to participate. You can click "Yes, I accept" and begin the survey, or you can click "No, I do not accept" and sit in your desk to opt-out. You do not have to participate and you can refuse to answer any question. Even if you begin the web-based online survey, you can stop at any time.

The possible risks or discomforts of the study are minimal. You may feel tired while answering the survey questions.

There are no direct benefits to you from participating in this study. However, your responses may help us learn more about how twelfth grade students are motivated to read and may help teachers develop lessons and activities for English classes in the future. You will not be paid for your participation in this study.

Your part in this study is anonymous to the researcher(s). However, because of the nature of web based surveys, it is possible that respondents could be identified by the IP address or other electronic record associated with the response. Neither the researcher nor anyone involved with this survey will be capturing those data. Any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data or anonymous individuals’ responses but will not identify you or any individual as being affiliated with this project.
If you have any questions regarding electronic privacy, please feel free to contact Mark Nardone, NU’s Director of Information Security via phone at 617-373-7901, or via email at privacy@neu.edu.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Courtney A. Shepard at shepard.c@husky.neu.edu the person mainly responsible for the research. You can also contact Dr. Margaret Dougherty, the Principal Investigator, at m.dougherty@northeastern.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.4588, Email: n.regina@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

By clicking on the “Yes, I accept” button below, you are indicating that you consent to participate in this study. Please make and save a copy of this consent form for your records. If you press the "Yes, I accept" button, the survey will begin after you press the "Next" arrow.

I consent to participate in this study.

- Yes, I accept.
- No, I do not accept.
Survey 1: Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP)


Survey 2: Survey of Adolescent Reading Attitudes (SARA)

Appendix E: Interview Questions with Corresponding Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions with Corresponding Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Research Question:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pertains to all interview questions, but especially the following interview questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question 5: The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high expectancy-beliefs, with an overall score of 77%. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results? How would you maintain students’ confidence in their ability to complete reading-related assignments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 6: The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high task-values for English Language Arts activities, with an overall score of 67%. The score is high, but is lower than the score for students’ confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities, but at times not all of them are convinced. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students’ perceived importance of reading-related activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Question 8: The student reading attitude survey (SARA) results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward reading, scoring a 4 on a 6 point scale. Breaking it down, there was a clearly positive attitude for recreational digital activities (with a 5.4/6). The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation (both scoring 4/6). The results for students’ attitudes toward academic print-related activities was the lowest with a score of 3.4/6, meaning that while they...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
did not have negative feelings, they also did not report positive feelings. What do you think of these results? What would you do to plan instruction that would maintain or improve student reading attitudes for class and for fun?

**Sub-Question a:**

**How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?**

**Interview Question 3:** How much importance do you feel students place on completing English Language Arts assignments? Are there certain assignments they value more highly than others? How do you know?

**Interview Question 4:** How confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments? How do you know who is confident and who is not?

**Interview Question 5:** The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high expectancy-beliefs, with an overall score of 77%. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results? How would you maintain students’ confidence in their ability to complete reading-related assignments?

**Interview Question 6:** The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high task-values for English Language Arts activities, with an overall score of 67%. The score is high, but is lower than the score for students’ confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities, but at
times not all of them are convinced. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students’ perceived importance of reading-related activities?

**Sub-Question b:**

**What are students’ attitudes toward reading?**

Interview Question 7: What preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text? Do you feel students prefer print or digital text for recreational reading?

Which format do students seem to prefer in the classroom? Do you prefer print text or digital text for use within the classroom? Why?

Interview Question 8: The student reading attitude survey (SARA) results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward reading, scoring a 4 on a 6 point scale. Breaking it down, there was a clearly positive attitude for recreational digital activities (with a 5.4/6). The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation (both scoring 4/6). The results for students’ attitudes toward academic print-related activities was the lowest with a score of 3.4/6, meaning that while they did not have negative feelings, they also did not report positive feelings. What do you think of these results? What would you do to plan instruction that would maintain or improve student reading attitudes for class and for fun?

**Sub-Question c:**

**How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?**

Interview Question 1: How long have you been teaching? How long have you been in this district? What grade levels and subjects have you taught? What class and grade level do you
teach now? How long have you been teaching this class? In what subject areas are you certified?

Interview Question 2: How would you describe the terms “reading motivation” and “reading attitude”? Describe the importance these concepts have to teaching English Language Arts.

Interview Question 9: What strategies do you feel are least successful at motivating students to read for class?

Interview Question 10: What strategies do you feel are most successful at motivating students to read for class? Describe an example of a time where you felt successful at motivating students to read. Why do you feel your strategy was successful? How did you know you were successful?
Appendix F: Themes, Codes and Definitions for 1st Cycle Coding by Research Question

Themes and Definitions for 1st Cycle Coding by Research Question

Central Research Question: How are twelfth grade English Language Arts students motivated to read?

Expected Theme: Reading Motivation Success
Data from teachers are expected to be positive reflections of past teaching practice impacting AMRP and SARA data from student surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>1st Cycle Code Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Motivation Success: Teachers’ Reflection on Students’ AMRP Results</td>
<td>R/M/S/T-AMRP</td>
<td>Teachers’ reaction to student AMRP results</td>
<td>Interviews AMRP</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Motivation Success: Teachers’ Reflection on Students’ SARA Results</td>
<td>R/M/S/T-SARA</td>
<td>Teachers’ reaction to student SARA results</td>
<td>Interviews SARA</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Question a: How do students value reading and perceive their ability to read successfully?

Expected Theme: Expectancy-Value Theory
Data from teachers are expected to provide insight into how teachers perceive students’ reading motivation according to expectancy-value theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>1st Cycle Code Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Expectancy- Beliefs</td>
<td>E/V-S/E/B</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions of student self-concept or expectancy-belief for reading assignments</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Task-Value</td>
<td>E/V-S/T/V</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions of student task-values</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Question b: What are students’ attitudes toward reading?

Expected Theme: Reading Attitude
Data from teachers are expected to provide insight into how teachers perceive students’ attitudes toward reading for two broad purposes and within two broad modes and to reveal teachers’ preferences for the modes used within the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>1st Cycle Code Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Attitude: Academic Digital</td>
<td>R/A-A/D</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions of student preferences for digital mode and academic purpose</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Attitude: Academic Print</td>
<td>R/A-A/P</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions of student preferences for print mode and academic purpose</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Attitude: Recreational Print</td>
<td>R/A-R/P</td>
<td>Teachers’ perceptions of student preferences for print mode for recreational reading</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Attitude: Recreational Digital</td>
<td>R/A-R/D</td>
<td>Teachers’ perceptions of student preferences for digital mode for recreational reading</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Digital Text for Assignments</td>
<td>R/A-T/D/A</td>
<td>Teachers’ preferences for use of digital text in classroom</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural Evaluative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Print Text for Assignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>1st Cycle Code Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Length of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>T/C-L/T/E</td>
<td>Length of time that the teacher has been working as a teacher</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Length of Time in District</td>
<td>T/C-L/T/D</td>
<td>Length of time that the teacher has worked in this district</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Grade Level Experience</td>
<td>T/C-G/L/E</td>
<td>Length of time the teacher has taught their specific grade level.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Subject Area Experience</td>
<td>T/C-S/A/E</td>
<td>Length of time the teacher has taught this subject area or class</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Certifications Held</td>
<td>T/C-C/H</td>
<td>Certifications held by this teacher</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Question c: How do English Language Arts teachers motivate students to read?**

**Expected Theme: Teacher Characteristics**

Data from teachers are expected to reveal background information that can affect students’ reading motivation in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>1st Cycle Code Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Length of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>T/C-L/T/E</td>
<td>Length of time that the teacher has been working as a teacher</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Length of Time in District</td>
<td>T/C-L/T/D</td>
<td>Length of time that the teacher has worked in this district</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Grade Level Experience</td>
<td>T/C-G/L/E</td>
<td>Length of time the teacher has taught their specific grade level.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Subject Area Experience</td>
<td>T/C-S/A/E</td>
<td>Length of time the teacher has taught this subject area or class</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Characteristics: Certifications Held</td>
<td>T/C-C/H</td>
<td>Certifications held by this teacher</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Theme: Teachers’ Responsiveness**

Data from teachers are expected to reveal how teachers respond to, anticipate and develop curriculum around perceived levels of student reading motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>1st Cycle Code Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work</td>
<td>T/R-S/W</td>
<td>Classroom strategies teachers feel work to motivate students to read.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work</td>
<td>T/R-S/N/W</td>
<td>Classroom strategies not recommended by teachers</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Success Stories</td>
<td>T/R-R/M/S</td>
<td>Descriptions of instances where reading motivation efforts were successful</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Non-Success Stories</td>
<td>T/R-R/M/N/S</td>
<td>Descriptions of instances where reading motivation efforts were not successful</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences</td>
<td>T/R-C/S/E</td>
<td>Teachers’ ability to empathize with students’ and their reading experiences</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation</td>
<td>T/R-T/C/O/R/M</td>
<td>Teacher-shared anecdotes of classroom reading motivation for groups, individuals and specific assignments</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude</td>
<td>T/R-T/C/O/R/A</td>
<td>Teacher-shared anecdotes of classroom reading attitude for groups, individuals and specific assignments</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Assignments Students Enjoy</td>
<td>T/R-R/A/S/E</td>
<td>Reading assignments that students seem to be more willing to complete</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-vivo Structural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Codes Expected from Each Teacher Interview Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Interview Question 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been teaching? How long have you been in this district? What grade levels and subjects have you taught? What class and grade level do you teach now? How long have you been teaching this class? In what subject areas are you certified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Codes:</strong> Length of Teaching Experience (T/C-L/T/E), Length of Time in District (T/C-L/T/D), Grade Level Experience (T/C-G/L/E), Subject Area Experience (T/C-S/A/E) and Certifications Held (T/C-C/H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Interview Question 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe the terms “reading motivation” and “reading attitude”? Describe the importance these concepts have to teaching English Language Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Codes:</strong> Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M), and Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude (T/R-T/C/O/R/A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Interview Question 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much importance do you feel students place on completing English Language Arts assignments? Are there certain assignments they value more highly than others? How do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Codes:</strong> Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Task-Value (E/V-S/T/V), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work (T/R-S/W), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work (T/R-S/N/W), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Success Stories (T/R-R/M/S), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Non-Success Stories (T/R-R/M/N/S), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M), and Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Assignments Students Enjoy (T/R-R/A/S/E).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Interview Question 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments? How do you know who is confident and who is not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Codes:</strong> Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs (E/V-S/E/B), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work (T/R-S/W), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work (T/R-S/N/W), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Success Stories (T/R-R/M/S),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teach**er Interview Question 5:**
The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high expectancy-beliefs, with an overall score of 77%. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results? How would you maintain students’ confidence in their ability to complete reading-related assignments?

