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ABSTRACT

This study sought to explore reading motivational practices implemented in local, primary (kindergarten-second) classrooms. The purpose for this study was to fill an existing gap in the literature pertaining to reading motivation in the early grades. The recent adoption of the Alabama College and Career Readiness Standards requires even our youngest students to engage with more complex texts across a variety of genres. In order to build stamina with such texts, reading motivation must be considered in classroom instructional practices.

This study initiated with a survey of all local primary teachers, followed by interviews and observations with local Teacher-of-the-Year nominees. Data was coded and themed in order to present classroom instructional findings as they pertain to motivating students to read. Reading motivation is directly linked to student academic achievement and has been shown to decrease beginning as early as the second grade. Therefore, this study on reading motivation was both timely and necessary.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In my experience as a kindergarten teacher, I have often wondered why many of my students, even as young as five and six years old, do not seem to enjoy reading or learning to read. Making reading enjoyable and helping my young students develop a love of reading is one of the most important goals I set each year. At the school where I work as a primary grade teacher, there have been numerous initiatives over the years attempting to motivate young children to read. Despite these well-intentioned efforts, however, there seems to be little if any real change in the children’s motivation and love of reading, at least from my own anecdotal observations.

The role that motivation plays in the reading achievement of students is certainly substantiated in the field of literacy education (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010). Children who independently read make greater gains in reading achievement, which subsequently serves them well for future academic success (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010). Not only do students achieve at a higher level in reading, but students will read more when they actually enjoy reading (Gambrell, 2015). Consequently, it can be concluded that the benefit of being an independent and motivated reader in the primary grades is crucial to the overall success of children in school. Gambrell (2015) suggested that reading motivation should be treated just as importantly as reading proficiency. In other words, it is not enough to simply teach the skills needed to read. Rather, it is vital that reading skills be taught in coordination with practices which motivate students to put
those reading skills to use and to read on their own (Gambrell, 2015). When teachers support the reading motivations of their students and use practices which support students’ reading proficiency, students’ potential for future academic success increases (Gambrell, 2015).

Not only is reading motivation a key to overall academic success, but research also indicates that reading motivation often decreases in the upper elementary grades (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), leaving even the most highly skilled elementary and high school teachers frustrated about how to support those students who are reluctant readers (Applegate & Applegate, 2010). Given the research that places importance upon reading motivation and its role in the overall achievement of children in school, decreases in motivation to read as children progress through school is problematic. Compounding the problem, is the fact that what happens in primary grade classrooms with respect to teaching reading motivational practices is unclear.

While the lack of clarity on what reading motivational practices are being enacted in the primary classrooms is certainly problematic, the current educational landscape only exacerbates this issue further. More specifically, the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (2010) across the United States placed increased demands upon teachers to teach children to become skilled readers of complex texts across a variety of genres and disciplines (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). The increased demands also place greater emphasis upon reading more challenging texts with young children (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Gambrell (2005) stated, “In U.S. classrooms and in the U.S. culture, informational text is becoming more and more important” (p. 590). Further, the rigorous demands hold true for teachers in Alabama with the adoption of the College and Career Readiness Standards (2010) in 2010, which closely mirror the Common Core State Standards.
As such, primary grade teachers in Alabama are also faced with the challenges associated with supporting their young readers to become skilled processors of complex texts across a variety of disciplines (College and Career Readiness Standards, 2010).

Given that teachers are tasked with teaching children to process a variety of complex texts, it seems important to also ask how these teachers are motivating young children to read and tackle such texts. Therefore, this study explored how local primary-grade teachers support the reading motivation of young children in the classroom.