**Expected Codes:** Reading Motivation Success: Teachers’ Reflection on Students’ AMRP Results (R/M/S/T-AMRP), Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs (E/V-S/E/B), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work (T/R-S/W), and Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E)

**Teacher Interview Question 6:**
The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high task-values for English Language Arts activities, with an overall score of 67%. The score is high, but is lower than the score for students’ confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities, but at times not all of them are convinced. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students’ perceived importance of reading-related activities?

**Expected Codes:** Reading Motivation Success: Teachers’ Reflection on Students’ AMRP Results (R/M/S/T-AMRP), Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Task-Value (E/V-S/T/V), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work (T/R-S/W), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E), and Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M)

**Teacher Interview Question 7:**
What preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text? Do you feel students prefer print or digital text for recreational reading? Which format do students seem to prefer in the classroom? Do you prefer print text or digital text for use within the classroom? Why?

**Expected Codes:** Reading Attitude: Recreational Print (R/A-R/P), Reading Attitude: Recreational Digital (R/A-R/D), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E), Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M), and Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude (T/R-T/C/O/R/A)
Teacher Interview Question 8:
The student reading attitude survey (SARA) results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward reading, scoring a 4 on a 6 point scale. Breaking it down, there was a clearly positive attitude for recreational digital activities (with a 5.4/6). The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation (both scoring 4/6). The results for students’ attitudes toward academic print-related activities was the lowest with a score of 3.4/6, meaning that while they did not have negative feelings, they also did not report positive feelings. What do you think of these results? What would you do to plan instruction that would maintain or improve student reading attitudes for class and for fun?

Expected Codes: Reading Motivation Success: Teachers’ Reflection on Students’ SARA Results (R/M/S/T-SARA),
Reading Attitude: Academic Digital (R/A-A/D),
Reading Attitude: Academic Print (R/A-A/P),
Reading Attitude: Recreational Print (R/A-R/P),
Reading Attitude: Recreational Digital (R/A-R/D),
Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Digital Text for Assignments (R/A-T/D/A),
Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Print Text for Assignments (R/A-T/P/A),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work (T/R-S/W),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work (T/R-S/N/W),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude (T/R-T/C/O/R/A), and
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Assignments Students Enjoy (T/R-R/A/S/E)

Teacher Interview Question 9:
What strategies do you feel are least successful at motivating students to read for class?

Expected Codes: Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs (E/V-S/E/B),
Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Task-Value (E/V-S/T/V),
Reading Attitude: Academic Digital (R/A-A/D),
Reading Attitude: Academic Print (R/A-A/P),
Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Digital Text for Assignments (R/A-T/D/A),
Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Print Text for Assignments (R/A-T/P/A),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Do Not Work (T/R-S/N/W),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Non-Success Stories (T/R-R/M/N/S),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M), and
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude (T/R-T/C/O/R/A)

**Teacher Interview Question 10:**
What strategies do you feel are most successful at motivating students to read for class?
Describe an example of a time where you felt successful at motivating students to read. Why do you feel your strategy was successful? How did you know you were successful?

**Expected Codes:** Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs (E/V-S/E/B),
Expectancy-Value Theory: Students’ Task-Value (E/V-S/T/V),
Reading Attitude: Academic Digital (R/A-A/D), Reading Attitude: Academic Print (R/A-A/P),
Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Digital Text for Assignments (R/A-T/D/A),
Reading Attitude: Teachers’ Print Text for Assignments (R/A-T/P/A),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Strategies that Work (T/R-S/W),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Motivation Success Stories (T/R-R/M/S),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Connections to Students’ Experiences (T/R-C/S/E),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Motivation (T/R-T/C/O/R/M),
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Teachers’ Classroom Observations on Reading Attitude (T/R-T/C/O/R/A), and
Teachers’ Responsiveness: Reading Assignments Students Enjoy (T/R-R/A/S/E)
Appendix H: Discussion of Teacher Interview Questions

Discussion of Teacher Interview Questions

*Interview Question 1: How long have you been teaching? How long have you been in this district? What grade levels and subjects have you taught? What class and grade level do you teach now? How long have you been teaching this class? In what subject areas are you certified?* This first interview question is expected to provide further information about teachers’ backgrounds and qualifications that will specifically help answer the sub-question c regarding how English Language Arts teachers motivate their students to read. This interview question is expected to provide data about certain teacher characteristics and background that may help in the analysis of the data for reading motivation observations and strategies. For example, it is expected that codes for length of teaching experience, grade level experience, subject experience, certifications, and whether the teacher had previously taught elsewhere all would be learned through this interview. This information, in turn, may be applied to later interview question responses to search for additional themes concerning teacher characteristics and teachers’ responsiveness to students.

Each code will provide important information. Length of Teaching Experience will provide data as to the total length of time the teacher has been an educator. The Length of Time in District code is expected to provide data about the teacher’s experience as a teacher in this specific district. The Grade Level Experience code is expected to provide data that reveals the amount of experience the teacher has with this particular grade level and whether the teacher has taught other grade levels that may influence his or her perspective on reading motivation. The Subject Area Experience code is expected to reveal data as to how long a teacher has been teaching this subject or class and whether the teacher has prior experience teaching other subject
areas that may or may not affect his or her perspective on reading motivation. The Certifications
Held code is expected to provide data about a teacher’s skill areas that may influence his or her
teaching of English Language Arts. The codes are expected to reveal different skill sets of
teachers that may provide insight into the teachers’ effect upon students’ reading motivation in
the classroom.

**Interview Question 2: How would you describe the terms “reading motivation” and
“reading attitude”? Describe the importance these concepts have to teaching English
Language Arts.** This interview question is expected to produce data related to the central
research question and sub-question c. The responses are expected to consist of teachers’
perceptions of the nature of reading motivation and reading attitudes and how they feel these
concepts relate to the teaching of English Language Arts. Teachers may provide examples of
why and how these concepts are important to teaching and how students respond, or do not
respond, to their attempts to integrate features meant to motivate students. Teachers may share
examples of how to identify students who are motivated readers and who have positive attitudes.
The depth and accuracy to which teachers can speak to reading motivation and reading attitude
may provide data that confirms the extent to which teachers attempt to enhance reading attitude
and encourage reading motivation in the classroom. The data may also confirm teachers’ skill
and ability in doing so.

**Interview Question 3: How much importance do you feel students place on completing
English Language Arts assignments? Are there certain assignments they value more highly
than others? How do you know?** This interview question is expected to produce data related to
sub-questions b and c. The responses are expected to consist of teacher observations of students’
task-values and teachers’ attempts to respond to the students’ valuation of classroom
assignments. The responses may also include teachers’ attempts to create or modify curriculum to address students’ reading motivation levels, particularly in creating assignments seen as valuable by the students. Teachers may also share examples of when they were successful and when they were not at creating assignments that students found valuable and motivating. Teachers will likely be willing to describe assignments that were particularly effective in motivating students or were enjoyed by students.

**Interview Question 4: How confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments? How do you know who is confident and who is not?** This interview question is also expected to produce data related to sub-questions a and c. The interview responses are expected to consist of teacher observations and perceptions of students’ expectancy-beliefs in English Language Arts classes. Also, teachers are expected to reflect on their attempts to address students’ levels of reading motivation, particularly their self-confidence in their ability to successfully complete their assignments. Teachers are likely to share stories, strategies and examples of how they were able to successfully increase the confidence of their students, or describe examples of when they were unsuccessful. Teachers are also likely to remember which assignments students enjoyed most and which were most effective.

**Interview Question 5: The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high expectancy-beliefs, with an overall score of 77%. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results? How would you maintain students’ confidence in their ability to complete reading-related assignments?**
This interview question is expected to produce data related to the central research question and sub-questions a and c. The teacher interview questions concerning the AMRP survey results are expected to provide data specifically pertaining to expectancy-value theory. As teachers consider the survey results provided to them, it is likely they will remember certain strategies that were successful and examples of students who responded favorably to the strategies that the teachers used in the classroom. Teachers may be able to reflect upon students’ confidence levels and perhaps make personal connections to students’ expectancy-beliefs and the data presented from the AMRP. Teachers may be able to offer additional recommendations on how to address the results of the survey based on their past teaching experiences.

Interview Question 6: The student reading motivation survey (AMRP) results revealed that students held high task-values for English Language Arts activities, with an overall score of 67%. The score is high, but is lower than the score for students’ confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities, but at times not all of them are convinced. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students’ perceived importance of reading-related activities?

This interview question is expected to produce data related to the central research question and sub-questions a and c. The data that will result from this AMRP survey based question is expected to include teachers’ reflections of their classroom practice relating to the task-value students in English Language Arts place upon certain assignments. The data collected are expected to include teachers’ observations from past classroom activities and their perceptions of students’ task-values for assignments. The teachers may be likely to share examples of success stories from classroom experiences and make connections to their students’ reading motivation and task-values demonstrated in class. Teachers may be able to provide
additional recommendations for strategies they would try to address the results of the survey based on their previous classroom experiences.

**Interview Question 7: What preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text? Do you feel students prefer print or digital text for recreational reading? Which format do students seem to prefer in the classroom? Do you prefer print text or digital text for use within the classroom? Why?**

This interview question relates to reading attitude of students, specifically students’ preferences for reading for fun and entertainment. The data generated from this interview question are expected to relate to sub-questions b and c. Teachers may often see students engage in reading for pleasure and make note of the kinds of books being read and the formats of those books. The data expected to be generated from this interview question includes the perceived preferences of students for print and for digital based text and the teachers’ connections to their students’ choices. Teachers may also observe and share their perceptions of students’ reading motivation and reading attitude for the students who prefer one mode of text over another. This may be useful information to determine students’ reading attitudes for classroom modes of reading and be useful for comparison purposes.

This teacher interview question is also related to reading attitude and how it affects classroom practice. The data expected to emerge are plentiful and expected to specifically relate to sub-questions b and c. Teachers will discuss their preferences for print or digital text based assignments in the classroom, curriculum development and their strategies to use these modes in assignments. Teachers will likely share both their success stories and unsuccessful examples of these assignments in the classroom. Teachers are expected to make connections to students’
experience in the classroom and to provide their observations regarding students’ reading attitudes with print and digital text.

**Interview Question 8:** The student reading attitude survey (SARA) results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward reading, scoring a 4 on a 6 point scale. Breaking it down, there was a clearly positive attitude for recreational digital activities (with a 5.4/6). The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation (both scoring 4/6). The results for students’ attitudes toward academic print-related activities was the lowest with a score of 3.4/6, meaning that while they did not have negative feelings, they also did not report positive feelings. What do you think of these results? What would you do to plan instruction that would maintain or improve student reading attitudes for class and for fun?

This question is based on the results of the student survey data for the SARA administration and the codes that are expected to emerge will be related to teachers’ observations and perceptions of reading mode and purpose. The data generated from this interview question are expected to relate to the central research question and sub-questions b and c. Teachers should be able to provide useful insight into the data obtained through the surveys and to offer recommendations to address the results based on past experiences. Teachers will likely share their experiences with students’ reactions to print, digital modes and the academic purpose. They will also share success stories and stories when their teaching strategies have been less than successful. Teachers will be able to make connections to their students, and reflect upon their efforts to encourage and motivate their students to read for class.

**Interview Question 9:** What strategies do you feel are least successful at motivating students to read for class? The data expected to be generated from this interview question are
expected to relate to the central research question and sub-questions a, b and c. This interview question is expected to produce exclusively negative examples of reading motivation. The question was developed so as to produce a response from the teachers that is not limited to expectancy-value theory or that is based on one of the two surveys. This is to provide the teachers another way to examine their classroom practice and discuss instances when their strategies did not work out as planned and the reasons why these assignments may have been unsuccessful. It is expected that stories of unsuccessful assignments, where students may have been reluctant to engage or the results from the students may have been less than expected. Teachers’ observations are expected to be shared and teachers will likely make connections between their students’ experiences and their own experiences in the classroom.

**Interview Question 10: What strategies do you feel are most successful at motivating students to read for class? Describe an example of a time where you felt successful at motivating students to read. Why do you feel your strategy was successful? How did you know you were successful?** Not wanting to leave the interview component off on a negative note, this is the positive experience counterpart to the previous interview question. This question, like the last, is expected to produce more of a conversational response where the teacher shares observations, connections and reflections on previous classroom practice where increased reading motivation was noted. Expectancy-value framework and the survey content and responses are not included as a part of this question in order to provide teachers more freedom to respond. Despite the structure of the question, teachers may still respond with expectancy-belief or task-value related responses and the results will be analyzed using the theory as well. The teachers are also likely to share stories and examples of instances where students were observed to be motivated to read and enjoying the experience and the assignments presented. The data
expected to be generated from this interview question relate to the central research question and sub-questions a, b and c.

Additional themes across interviews that may emerge include themes related to the range of possible perceptions of expectancy-value theory, reading attitude and successful teacher strategies. There is expected to be a continuum of positive, negative, successful and unsuccessful responses. It may be necessary to create additional themes for the variety of possible responses, as these variations may reveal data related to teachers’ abilities to adapt instruction to certain levels of motivation and attitude.

There are potential themes that may emerge relating to the trends seen in the demographics of the surveys. For example, there may be a difference in attitude and motivation between males and females (Gabriel, Allington, & Billen, 2012; Huang, Liang, & Chiu, 2013; McKenna et al., 2012). And therefore there may be adjustments enacted by the teachers. There are also likely to be differences seen among students enrolled in the four courses offered at the high school: AP English, Academic English 12, Standard English 12 and Co-taught English 12, due to differences in amount and breadth of reading and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation levels (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Teachers may also adjust their instructional practices according to their perceptions of the motivation and attitude of each class.
Appendix I: Students’ Survey Responses by Student and Overall

Students’ Survey Responses by Student and Overall

Student 1:

**Demographics:** Female, Academic course

**AMRP Scoring Sheet Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
<th>Question #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>TOTAL VR</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMRP Full Survey Raw Score:** 61

**AMRP Total Percentage:** 76.25

SARA Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 3.4, 3.4, 5.2, 6

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Student 2:

**Demographics:** Female, Academic course

**AMRP Scoring Sheet Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Q16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SC</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL VR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMRP Full Survey Raw Score:** 60

**AMRP Overall Survey Percentage:** 75

### SARA Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 2.6 2.2 4.6 6

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Student 3:

**Demographics:** Male, Academic course

**AMRP Scoring Sheet Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SC</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMRP Full Raw Score:** 48

**AMRP Total Percentage:** 60

### SARA Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th></th>
<th>AD</th>
<th></th>
<th>RP</th>
<th></th>
<th>RD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Student 4:

Demographics: Male, Standard course

AMRP Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL SC: 31
TOTAL VR: 26

PERCENT: 77.5
PERCENT: 65

AMRP Full Survey Raw Score: 57

AMRP Survey Total Percentage: 71.25

SARA Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th></th>
<th>AD</th>
<th></th>
<th>RP</th>
<th></th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 4.4 5.4 3.2 6

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Student 5:

**Demographics:** Female, Advanced Placement (Adv. P.) course

**AMRP Scoring Sheet Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>TOTAL VR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENT** 92.5  **PERCENT** 90

**AMRP Full Survey Raw Score:** 73

**AMRP Survey Total Percentage:** 91.25

**SARA Scoring Sheet Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Student 6:

Demographics: Male, Advanced Placement (Adv. P.) course

AMRP Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 3 RECODE</td>
<td>Q2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2</td>
<td>Q4 1 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 3 RECODE</td>
<td>Q6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q8 3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 3</td>
<td>Q10 2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 4</td>
<td>Q12 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 4</td>
<td>Q14 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 4 RECODE</td>
<td>Q16 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 2</td>
<td>Q18 2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 3</td>
<td>Q20 3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SC** 32 **TOTAL VR** 24

**PERCENT** 80 **PERCENT** 60

**AMRP Full Survey Raw Score:** 56

**AMRP Survey Total Percentage:** 70

### SARA Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Student 7:

**Demographics:** Male, Learning Support/Co-taught course

**AMRP Scoring Sheet Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2 RECODE</td>
<td>Q2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 4</td>
<td>Q4 1 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 3 RECODE</td>
<td>Q6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 3 RECODE</td>
<td>Q8 2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 3</td>
<td>Q10 3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 4</td>
<td>Q12 4 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 3</td>
<td>Q14 2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 2 RECODE</td>
<td>Q16 3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 1</td>
<td>Q18 2 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 2</td>
<td>Q20 3 RECODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SC 27</td>
<td>TOTAL VR 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT 67.5</td>
<td>PERCENT 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMRP Full Survey Raw Score:** 49

**AMRP Survey Total Percentage:** 61.25

### SARA Scoring Sheet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th></th>
<th>AD</th>
<th></th>
<th>RP</th>
<th></th>
<th>RD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AP = Academic Print; RP = Recreational Print; AD = Academic Digital; RD = Recreational Digital.
Appendix J: Transcript of Interview with Teacher 1

Transcript of Interview with Teacher 1

Certain words have been omitted or replaced from the following transcript so as not to reveal the identity of the teacher who volunteered to be interviewed.

Speaker 1: Do I have your permission to record this interview?
Speaker 2: Yes.
Speaker 1: All responses will be confidential, and only a pseudonym will be used in the analysis and when quoting from the transcripts. Any identifying information, including names, places, districts, schools, towns, and state will be omitted. The principal investigator, the transcriptionist provided by Rev.com, and I will be the only people with access to the recordings. The recordings and the transcriptions will be stored securely after they are transcribed. They will be destroyed five years after the completion of the research.

After the interview is complete and transcribed, I will provide you with a copy of the transcript via email for your review and feedback. Please review it and provide any feedback and/or suggestions within 10 days, and let me know any changes you would like to make. This interview is designed to last no longer than about 30 to 45 minutes. Do you have any questions at this time?

Speaker 2: No.

Speaker 1: Okay. Question number one. How long have you been teaching?
Speaker 2: This is my 14th year. Am I supposed to say what school district? Sorry, I know you're going to omit them, but you still want to know?
Speaker 1: How long have you been in this district?
Speaker 2: This is my 13th year in this district.
Speaker 1: What grade levels and subjects have you taught?

Speaker 2: In my 14 years total, I have taught from Kindergarten all the way up to seniors....

Speaker 1: What class and grade level do you teach now?

Speaker 2: Right now I have a...learning support English class, and then an, I guess,...[many levels], reading class.

Speaker 1: How long have you been teaching this class?