**Reading Motivation**

In order to investigate the practices enacted to support students in becoming motivated readers, it is important to understand how reading motivation is conceptualized. Reading motivation is defined by Urdan and Schoenfelder (2006) as being a willingness to engage and persist in a reading activity even when it is difficult. Cambria and Guthrie (2010) characterized reading motivation as “the values, beliefs, and behaviors surrounding reading for an individual” (p. 16). These reading values and beliefs and behaviors surround the process, goals, and end results of any given reading task for an individual (Carlson, 2011). Therefore, it is important for teachers to understand that reading motivation for every student will be different (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). For example, students’ different reading experiences and values surrounding reading and beliefs about what reading is and can do all culminate impact any given reading task.

The importance of motivation in reading implies that teachers must not only equip students with the skills necessary for reading, but they should also implement practices that spark an inner desire to read independently (Watkins & Coffey, 2004). In other words, it will not suffice to solely teach a child how to read. Rather, teachers must also make concerted efforts in their classroom practices to help children foster a love of reading (Hiebert, 2009). Accordingly, it
was my interest in primary grade teachers’ motivational practices that provoked this particular study.

**Statement of the Problem**

Marinak, Malloy, Gambrell and Mazzoni’s (2015) work noted that reading motivation can begin to erode as early as second grade. In Guthrie, McRae and Klauda’s (2007) survey of fourth grade students, 65% reported they did not choose reading as a favorite activity. “These statistics indicate that a substantial majority of grade four students are not intrinsically motivated to read” (Guthrie et al., 2007, p. 237). The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) also reported a decrease in grade four students’ motivation to read from 2002 to 2005 (Perie, Grigg, & Donahue, 2005), further highlighting the lack of motivation to read as students progress through school.

The focus on reading motivation research has primarily focused on students who are in the upper-elementary through high school grades (Baker, Dreher, & Guthrie, 2000; Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Marinak et al. (2015) reinforced that a gap exists in the literature pertaining to reading motivation for students in grades kindergarten through second. This gap is distressing given the role motivation plays in students’ academic achievement (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010).

Understanding the practices that teachers are implementing to circumvent a lack of reading motivation and meet the rigorous educational standards is necessary, since the impact of reading motivation on achievement outcomes affects students both early in elementary school and later in college and career readiness (Common Core State Standards, 2010). If children are to be prepared to be successful in the years to come, reading motivation in the early grades must be studied to gain a better understanding of how classrooms can foster a lifetime love of reading.
Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate how primary-grade teachers support reading motivation in young children. The lack of literature pertaining to this topic along with the increased reading demands in place with the new Common Core State Standards (2010) and Alabama’s College and Career Readiness Standards (2010) validated the purpose of this study. Further, this study not only helped to fill a gap in the literature, but also brought an awareness of the importance of classroom reading motivational practices to local teachers and leaders.

Research in the field of literacy has noted motivation as being crucial to effective literacy instruction, student learning, and achievement (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010; Gambrell, 2015; Wigfield, 2000). Given the importance of reading motivation in developing skilled and successful students along with the lack of research on this topic in the early grades (Marinak et al., 2015) studies designed to explore the role of motivation in teaching young children to read are both timely and necessary (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010).

Research Questions

A mixed methods study was conducted to investigate how teachers are supporting young children in their motivation to read in the classroom. This study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do teachers support the reading motivations of young children?
2. What teacher practices are being employed by primary-grade teachers to motivate young children to read?

Theoretical Framework

This study was built upon two theoretical frameworks. Exploration of primary-grade teachers’ instructional practices which support reading motivation in young children was the
main objective of this study. The learning environment and the culture of the classroom are central to this study. Therefore, the framework was a combination of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Reeve, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000) and Sociocultural Constructivism (Hickey & Granade, 2004; Narayan, Rodriguez, Araujo, Shaqlaih, & Moss, 2013) in order to explain the phenomena being explored.