Speaker 2: The reading class, yeah, I guess. The reading class, this is my fourth year, and this is my fifth year of doing the learning support English at the secondary level.

Speaker 1: In what subject areas are you certified?

Speaker 2: Special Education K to 12, and a secondary English education.

Speaker 1: Question number two. How would you describe the terms reading motivation and reading attitude? Then, think about the importance these concepts have to teaching English Language Arts.

Speaker 2: Okay. Motivation I think is more the desire to not only become a better reader, but to gain knowledge from what they read, not just to read and get through it but to actually learn something from it. Reading attitude is more how they feel about it, regardless of their ability. Some students are low readers, yet they demonstrate the motivation to read and learn from what they're reading. Others do not really struggle with reading, but they have no desire to do so.

Working with mostly struggling readers, I have seen that motivation is highly important. Reading is difficult, and yet day after day they do what is asked of them with very little complaints. However, I have students who read at or above grade level who fight and resist their Language Arts assignments on a daily basis.
They receive a failing grade due to their unwillingness to complete the assignments and not actually reading ability.

Speaker 1: How much importance do you feel students place on completing English Language Arts assignments?

Speaker 2: My perspective is a little bit different, because it's always students who are struggling learners. Lower-functioning students and those whose reading level is far below grade level seem more motivated to complete their assignments. They're more concerned about missing assignments, and they ask about their grade more often. They express disappointment when their grade is low or if the reading level does not improve at their desired rate.

Students who are at grade level are aware that they're at grade level, and they are content with that. They very rarely ask for help on those assignments. It's almost as if it's okay to be failing a Language Arts class due to incomplete assignments, because as far as their peers are concerned, and image, it's not the reading ability. They could do it if they want to. There's just no motivation to do so.

Speaker 1: Are there certain assignments they value more highly than others, and how do you know which ones they value?

Speaker 2: They tend to value the ones that involve technology. This is just off the top of my head. I don't know if it's because it involves a laptop, and they can become consumed with what image they use, what other things they insert into the slides or the presentation. It's, I don't know, something they're more comfortable with. When they have to sit and sustain their attention, forget it.

Speaker 1: I can definitely see that.
Speaker 2: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 1: All right. Number four. How confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments, and how do you know who's confident and who is not?

Speaker 2: I struggle with the knowing who's confident. One would think that if the student enjoys the active reading, then completing Language Arts assignments would not be a problem. However, today's assignments seem to involve a deeper understanding and a sustained focus. Reading for pleasure is on their terms. The assignments that require them to analyze a text are not. Just because I observe a student who reads for pleasure does not mean that they are completing the assignments. Just because they do not ask me for help does not mean they are completing their assignments.

Speaker 1: Number five.

Speaker 2: This is the one I skipped, so I have to think about it.

Speaker 1: All right.

Speaker 2: Anything with those surveys, because a survey response is what I am getting from the students that I work with. Students have a high ... 

Speaker 1: The student reading motivation, which is called the AMRP. Those are the initials that describe it. The Adolescent Motivation Reading Profile. The results revealed that students held high expectancy beliefs, with an overall average of 77% or a little over three on a four-point scale, with four being the most positive. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities.
They're thinking it seems like-

Speaker 2: They're thinking that they can do it.

Speaker 1: They can do it. They feel the confidence that, "Yes, I can complete this. I can do it."

Speaker 2: "If I wanted to."

Speaker 1: Yeah, that's the thing.

Speaker 2: Yeah. It's a big connection to their motivation then, is what it's sounding like.

Speaker 1: Yeah.

Speaker 2: That's actually an answer that we get from our students when we talk to them about, "You're reading at grade level. Your Lexile was this. Why is it? How could you possibly be failing Language Arts if you're ...? We got a lot of, "I could do it if I wanted to. I'm just ... I'm not going to do it. I don't want to do it." I guess that's a strong connection which maybe shows that motivation is stronger, or lack of motivation.

Speaker 1: How would you encourage or maintain students' confidence in their ability to complete the reading-related assignments? Their confidence is high. How would you try to maintain that? How would you keep that from going down or slipping?

Speaker 2: You would think that just even reminding them that you need reading in all areas of life, not just to graduate high school or to pass eighth grade, but I don't know, because I'm struggling with motivating them as well.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number six.

Speaker 2: Okay, this is another survey question.

Speaker 1: This is the other half of the reading motivation, the AMRP, the reading profile.
Speaker 2: They think it's important. Is that what you're telling me?

Speaker 1: It's a little bit less. The student reading motivation survey AMRP results revealed that students held high task values for English Language Arts activities with an overall score of 67%, or somewhat below a three on a four-point scale, with a four being most positive. The score is high, but it's lower than the score for students' confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities, but at times they're not totally convinced that reading is important. Even though they feel like they could do it, they don't really feel like they should.

Speaker 2: Right. I think probably once they reach grade level, not so much at the elementary level but maybe here from eighth grade on up, what do they say the average newspaper is at, a third-grade reading level? For them, they've reached that point to where they can read pretty much anything they want as far as they're concerned at this point in their lives. Yeah, who cares? Why do we want to go higher than that? How do we….

Speaker 1: How do you think you would improve their value, their valuation, of reading? How would you get them to see that it's important, that you need to be able to do this?

Speaker 2: Do we maybe continue with reading-specific courses? I know English is supposed to cover that here, but it's also supposed to focus on writing. We have no reading courses after eighth grade, so it's like, "Well, if it's not important enough to have a reading class after eighth grade, then how important can it possibly be?"

Speaker 1: Good point.
Speaker 2: I think we need to keep going, but-

Speaker 1: No, I agree.

Speaker 2: Because in their mind, eighth grade stops at the eighth grade reading level. Everything I need to know in life I can do now, because I'm an eighth grade reader.

Speaker 1: All right. Number seven. What preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text? Do you feel students prefer print or digital texts for recreational reading?

Speaker 2: Recreational reading, I think they prefer digital, because it's all done on things that we associate with recreational, checking texts, checking their Facebook pages, any other kind of social media. Yeah, I guess they would say they prefer it, and students here are more comfortable with it, but I've never had a student, when I offered them a printed version, say, "Oh, can I read the digital version instead?" That might be specific to our school district because of how it is. I asked my...kids today, because some of them have higher Lexiles. They're like, "Oh yeah, we ..." I said, "If I wanted to give you an action story, and I didn't give you a packet," and I said, "We're just going to read it all on our laptops," they're like, "Oh yeah. The pictures are brighter." Life doesn't always present you with a photograph and images and everything that you read. I said, "Well, what if we took away all the pictures?" They're like, "Oh wow. I don't know then. We'd probably keep the packets."
Yeah, they probably tell you they prefer digital, but to actually take it seriously, I still think they prefer printed, but it could be that population of students. I don't know.

Speaker 1: Okay. All right. Number eight.

Speaker 2: Another survey question.

Speaker 1: Yeah, this is another one. This is the attitudes survey. The student reading attitude survey, S-A-R-A, the SARA, results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward Language Arts activities, with a score of four on a six-point scale, with a six being most positive. Breaking it down, there was clearly a positive attitude for recreational digital activities, with an overall score of 5.4 out of six. The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation, with both scoring four out of six. The results for students' attitudes towards academic print-related activities was the lowest, with a score of 3.4 out of six, meaning that overall-

Speaker 2: They liked digital.

Speaker 1: ... while they did not report overly negative feelings, they did not report overly positive feelings, either. What do you think of those results?

Speaker 2: Which was the lowest?

Speaker 1: The lowest was the academic print-related, and that was middling. It was three out of six. They weren't excited.

Speaker 2: If they're showing a preference for that and showing progress using that, there's no need to discontinue it, but I don't know. Maybe that's just my preference, too. I've seen too many kids become distracted by the digital text.
Speaker 1: Do you prefer the print text in class?

Speaker 2: I do. I prefer the print text in class, but maybe it's the population of students that I deal with. If I were to sit in an AP class, I might see something totally different. Least successful for motivating them to read for class. Do they really like independent reading, or am I missing that? Some do.

Speaker 1: Some like to read on their own.

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 1: Yeah.

Speaker 2: I think motivation comes from inside. I don't know. Maybe not hammering them with all these other labs. Maybe I think reading for pleasure and reading outside of class went by the wayside when we took away all their other time with labs and things geared towards standardized testing. If they had study halls minus laptops in front of them, they might be a little bit more motivated to read for class. I guess time, free time, free school time. Not home time, because I don't know. I think their lives are different when they go home, but study halls are when I used to do a lot of reading, and they don't have as many of them, and a laptop without any academic purpose is a distraction.

What do I feel is most successful for motivating them? I think variety. I think that's huge, and not just stories but different genres. That's what I've seen, because I have a different population, but I do try to mix it up, and I tell them that. "Okay, we're going to read a little bit of fiction, and then we're going to switch to non-fiction, and then we're going to start poetry, because we need to keep things
moving in here and look at different kinds of text, not just what we read in the
newspaper or from an in-class story." That seems to work.

Speaker 1: The variety?

Speaker 2: Because they tire of things. We've talked about [curriculum] and some other
programs that are great programs, but when they're presented with the same thing
over and over and over again, they are tired of it. They will flat out tell me,
"When are we going to stop doing this? Have you talked to your boss yet to see if
we don't have to do this anymore? What can we do? Did you find another
program?" Yeah, I think it's definitely variety.

Speaker 1: There any other strategies that you use in order to motivate them to read, to get
into their English Language Arts assignments?

Speaker 2: I don't have any. The students that I work with aren't that hard to motivate, not the
low-functioning students. I feel like they have more to gain. They're not there yet.
Maybe it's enough to think that their peers are at grade level and they're not, so
they want to get a little bit closer. This is high school. They want to be like
everybody else, so they're a little bit more intrinsically motivated, I think. I don't
know. Anything else?