**Self-Determination Theory**

Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) assumes that extrinsic factors, such as certain rewards and activities, are embedded within specific sociocultural conditions which can either perpetuate or impair students’ motivation to read (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Reeve, Deci, and Ryan (2004) asserted that this theory, “is an approach to human motivation that highlights people’s inner motivational resources in explaining healthy personality development and autonomous self-regulation” (p. 33). More specifically, Self-Determination Theory explains how extrinsic factors affect intrinsic interest and motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). According to this theory, people who are intrinsically motivated act in order to become more autonomous. Conversely, those who are more extrinsically motivated tend to do things they feel pressured to do and not necessarily things which help to self-determine, or represent who they are (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

In the context of reading motivation, self-determined students read because the act of reading validates that particular student’s individuality or helps determine his or her sense of self. Those students who lack motivation to read may not see reading as an activity which determines a sense of self because intrinsic motivation to read has been undermined in some way (Ryan & Deci, 2000).
In order to cultivate a desire in students to read independently, teachers must consider how the act of reading is valued in their classrooms. Although it is imperative that teachers consider the value placed upon reading, it is equally important to understand the means by which reading is rewarded or incentivized in order to ensure that intrinsic motivation is not undermined (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The context of the classroom plays an impactful role in motivating students to read (Reeve et al., 2004). Students and teachers bring to the classroom various values related to reading, reading experiences, and reading behaviors, all inevitably impacting how students come to be motivated readers. Therefore, I have chosen to further frame this study using a sociocultural approach to explain the implications of the classroom context on students’ reading motivation.

**Sociocultural Constructivist Approach**

While there are many subcategories of Constructivism, the basic idea remains the same. That is, “Constructivism is a way of thinking about knowing, a referent for building models of teaching, learning and curriculum. It thus functions as a philosophy of learning as well as a philosophy of teaching” (Narayan et al., 2013, p. 173). In other words, Constructivism has implications for the teacher, not just the learner. “Teachers in a constructivist learning experience take on the roles of coordinators, facilitators, resource advisors, tutors or coaches” (Narayan et al., 2013, p. 170).

Constructivism stands in contrast to passive transmission of information from the teacher to the student, and asserts that learning takes place when new information is meshed with preexisting knowledge (Narayan et al., 2013). Learning, then, is not a dissemination of knowledge from the teacher to the students, but an active process of students constructing meaning based on preexisting knowledge and experiences (Narayan et al., 2013).
Sociocultural theory is rooted in the work of Lev Vygotsky (1978), assuming that values and knowledge are co-constructed by participants in specific contexts (Hickey & Granade, 2004). Students construct meaning within the context of a classroom through interactions with others (Narayan et al., 2013; Hickey & Granade, 2004). As participants co-construct values and knowledge via interactions with one another, they simultaneously internalize those values and knowledge in a way that enhances their ability to participate in their environment (Hickey & Granade, 2004). Approaching reading motivation in this way means that students socially construct values about reading and create an environment that reflects those values.

Sociocultural theory is further defined by Hickey and Granade (2004) as engaged participation. When participants engage in practices, they are doing so to negotiate personal identity in relation to the standards and values represented by the community in which those practices are taking place (Hickey & Granade, 2004). From the sociocultural perspective, the classroom context is situated at the forefront of thinking about reading motivation. If the classroom does not present a context that values participation in reading activities, then the students in that classroom will be less likely to engage in reading (Hickey & Granade, 2004).

**Literacy and Culture**

Culture is composed of shared and historical patterns of practice, meaning systems, and tools (Markus & Hamedani, 2007). Culture “denotes a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms, by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life” (Geertz, 1973, p. 89). The classroom culture is embodied by the knowledge and values actively constructed by the participants within that classroom (Hickey & Grenade, 2004).
Different cultures provide people with various tools and experiences and ways of thinking that impact their learning (Markus & Hamedani, 2007). A classroom, then, is representative of the cumulative experiences and meaning-making tools brought by the students and the teacher into that classroom. Consequently, reading motivation is impacted by the value or importance students and teachers place upon the act of reading as a meaning-making system within classrooms. In other words, classroom culture is inherent in all learning experiences, and it also inevitably impacts how each individual student learns and becomes motivated to read. While classroom culture is not the focus of this study, the foundation upon which this study is framed acknowledges that classroom culture inherently effects the learning and motivation of students.