Speaker 1: Is there an example of a time you felt successful at motivating students to read,
and why do you think your strategy worked? Is there a specific example you can
think of where somebody went from not wanting to do anything to doing
something because of something you might have done?

Speaker 2: Yes. I have a student who really fought her teachers every step of the way last
year. She was in regular. It was too hard for her. She was nowhere near reading at
her grade level. We brought her significantly down to a life skills class. We break everything down and we go a lot slower. Her stuff is adapted. From what I'm hearing, she is motivated. She feels better, and she feels confident, and her self-esteem is building, but that was a whole IEP team. We changed her whole schedule so that her material across the board wasn't so high. It wasn't the right ... It wasn't working for her. It wasn't at her level, and you need an IEP to do that.

Speaker 1:  All right. Thank you for participating.
Speaker 2: Mm-hmm (affirmative).
Speaker 1: I'll email a copy of your transcript and the initial analysis to you later in February so that you can review it and provide feedback or suggestions.
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Transcript of Interview with Teacher 2

Certain words have been omitted or replaced from the following transcript so as not to reveal the identity of the teacher who volunteered to be interviewed.

Speaker 1: Because your responses are important, and I want to make sure to capture everything you say, I would like to record our conversation today via digital audio. Do I have your permission to record this interview?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: All responses will be confidential, and only a pseudonym will be used in the analysis and when quoting from the transcripts. Any identifying information, including names, places, districts, schools, towns and state will be omitted. The principal investigator, the transcriptionist provided by Rev.com and I are the only people with access to the recordings. The recordings and the transcriptions will be stored securely after they are transcribed. They will be destroyed five years after the completion of this research.

After the interview is transcribed, I will provide you with a copy of the transcript via email for your review and feedback. Please review it and provide any feedback or suggestions within ten days and let me know any changes you would like to make.

This interview is designed to last no longer than about thirty to forty-five minutes.

Do you have any questions at this time?

Speaker 2: No.

Speaker 1: Question number one, how long have you been teaching?

Speaker 2: Ten years.
Speaker 1: How long have you been in this district?
Speaker 2: Nine years.
Speaker 1: What grade levels and subjects have you taught?
Speaker 2: Just in this district?
Speaker 1: Total, everywhere.
Speaker 2: Total? I've taught English in every grade except twelfth.
Speaker 1: Every high school grade?
Speaker 2: Yeah, every high school grade.
Speaker 1: Okay. What class and grade level do you teach now?
Speaker 2: I teach majority [one level of high school] English.
Speaker 1: How long have you been teaching this class?
Speaker 2: Five years.
Speaker 1: In what subject areas are you certified?
Speaker 2: Just English.
Speaker 1: How would you describe the terms reading motivation and reading attitude?
Speaker 2: At first glance, I saw a lot of similarities between the two, but then I thought the longer I've taught I've realized that attitude reflects motivation. So, in other words, if I, as the teacher, portray a positive reading attitude, the student motivation for reading increases.
Speaker 1: How important do you think that is to success in Language Arts?
Speaker 2: I think it's vital. I think if they're not interested at all in what they're reading. I think if the teacher's not interested and it's just something that he or she has to
cross off the curriculum list, and so they do it. Then I don't think the kids will be. You always have those kids that no matter what, they're interested in that subject, so they're personally motivated. But, in terms of having the class motivated, I don't think that you would in that case.

Speaker 1: Number three, how much importance do you feel students place on completing English Language Arts assignments? Are there certain assignments they value more highly than others, and how do you know?

Speaker 2: Throughout my career I have thought that students always put their math assignments ahead of the English Language Arts assignments, even if they favor English over math. That question had a little bit of irony for me because just about a month ago I overheard a student saying, we kind of had this conversation in my…class that I teach, and the one girl had said, "I love to read." She's like, "I read anything and everything. I read outside of school. I'd rather read outside of school." But, she said, "I complete my math assignments first and foremost because of those definitive answers and having to show the steps, and there's math homework every single night," so math always gets a priority.

If the kid had math homework and even a short story assigned to read, they would do the math before they read the story. I can't quite figure out, other than that when that student said that, I can't quite figure it out. The other part of the question, the certain assignments value more highly. The readers, the kids who I would call life-long readers who are already established and those interested in art, always do value those assignments more. That's what I see.
Speaker 1: Is there a certain type of assignment? Do they like assignments on, let's say, the computer, or in a book, or writing assignments?

Speaker 2: I don't know if it would matter. Writing assignments, definitely more because that's my focus in [this] grade, is the writing, so for me.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number four, how confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments? How do you know who is confident and who is not?

Speaker 2: The confident students are the ones who are motivated students. For the past three years the…classes I have are only academic students, so you would think or you would assume that all of them are there to study, learn and get good grades. And, every year, increasingly, I have very smart students that, we're into the third grading period, that have failed the first two grading periods to the point where I've gone to guidance and said, "Get this kid out of here if they're not going to utilize their abilities." So, most of them in the academic classes will complete them, but successfully, I see that diminishing every year.

Speaker 1: So, they seem to have less confidence that they can complete it?

Speaker 2: No, I don't think confidence is the issue. I think they're lazy, or unmotivated, to speak more formally.

Speaker 1: Number five, the student reading motivation survey, the AMRP results revealed that students held high expectancy beliefs with an overall score of 77%, or a little over three on a four point scale with four being most positive. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results? How would you maintain students’
confidence in their ability to complete reading-related assignments? Now, these were twelfth graders that I surveyed.

Speaker 2: Oh, okay.

Speaker 1: And overall they said, 77% it was, that they wouldn't have any problem completing a Language Arts assignment, that they were very confident that they would complete it successfully.

Speaker 2: Yeah, I agree with that. Like I said in the last statement, I don't think it's a confidence issue. I think it's a motivation issue and how successful do they really want to be. How to maintain their confidence? When we read something, I like to assign a narrative, creative piece of writing toward the beginning of the reading selection, whether we are mirroring the topic or trying to emulate the author's writing style, something to get them to make a connection. Sometimes we write in partners, but I always give the option to write on their own. That seems to get them going a little bit more.

Speaker 1: So, the opportunity for creativity?

Speaker 2: Yeah. It's a great conversation piece. Their confidence is not necessarily strong enough overall that I could say, "Okay, now we're going to read our stories to each other, to the class." They're at that embarrassing age, so that doesn't really work, but just so that they can talk about it with those that they want to, it's good for ...

Speaker 1: Okay, so if they can share it, then they're more interested?

Speaker 2: Right. Yeah.
Speaker 1: Number six, the student reading motivation survey, the AMRP, the other half of that same survey, results revealed that students held high task values for English Language Arts activities with an overall score of 67%, or somewhat below a three on a four point scale, with a four being most positive. The score is high, but it is lower than the score for students’ confidence in their abilities. This means students, overall, see the important of English language arts activities, but at times not all of them are convinced that reading is important. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students’ perceived importance of reading-related activities?

Speaker 2: I agree with the results. I could see that happening. The statement that says not all of them are convinced that reading is important, that one's a tough one because it's like whenever I tell kids, "You don't understand you need to be a reader for the rest of your life because you will read for the rest of your life." Many of them are like, "Nope, not going to happen. Like, I have a friend of mine who is a plumber," and I teach academic classes. So, a lot of kids in the academic classes, and I am being judgmental, but I've taught the academic kids for eight years, so stereotypically they're like, "Oh, no, I'm not going to be a plumber. That job would be beneath me." But, the plumber, chances are, is making twice as much money at his job as whatever they're choosing, but they don't see that. And they also don't see on the flip side that the plumber also has to read on a daily basis. I try to give them examples of things like that and more specific in the classroom. I just can't think of one, but I think they don't realize how centered their lives become around reading. Even the ones who are 120% motivated and they want to
be a doctor. Okay, well, you have to read theory and publish your own work. It never stops, and most jobs don't stop, or even if you're not working. You should be reading, even if you're reading the newspaper, you're reading. I try to convince that. They think just because I'm an English teacher when I say, "Reading, it doesn't matter what you read, you have to read and you'll get smarter." They don't necessarily see that, maybe someday, hopefully.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number seven, what preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text. Do you feel students prefer print or digital text for recreational reading? What format do students seem to prefer in the classroom? Do you prefer print text or digital text for use within the classroom?

Speaker 2: I always prefer print text, always, even in our age of technology. I just finished teaching a novel, actually, where I only had enough for a classroom set, but I had a PDF online. It was on Canvas, and so all the outside reading, which would have been more than half the novel, had to be done on the PDF. That was my only option because I really wanted to teach that book. Out of 63 students, I had two that preferred reading it on the computer.

Speaker 1: Wow.

Speaker 2: Yeah.

Speaker 1: All right. Now, why do you like to have the print text in your classroom? What would be some reasons why?

Speaker 2: The print text, not even so much the textbook. I've started to get printed-out copies made. Like, we're reading a play right now, and I got it printed front-to-back and stapled like it is a book. That way the kids can write in it and highlight
it. I think keeping that focus and making them, I wouldn't say full-fledged annotating as we read, but a little bit here and there, I think it makes them absorb it better. Otherwise, they're just sitting and scroll, scroll, scroll. I don't think they comprehend near as much. I hear it all the time, still. They've had their laptops. We've been one-to-one for how many years,…[a certain number of] years or something?

Speaker 1: Yeah, at least…[that number of years].

Speaker 2: At least [that number of] years, and repeatedly, "Why do we have to take tests online?" Which I don't even do anymore. I don't make tests online. When we go to take our…[state standardized] test, because I have…[a certain grade level] and we go down, and they don't like it. But 90% of them would rather have the booklet. "Why don't we have the story so that we can underline things and flip back through it?" Which, sure, all of that technology has the highlighters and the underline and everything, but the kids say it's not the same. They can't lay it out in front of them and see it, and I agree with that. I have a Kindle, I read on it, too. I'm not entirely against it all, but if I had to pick one, in a heartbeat we would get print.

Speaker 1: All right. Number eight, the Student Reading Attitude Survey, the SARA, results revealed that students had an overall positive attitude toward Language Arts activities with a score of four on a six point scale with a six being most positive. Breaking it down, there was clearly a positive attitude for recreational digital activities with an overall score of 5.4 out of 6. The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for
recreation, with both scoring four out of six. The results for students’ attitudes
toward academic print-related activities was the lowest with a score of 3.4 out of
6, meaning that overall, while they did not report overly negative feelings, they
also did not report overly positive feelings. What do you think of these results,
and what would you do to plan instruction to maintain or improve student reading
attitudes for class and for fun?

Speaker 2: Based on what I said in the last question, I'm surprised at the last result, the print-
related activities is 3.4 out of 6. We do some brainstorming on paper and then
they type when we do writing activities because that's just second nature to them
now, and I guess, maybe, online activities are also second nature to them. I always
survey my students to see what their preferences are. I surveyed them after we
finished this novel. That's how I learned those other results, and that's just what
I'm going to continue to do. I always watch what kids bring novels to class with
them that they're reading outside of class. I assign outside of class independent
reading and different projects. Whatever I can do to keep them interested in
reading, I'm willing to do.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number nine, what strategies do you feel are least successful at motivating
students to read for class? What have you seen in class that is not very successful
at motivating students?

Speaker 2: To read? I would say when I'm not motivated about what we're reading, then
they're not going to be as motivated. I know I kind of mentioned that earlier, too.
That's what I try to look at every year. I do a student interest survey at the
beginning of the year. Before our purchase orders go in, I get together with other
teachers and we talk about different short stories and novels, like, "What do we read in class?" We talk about what didn't have any interest, and then we look at the skills that are in that selection, and then we sit and brainstorm, like, "Okay, well, what stories do we know that we can cover these ideals, but would be of higher interest?"

Speaker 1: Okay, so like their topic.

Speaker 2: I think the communication. Yeah, the same topic. Communicating, I think, is key. I think it helps a lot.

Speaker 1: Okay, so student input helps a lot in determining what kinds of things they like to read about.

Speaker 2: Yeah. I think I kind of led into the next question.

Speaker 1: All right. The last one is number ten, what strategies do you feel are most successful at motivating students to read for class? Describe an example of a time where you felt successful at motivating students to read, and why do you think that strategy was successful? How did you know you were successful? Maybe if you could think of one particular student who was having a hard time, they didn't want to do it, but then you did something to get them interested.

Speaker 2: The first one, what strategies are most successful? I talk about books every day with kids, whether it's something I just see with someone's stuff and I ask them about their book. I like to take books from my classroom library shelf and if we have some free time I'll be like, "Hey, I read this book. Here's what it's about. It was really good." We've even on the flip side, we've like, "No, don't ever read this book. It's not good." The example, the last book that we read. It's called...
title]. It takes place in 2041. It's virtual reality. It has a lot of references to the 80s.
It's about a kid who loves video games.
I read it last year, so I taught it this year because I told the kids, I said, "I don't
play video games. I don't like them. I would not spend my free time playing video
games." I said, "But the fact that this is a main symbol in the book, it didn't bother
me. I couldn't wait to finish the book." It's like an action adventure, which we
don't have many action adventure stories in our literature book or in our other
novel options. So, I was like, "Just give this a shot. Let's just try it." And by the
time we were done reading it, we just went to the library last week to get books
for an independent project I assigned, and the kids said, "Hey, do you think they
have that book that the same author, of…[novel title], read?" Because, yeah, he's
like, "I liked it and I want to read this guy's other stuff," so I thought, "Good."
Anything that I can try to make a connection, even though it sounds negative. It's
like, "Even if you don't like this, here is something that you might like about it,"

Speaker 1: Okay, so different genres, and even books by the same author they're interested.
Speaker 2: Yep.
Speaker 1: All right. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Speaker 2: I can't think of anything.
Speaker 1: Thank you for participating. I'll email a copy of your transcript and the initial analysis to you later in February, 2017 so that you can review it and provide feedback or suggestions.

Speaker 2: Thanks.
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Transcript of Interview with Teacher 3

Certain words have been omitted or replaced from the following transcript so as not to reveal the identity of the teacher who volunteered to be interviewed.

Speaker 1: Because your responses are important and I want to make sure to capture everything you say, I would like to record our conversation today via digital audio. Do I have your permission to record this interview?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: All responses will be confidential and only a pseudonym will be used in the analysis and when quoting from the transcripts. Any identifying information, including names, places, district, schools, towns, and state, will be omitted. The principal investigator, the transcriptionist provided by Rev.com, and I will be the only people with access to the recordings. The recordings and the transcriptions will be stored securely after they are transcribed. They will be destroyed five years after the completion of this research.

After the interview is transcribed, I will provide you with a copy of the transcript via email for your review and feedback. Please review it and provide any feedback and/or suggestions within ten days and let me know any changes you would like to make.

This interview is designed to last no longer than about thirty to forty-five minutes.

Do you have any questions at this time?

Speaker 2: No.

Speaker 1: Question number one. How long have you been teaching?

Speaker 2: Twenty-six years.
Speaker 1: How long have you been in this district?

Speaker 2: Twenty-four.

Speaker 1: What grade levels and subjects have you taught?

Speaker 2: Grades eight through twelve. English Language Arts.

Speaker 1: What class and grade level do you teach now?

Speaker 2: [a certain] grade [of high school] English.

Speaker 1: How long have you been teaching this class?

Speaker 2: Six years.

Speaker 1: In what subject areas are you certified?

Speaker 2: Secondary English education.

Speaker 1: How would you describe the terms reading motivation and reading attitude?

   Describe the importance these concepts have to teaching English Language Arts.

Speaker 2: I would describe reading motivation as the reason someone reads and reading attitude as the feeling someone has about reading. Reading motivation doesn't seem to vary for students in the ELA classrooms. They are motivated to read to pass the class or pass the test. Reading attitude is the same for almost all of the students and it's generally negative. Although students are motivated to read for the grade on the test, their negative attitudes tend to sabotage their success.

Speaker 1: Okay. So you think that reading attitude and reading motivation go together pretty closely?

Speaker 2: Yes.
Speaker 1: Okay. Number three. How much importance do you feel students place on completing English Language Arts assignments? Are there certain assignments they value more highly than others, and how do you know?

Speaker 2: I feel that students place a lot of importance on completing English Language Arts assignments for the grade, but not for the knowledge gained. They value objective assignments more than subjective assignments. They want to answer pointed and specific questions, not close reading or annotations or reflect and write. They always want to know if their answers are right, not thorough. They want short recall questions and answers, not ones needing textual evidence.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number four. How confident do you feel students are that they will successfully complete English Language Arts assignments, and how do you know who is confident and who is not?

Speaker 2: I feel confident that they will successfully complete the English Language Arts assignments because they were front loaded with the information and they value their grades. I know who is confident and who is not by the amount of times I'm asked, "Am I doing this right?" These are students who are not confident, but who I know will successfully complete the assignments.

Speaker 1: Do you think students, in general, are confident that they're going to complete the assignment, that they have that confidence to actually begin the assignment and say, "Yeah, I can do this"?

Speaker 2: More so the standard level students, not the academic, because they're more driven by the grade. I think they want to have a perfect completion of the assignment.
Speaker 1: Okay. Number five. The student reading motivation survey, the AMRP, results revealed that students held high expectancy beliefs, with an overall score of 77%, or a little over a three on a four point scale, with a four being most positive. This means students have confidence in their success at completing English Language Arts activities. What do you think of these results and how would you maintain students' confidence in their ability to complete reading related assignments?

Speaker 2: I think I agree with these results because very few of my students in both the academic and standard classes do not complete their ELA activities. I would maintain students' confidence in their ability to complete their reading related assignments by creating assignments that are not requiring short right or wrong answers, but answers that require close reading and annotations.

Speaker 1: Okay. All right. Number six. The student reading motivation survey, the AMRP, results revealed that students held high task values for English Language Arts activities, with an overall score of 67%, or somewhat below a three on a four point scale, with a four being most positive. The score is high, but it is lower than the score for students' confidence in their abilities. This means students overall see the importance of English Language Arts activities but, at times, not all of them are convinced that reading is important. What do you think of these results? How would you develop students' perceived importance of reading related activities?

Speaker 2: I would agree with the results because students do not display that reading is important in my classroom. They rush through reading assignments, they skim and scan for information, they ignore written instructions and directions, and they
don't even read popups and warnings on computers before hitting the 'Next' button. I tried to develop their perceived importance of reading related activities by modeling reading, requiring annotation of text, stressing the benefit of re-reading passages, playing audio versions of the author reading his or her work so that they can hear what the author intended the poem or the passage to sound like, and allowing or accepting different interpretations of text as long as there is textual evidence for support.

Speaker 1: Okay. Do you think that they think they will ever use reading for anything when they graduate?

Speaker 2: Honestly, no. I think they think they will use it in college to continue education, but not once they get into their selected career.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number seven. What preferences do you feel students have concerning print text versus digital text? Do you feel students prefer print or digital text for recreational reading? Which format do students seem to prefer in the classroom? Do you prefer print text or digital text for use within the classroom, and why?

Speaker 2: I feel that students' preference is print text for both classroom and recreational reading. With every reading assignment, I provide the online textbook access and the PDF upload for novels and at times have not even distributed print books. Almost always, students request that they have a print book to read, both in and out of the classroom. I see many students reading for pleasure and I witness few to none who are reading a digital version of their book. I prefer print text for use within my classroom because it's easier for all of us to reference quotations, stanzas, passages, pages, et cetera, within a printed text.
versus a digital version. There's less lag time in loading and scrolling when you can open up a book to a specific page, stanza, or paragraph.