In thinking further about how the idea of how classroom culture impacts literacy learning, it is important to understand how literacy is conceptualized. Li (2011) defined literacy as the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, compute, and use printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Further, Kozulin (2003) presented the idea of literacy from a Vygotskian sociocultural perspective by stating that literacy “ceases to be a homogenous entity related to a student’s ability to decode and comprehend standard written texts and appears as a diverse and heterogeneous phenomenon” (p. 16), alluding to the implication that being literate is much more involved than solely being able to read and comprehend written texts.

Kucer (2009) argued that literacy learning should be ongoing. In other words, literacy does not stop with learning to read and write. Harste (2003) stated, “Instead of one literacy, there are multiple literacies” (p. 8). The idea of multiple literacies points to the myriad ways that the
people of a particular cultural group become literate or make meaning in given contexts. In the case of this study, the context is the primary classroom.

Harste (2003) further pointed to the importance of sociocultural influences on literacy development when he challenged teachers to think about the social practices in place in the classroom. Considering the social practices within a classroom helps teachers to see how literacy is being defined (Harste, 2003). From a sociocultural perspective, literacy is defined by the social groups represented in a classroom (Harste, 2003). Giroux (1992) stated, “Here literacy is engaged as part of a broader reconceptualization of culture taken up in terms of collective discourses, multiple literacies, and diverse relations of difference” (p. 2).

Alvermann (2011) discussed literacy in terms of being autonomous or ideological. The autonomous view of literacy only allows for literacy itself to be a neutral set of skills. Skill-based instruction may look compartmentalized in the classroom, where students are taught how to do something in a specific context, but lack in being able to understand when and why that particular skill should be applied, so that the reader understands its application.

The ideological view, on the other hand, defines literacy as a social practice embedded in power relations, meaning that literacy transcends the limits of the written word and involves thinking about how particular groups function and communicate within diverse cultures. In the classroom, the ideological view is observed by those who provide authentic opportunities to make connections and infer meaning and communicate. In thinking, then, about motivating students to read, the idea that literacy supersedes just being able to read and write and varies according to context, implies that the instructional practices that take place in the classroom should be considered when working to motivate students to read. A sociocultural theory frames
literacy ideologically, indicating that literate people have the ability to function and make sense of the world within their cultural contexts.

In building upon sociocultural constructivism (Hickey & Granade, 2004; Narayan et al., 2013) and Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Reeve, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000), researcher positionality was acknowledged, and data was included from multiple sources. Further, thorough contextualization highlighted the culture of the classroom in order to best explain what exactly the primary grade teachers are doing to motivate students to read and why the teachers are making those choices.

**Significance of the Study**

Results of this study will provide researchers, teachers, and school administrators with data explaining primary teachers’ practices for motivating students to read. The rigorous new demands of the Alabama College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS, 2010) along with the lack of literature pertaining to reading motivation in the primary grades (Baker et al., 2000; Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006), make this data extremely valuable to our local educational system. Further, the results from this study will provide instructional coaches and curriculum specialists with the background information and insight needed for professional development in the area of literacy instruction, specifically as it relates to reading motivation in the primary grades.

**Limitations of the Study**

While this study was a mixed methods study, it focused on exploring the reading motivation practices in primary classrooms. Since the focus is primarily qualitative in nature, and thus offers a description of the practices enacted in the classrooms of selected, local teachers, it is
not intended to describe other teachers not interviewed nor should readers draw inferences about other teachers based on the results of this study.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, I have chosen to employ the following definitions:

- **Reading Motivation** - a willingness to engage and persist in a reading activity even when it is difficult (Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006)
- **Reading Engagement** - interacting with text in ways that are both strategic and motivated (Guthrie et al., 2012)
- **Literacy** - the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, compute, and use printed and written materials associated with varying contexts (Li, 2011); the ongoing process of using various modes of making meaning in order to become a more integral participant in one’s own culture as well as an interconnected member of our global society.
- **Culture** - a composition of shared and historical patterns of practice, meaning systems, and tools (Markus & Hamedani, 2007)
- **Multiliteracies** - the pedagogical idea focused on multiple ways to make meaning (The New London Group, 1996)
- **Extrinsic Reading Motivation** - reading because of an external pressure to do so, even though the action does not promote autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2000).
- **Intrinsic Reading Motivation** - reading for one’s own enjoyment because the act of reading helps the reader develop autonomy (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Within this chapter, I offer a general overview of the current educational landscape followed by the theoretical framework undergirding this study. Next, I provide relevant research on reading motivation and engagement. Lastly, I present the pedagogical overview of classroom instructional practices that foster reading motivation for students. The practices delineated in this review are those that are relevant to elementary classroom contexts.

Current Educational Landscape

In 2009, the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers convened with many states committing to a state-led process of putting together the Common Core State Standards (Achieve, 2016). The Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics (CCSS) were released in 2010, and over 45 states have adopted and are now working to implement these standards (Achieve, 2016).

In part, this initiative resulted from a growing concern over the inadequacies of former standards in many states across the United States, particularly standards for reading informational and more complex texts (Common Core State Standards, 2010). The Common Core State Standards (2010) also provided a uniform way of approaching literacy instruction for
states that opted to adopt these standards, since determining student academic achievement and progress was challenging given each state’s uniquely different set of standards and expectations.

Alabama adopted the standards in 2010 but opted for full implementation of the standards to occur in the 2013-2014 school year (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). While these standards do not dictate which books students should read, they do necessitate that students engage with texts that demand close reading, the ability to make inferences, the citing of textual evidence, and the exposure to complex texts (Common Core State Standards, 2010). Common Core standards influence instruction greatly because teachers now have to make sure that students are not just thinking about the text, but that they are thinking beyond the text (Fisher & Frey, 2014). The increased rigor of the new standards suggests that engaging students to interact with such complex texts may require teachers to consider the motivation of the learners in order to do so.

**Self-Determination Theory**

Self-Determination Theory serves to explain behaviors by asserting that people behave in ways that help them develop autonomy, or a sense of self, rather than just behaving in a certain way because of a perceived pressure to do so (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Self-Determination Theory helps frame the thinking about intrinsic and extrinsic motivation by asserting that people who are intrinsically motivated, act to become more autonomous or self-determined. Those who are more extrinsically motivated, behave in ways that they feel pressured to, even though the behaviors may not validate a sense of self (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Intrinsically motivated people act out of enjoyment in a given task or activity (Deci & Ryan, 1985). On the contrary, someone who is extrinsically motivated acts with a different
desired outcome—one that is separate from the behavior-in mind (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Intrinsically motivated people take action because the action affirms an inner-self. Extrinsically motivated people take action because they feel compelled to do so, and the action does not affirm an inner-self (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In thinking about how we are motivating students to read and think about reading, it is essential to consider intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the way postulated by Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985). With this framework in mind, students come into classrooms with various experiences and beliefs and values pertaining to reading, and these factors influence how students will progress to become motivated readers.

Self-Determination Theory also serves to undergird the rigorous Common Core State Standards (2010) in its assumption that moderate challenges actually serve to motivate students. In contrast to the assumption that motivation can be undermined by excessive challenges or the lack of a challenge altogether (Deci & Ryan, 1985), “This theory suggests that learning is enhanced when reading tasks and activities are moderately challenging” (Gambrell, 2015, p. 262). Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) serves to undergird this study of reading motivation in young learners by not only theorizing that appropriate challenges serve to motivate students, but also by delineating the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In order to understand these constructs more deeply, reading motivation must be clearly conceptualized.