Speaker 1: Okay. So it's easier to find a way around in a print book?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Okay. Do your kids like to mark the paper?

Speaker 2: Yes. Yes. When I have something I really require annotations, I'll just copy and paste the page from the PDF version and give them a printed copy so they can highlight or mark.

Speaker 1: Okay. Number eight. The student reading attitude survey, the SARA, results reveal that students had an overall positive attitude toward Language Arts activities with a score of four on a six point scale, with a six being most positive. Breaking it down, there was clearly a positive attitude for recreational digital activities, with an overall score of 5.4 out of 6. The results for academic digital activities was also positive, as were the results for reading printed text for recreation, with both scoring 4 out of 6. The results for students' attitudes toward academic print related activities was the lowest, with a score of 3.4 out of 6, meaning that overall, while they did not report overly negative feelings, they also did not report overly positive feelings. What do you think of these results? What would you do to plan instruction that would maintain or improve student reading attitudes for class and for fun?

Speaker 2: The results don't surprise me. Overall, I think that students have neither a negative nor a positive attitude towards the academic print related activities in general. Most of them see it as work, not fun, and will complete what is asked for the
grade that is attached, but are often reluctant to enjoy the activity because they see
it as classroom work and a grade that will be earned.

I plan instruction that hopefully maintains and improves student reading attitudes
by using groups, audiobooks, contemporary companion texts, modern film clips,
and most importantly, by showing them my positive attitude in relationship to my
characters, the storyline, et cetera.

Speaker 1: Okay. So you like to model the positive attitude and show them?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 2: I almost, at times, bring the characters to life. I'm goofy and pretend they're my
friends. And I know that-

Speaker 1: Does that help them get into it more?

Speaker 2: Some. Especially the old…literature…because a lot of them can't even think of
that time.

Speaker 1: Do you think that helps them kind of picture it a little bit better?

Speaker 2: Yeah. I do. That's where I find video clips that are maybe portions of old films or
something that's a modern retake on something, and kind of pulls them in a little
more.

Speaker 1: Now, is your class…[a certain genre]?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 2: Yes.
Speaker 1: All right. Number nine. What strategies do you feel are least successful at motivating students to read for class?

Speaker 2: I feel that using study guides, reading checks, discussion boards, are the least successful at motivating my students to read for class. They can find answers and almost buffalo their way through these assignments to satisfy the requirement. These strategies don't motivate them to actually read the text.

Speaker 1: Okay. Why do you think they don't like discussion boards? Do they…

Speaker 2: I think because they consider it to be another writing assignment that has very specific requirements with length or number of responses. If I use the exact same question in a group discussion, they can answer it much better than on an online discussion board.

Speaker 1: Okay. Why don't you feel discussion boards are motivating students to read?

Speaker 2: By the time they're in…[this] grade, it seems as if the novelty of the discussion board has worn off and they don't like the restrictive requirements. Plus, even using the computers within the classroom, they prefer the books, they prefer the papers. It's just a toy to them at this point. They want the actual hard copy books, papers.

Speaker 1: So, they take the papers more seriously.

Speaker 2: I think so. I think so. I think I instruct differently because I'm not as concerned of what they're not paying ... How do I want to say this? I'm concerned of what they're paying attention to when they're on the computer. When they have the paper, I know it's the paper. Online, I have to be monitoring and I'm distracted by what they have on their screens.
Speaker 1: Okay. All right. Number ten. What strategies do you feel are most successful at motivating students to read for class? Describe an example of a time where you felt successful at motivating students to read? Why do you think the strategy was successful, and how did you know you were successful?

Speaker 2: The strategies that I feel are most successful at motivating students to read are the assignments that require students to reflect and connect to the reading. Writing reflection journals or responding to prompts to make connections to their lives seems to motivate them to read because they know they must have evidence from the reading beyond superficial details and summaries.

An example of a time where I felt successful at motivating students to read was assigning reflection journals for...[a novel title]. Each entry required the students to connect to the literature with a quote, a movie, a song, or a life event. They had to read the literature to make authentic connections.

I know that I was successful because those who did well on the journal entries actually read beyond details for study guide questions. Yes, there were a number of students who do not read or read well and the reflection in their journal was poorly written and the grade was low. They admitted that they should have read because it wasn't a matter of Googling answers or reading Spark Notes to obtain a summary.

Speaker 1: Okay. Were there a lot of students that were just kind of trying to look for answers online?

Speaker 2: Yes. Yes. Each journal reflection had a, like I said, a quote or a lyric or something from a piece of literature, if you will, unrelated and they had to provide the
connection. They couldn't just Google an answer. They had to actually go and read another piece of literature, a poem, or even a song lyric, or even a quote by someone, and relate both.

Speaker 1: Okay. Do you think that the creativity, the opportunity for creativity, the reaction and the connection, do those have any ... Do you think that was a big motivator for them?

Speaker 2: Yeah. At least for my academic kids, it seemed to give a lot of them an outlet to say things that they would want to in class discussion, but couldn't because it was too public then. But with a journal, it was private. A lot of them shared poems that they had written. They were kind of like the ones that they were reading, like modeled. I mean, they weren't great, but they were at least connecting. Yeah. There was a lot of creativity. There was a lot more effort in that than anything that I've ever assigned as a companion to the reading.

Speaker 1: Okay. All right. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Speaker 2: I can't think of anything.

Speaker 1: Okay. Thank you for participating. I'll email a copy of your transcript and the initial analysis to you later in February, 2017 so that you can review it and provide feedback or suggestions.

Speaker 2: Okay. Thank you.
### Appendix M: Chapter Four Teacher Interview Quotes

#### Chapter Four Teacher Interview Quotes

**Table 17**

*Teachers’ Observations on Task-Value in General*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Data Concerning Teachers’ Task-Value Comments in General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think probably once they reach grade level, not so much at the elementary level but maybe here from eighth grade on up, what do they say the average newspaper is at, a third-grade reading level? For them, they've reached that point to where they can read pretty much anything they want as far as they're concerned at this point in their lives. Yeah, who cares? Why do we want to go higher than that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>For the past three years, the...classes I have are only academic students, so you would think, or you would assume that all of them are there to study, learn, and get good grades. And, every year, increasingly, I have very smart students that, we're into the third grading period, that have failed the first two grading periods to the point where I've gone to Guidance and said, &quot;Get this kid out of here if they're not going to utilize their abilities.&quot; So, most of them in the academic classes will complete them, but successfully, I see that diminishing every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students do not display that reading is important in my classroom. They rush through reading assignments, they skim and scan for information, they ignore written instructions and directions, and they don't even read popups and warnings on computers before hitting the 'Next' button.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[Students] tend to value [ELA activities] that involve technology. This is just off the top of my head. I don't know if it's because it involves a laptop, and they can become consumed with what image they use, what other things they insert into the slides or the presentation. It's, I don't know, something they're more comfortable with. When they have to sit and sustain their attention, forget it.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout my career I have thought that students always put their math assignments ahead of the English Language Arts assignments, even if they favor English over math...Just about a month ago, I overheard a student saying, we kind of had this conversation in my...class...and the one girl had said, "I love to read." She's like, "I read anything and everything. I read outside of school. I'd rather read outside of school." But, she said, "I complete my math assignments first and foremost because of those definitive answers and having to show the steps, and there's math homework every single night," so math always gets a priority.
Table 18

Teacher 2's Perceptions of Students’ Task-Values and Future Selves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Data for Teacher 2’s Perceptions of Students’ Task-Values and Future Selves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I try to give them examples of things like that and more specific in the classroom. I just can't think of one, but I think they don't realize how centered their lives become around reading. Even the ones who are 120% motivated and they want to be a doctor. Okay, well, you have to read theory and publish your own work. It never stops, and most jobs don't stop, or even if you're not working. You should be reading, even if you're reading the newspaper, you're reading. I try to convince them of that. They think just because I'm an English teacher when I say, &quot;Reading, it doesn't matter what you read, you have to read and you'll get smarter.&quot; They don't necessarily see that, maybe someday, hopefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have a friend of mine who is a plumber, and I teach academic classes. So, a lot of kids in the academic classes, and I am being judgmental, but I've taught the academic kids for eight years, so stereotypically they're like, &quot;Oh, no, I'm not going to be a plumber. That job would be beneath me.&quot; But, the plumber, chances are, is making twice as much money at his job as whatever they're choosing, but they don't see that. And they also don't see on the flip side that the plumber also has to read on a daily basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

**Teachers’ Perceptions of Aliteracy and Extrinsic Motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Data from Teacher Interviews Concerning Aliteracy and Extrinsic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>That's actually an answer that we get from our students when we talk to them about, &quot;You're reading at grade level. Your Lexile was this. Why is it? How could you possibly be failing Language Arts if you're ...? We got a lot of, &quot;I could do it if I wanted to. I'm just ... I'm not going to do it. I don't want to do it.&quot; I guess that's a strong connection which maybe shows that motivation is stronger, or lack of motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For the past three years, the...classes I have are only academic students, so you would think or you would assume that all of them are there to study, learn and get good grades. And, every year, increasingly, I have very smart students that, we're into the third grading period, that have failed the first two grading periods to the point where I've gone to Guidance and said, &quot;Get this kid out of here if they're not going to utilize their abilities.&quot; So, most of them in the Academic classes will complete them, but successfully, I see that diminishing every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most of them see [reading and writing] as work, not fun, and will complete what is asked for the grade that is attached, but are often reluctant to enjoy the activity because they see it as classroom work and a grade that will be earned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

**Teachers’ Perceptions of Struggling Students’ Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Data Concerning Struggling Students’ Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[They] aren't that hard to motivate, not the low-functioning students. I feel like they have more to gain. They're not there yet. Maybe it's enough to think that their peers are at grade level and they're not, so they want to get a little bit closer. This is high school. They want to be like everybody else, so they're a little bit more intrinsically motivated, I think. I don't know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

**Teachers’ Perceptions of Students’ Expectancy-Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Data for Teachers’ Perceptions of Students’ Expectancy Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I know who is confident and who is not by the amount of times I'm asked, &quot;Am I doing this right?&quot; These are students who are not confident, but who I know will successfully complete the assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I struggle with the knowing who's confident...Just because I observe a student who reads for pleasure does not mean that they are completing the assignments. Just because they do not ask me for help does not mean they are completing their assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

*Teachers’ Perceptions of Students’ Reading Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Data Concerning Students’ Reading Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I asked my…kids today, because some of them have higher Lexiles.... I said, &quot;If I wanted to give you an action story, and I didn't give you a packet,&quot; and I said, &quot;We're just going to read it all on our laptops,&quot; they're like, &quot;Oh yeah. The pictures are brighter.&quot; Life doesn't always present you with a photograph and images and everything that you read. I said, &quot;Well, what if we took away all the pictures?&quot; They're like, &quot;Oh wow. I don't know then. We'd probably keep the packets.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yeah, I guess they would say they prefer it, and students here are more comfortable with it, but I've never had a student, when I offered them a printed version, say, &quot;Oh, can I read the digital version instead?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don't know if it's because it involves a laptop, and they can become consumed with what image they use, what other things they insert into the slides or the presentation. It's, I don't know, something they're more comfortable with. When they have to sit and sustain their attention, forget it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a Kindle, I read on it, too. I'm not entirely against it all, but if I had to pick one, in a heartbeat we would get print. I always prefer print text, always, even in our age of technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I've started to get printed-out copies made. Like, we're reading a play right now, and I got it printed front-to-back and stapled like it is a book. That way the kids can write in it and highlight it. I think keeping that focus and…annotating as we read…, I think it makes them absorb it better. Otherwise, they're just sitting and scroll, scroll, scroll. I don't think they comprehend near as much. I hear it all the time, still.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sure, all of that technology has the highlighters and the underline and everything, but the kids say it's not the same. They can't lay it out in front of them and see it, and I agree with that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>When we go to take our [state standardized online] test, because I have… [students] and we go down [to take the test], and they don't like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think I instruct differently because I'm not as concerned with what they're not paying... How do I want to say this? I'm concerned with what they're paying attention to when they're on the computer. When they have the paper, I know it's the paper. Online, I have to be monitoring and I'm distracted by what they have on their screens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I prefer print text for use within my classroom because it's easier for all of us to reference quotations, stanzas, passages, pages, et cetera, within a printed text versus a digital version. There's less lag time in loading and scrolling when you can open up a book to a specific page, stanza, or paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>With every reading assignment, I provide the online textbook access and the PDF upload for novels and at times have not even distributed print books. Almost always, students request that they have a print book to read, both in and out of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

*Teachers Use Variety and Novelty to Motivate Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Data Supporting the Use of Variety and Novelty in Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>What do I feel is most successful for motivating them? I think variety. I think that's huge, and not just stories, but different genres. That's what I've seen, because I have a different population, but I do try to mix it up, and I tell them that. &quot;Okay, we're going to read a little bit of fiction, and then we're going to switch to non-fiction, and then we're going to start poetry, because we need to keep things moving in here and look at different kinds of text, not just what we read in the newspaper or from an in-class story.&quot; That seems to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Because they tire of things. We've talked about [a popular reading program] and some other programs that are great programs, but when they're presented with the same thing over and over and over again, they are tired of it. They will flat out tell me, &quot;When are we going to stop doing this? Have you talked to your boss yet to see if we don't have to do this anymore? What can we do? Did you find another program?&quot; Yeah, I think it's definitely variety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[One] class that I teach, the novels I select, I try to select a different genre or something with a completely different perspective just so that the kids will branch out a little bit and see different styles. So, I hope it works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel that using study guides, reading checks, discussion boards, are the least successful at motivating my students to read for class. They can find answers and almost buffalo their way through these assignments to satisfy the requirement. These strategies don't motivate them to actually read the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

*Teacher 2 Models Positive Reading Motivation and Reading Attitude*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Teacher 2’s Data Concerning Modeling of Reading Motivation and Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think if the teacher's not interested and it's just something that he or she has to cross off the curriculum list, and so they do it...[half-heartedly]. Then I don't think the kids will be...[motivated to read]. You always have those kids that no matter what, they're interested in that subject, so they're personally motivated. But, in terms of having the class motivated, I don't think that you would in that case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like to take books from my classroom library shelf and if we have some free time I'll be like, &quot;Hey, I read this book. Here's what it's about. It was really good.&quot; We've even on the flip side...[said], &quot;No, don't ever read this book. It's not good.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

*Teachers Encourage Creativity and Sharing to Motivate Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Data Concerning Creativity and Sharing to Motivate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Their confidence is not necessarily strong enough overall that I could say, &quot;Okay, now we're going to read our stories to each other, to the class.&quot; They're at that embarrassing age, so that doesn't really work, but just so that they can talk about it with those [students] that they want to…[talk about it with].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes we write in partners, but I always give the option to write on their own. That seems to get them going a little bit more.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>At least for my academic kids, it seemed to give a lot of them an outlet to say things that they would want to in class discussion, but couldn't because it was too public then. But with a journal, it was private. A lot of them shared poems that they had written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kind of like the ones that they were reading, like [the ones] modeled. I mean, [the ones written by students] weren't great, but they were at least connecting. Yeah. There was a lot of creativity. There was a lot more effort in that than anything that I've ever assigned as a companion to the reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 26

**Teacher 3 Provides Opportunities for Reflection and Connection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Teacher 3 Data Concerning Reflection and Connection to Increase Reading Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At least for my academic kids, it seemed to give a lot of them an outlet to say things that they would want to in class discussion, but couldn't because it was too public then. But with a journal, it was private. A lot of them shared poems that they had written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kind of like the ones that they were reading, like [the ones] modeled. I mean, [the ones written by students] weren't great, but they were at least connecting. Yeah. There was a lot of creativity. There was a lot more effort in that than anything that I've ever assigned as a companion to the reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>An example of a time where I felt successful at motivating students to read was assigning reflection journals for [the novel]. Each entry required the students to connect to the literature with a quote, a movie, a song, or a life event. They had to read the literature to make authentic connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Writing reflection journals or responding to prompts to make connections to their lives seems to motivate them to read because they know they must have evidence from the reading beyond superficial details and summaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher 3: I know that I was successful because those who did well on the journal entries actually read beyond details for study guide questions. Yes, there were a number of students who do not read or read well and the reflection in their journal was poorly written and the grade was low. They admitted that they should have read because it wasn't a matter of Googling answers or reading Spark Notes to obtain a summary. Researcher: Were there a lot of students…trying to look for answers online? Teacher 3: Yes. Yes. Each journal reflection had a, like I said, a quote or a lyric or something from a piece of literature, if you will, unrelated and they had to provide the connection. They couldn't just Google an answer. They had to actually go and read another piece of literature, a poem, or even a song lyric, or even a quote by someone, and relate both.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

**Teacher 2 Created Situational Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Teacher 2 Data Concerning Situational Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The last book that we read. It's called [novel title]. It takes place in 2041. It's virtual reality. It has a lot of references to the 80s. It's about a kid who loves video games. I read it last year, so I taught it this year… I told the kids,…&quot;I don't play video games. I don't like them. I would not spend my free time playing video games.&quot; I said, &quot;But the fact that this is a main symbol in the book, it didn't bother me. I couldn't wait to finish the book.&quot; It's like an action adventure, which we don't have many action adventure stories in our literature book or in our other novel options. So, I was like, &quot;Just give this a shot. Let's just try it.&quot; And by the time we were done reading it, we just went to the library last week to get books for an independent project I assigned, and the kids said, &quot;Hey, do you think they have that book that the same author, of [the novel], read?&quot; Because, yeah, he's like, &quot;I liked it and I want to read this guy's other stuff,&quot; so I thought, &quot;Good.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anything that I can try to make a connection, even though it sounds negative. It's like, &quot;Even if you don't like this, here is something that you might like about it,&quot; to try to get the kids to branch out…. The novels I select, I try to select a different genre or something with a completely different perspective just so that the kids will branch out a little bit and see different styles. So, I hope it works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

**Teachers Customize Curriculum to Fit Students’ Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Data Concerning How Teachers Customize Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a student who really fought her teachers every step of the way last year… It was too hard for her. She was nowhere near reading at her grade level. We brought her significantly down to a life skills class. We break everything down and we go a lot slower. Her…[work] is adapted. From what I'm hearing, she is motivated. She feels better, and she feels confident, and her self-esteem is building, but that was a whole IEP team. We changed her whole schedule so that her material across the board wasn't so high. It wasn't the right... It wasn't working for her. It wasn't at her level, and you need an IEP to do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Before our purchase orders go in, I get together with other teachers and we talk about different short stories and novels, like, &quot;What do we read in class?&quot; We talk about what didn't have any interest, and then we look at the skills that are in that selection, and then we sit and brainstorm, like, &quot;Okay, well, what stories do we know that…can cover these ideals, but would be of higher interest?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29

*Teachers’ Data Concerning Students’ Reading Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher #</th>
<th>Quote #</th>
<th>Teachers’ Data Concerning Students’ Reading Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1         | 1       | Yeah, I guess they would say they prefer it, and students here are more comfortable with it, but I've never had a student, when I offered them a printed version, say, "Oh, can I read the digital version instead?"
| 1         | 2       | Yeah, they probably tell you they prefer digital, but to actually take it seriously, I still think they prefer printed, but it could be that population of students. I don't know. |
| 3         | 1       | Most of them see it as work, not fun, and will complete what is asked for the grade that is attached, but are often reluctant to enjoy the activity because they see it as classroom work and a grade that will be earned. |