**Reading Motivation**

There are numerous definitions used in the literature on reading motivation. Urdan and Schoenfelder (2006) defined motivation as a willingness to engage and persist in an activity even when it is difficult. Cambria and Guthrie (2010) defined reading motivation as “the values, beliefs, and behaviors surrounding reading for an individual” (p. 16). Malloy and Gambrell
characterized a motivated student as one who demonstrates persistence and effort in an activity of his or her choice. Students are often generally subdivided into two distinct motivational groups defined as those who are motivated readers and those who are unmotivated readers (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013). In order to understand the dynamics that fuel these definitions, it is important to iterate that reading motivation is multifaceted (Carlson, 2011).

Wigfield and Asher (1984) defined reading motivational constructs that point to the reasons why students may or may not engage with reading tasks. The constructs are founded upon the idea that students’ motivation to read is impacted by their self-perceived ability to be successful along with their personal reasons for wanting to be successful. If students feel that they can be successful with reading, they are more likely to engage in reading and be motivated to continue reading (Wigfield & Asher, 1984). Wigfield (2007) stated that students’ personal reasons for choosing to read could vary from social implications of reading to reading for grades or as a result of curiosity. It is important to understand that these constructs are at work when considering why students engage with texts and become motivated readers.

Since motivation is directly linked to student achievement (Wigfield, 2000), it is vital to grasp how influential motivation should be in our thinking about literacy learning and teaching our young children to read. Students’ motivation to read is impacted by the level of reading skills those students possess (Morgan & Fuchs, 2007). As students become more proficient readers, they tend to read more, and as they increase volumes of reading, they become more skilled readers (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008; Wigfield, 2007). In the classroom, reading motivation is made evident by students who are dedicated to engaging in texts of varying levels of difficulty,
interested in reading activities, and confident in the reading skills they have (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010; Malloy et al., 2008; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006).

**A Brief History of Reading Motivation Research**

Over the course of five years between 1992 and 1997, the National Reading Research Center put forth a focused effort to understand literacy motivation and instruction. This effort was funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education (Malloy & Gambrell, 2000). The research that took place over the course of this five-year span encompassed studies of preschool, elementary, middle, and high school levels (Malloy & Gambrell, 2000).

For preschool students, the NRRC report indicated that an abundance of texts in the homes, opportunities to read and be read to, observation of caregivers reading, opportunities to play, and opportunities to interact with environmental print were factors which supported students becoming motivated readers (Malloy & Gambrell, 2000). The NRRC researchers discovered that access to books, choice of reading materials, and discussion of readings were highly motivating to elementary school children (Gambrell, Codling, & Palmer, 1996). Furthermore, when teachers share books which they enjoy with the students along with engaging the students in discussions about those books, the students are more motivated to read those selections (Palmer, Codling, & Gambrell, 1994). The middle and high school students were found to be motivated to read when given the opportunity to engage in reading for pleasure with their peers and to choose texts which reflected their interests (Alvermann, Young, & Green, 1997).

The findings from the research conducted by the NRRC concluded that learning to read involved reading engagement as well as motivation. Specifically, the NRRC findings,
“highlighted the interrelatedness of values, beliefs, and social factors for reading engagement and reading comprehension (Malloy & Gambrell, 2000, p. 229).” In other words, it became clear that reading motivation and reading engagement were connected and that there were pertinent instructional implications for understanding the connection in order to support readers.

**Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation**

Although complex, motivation in its simplest form can be broken into two main types: intrinsic and extrinsic (Guildford, Hilden, & Jones, 2011). Intrinsic motivation for reading is an individual’s enjoyment of reading on his or her own time and for his or her own enjoyment (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Those who are extrinsically motivated tend to do things that they feel pressured to do, even though the behavior may not validate their inner-selves (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation exist on a continuum representing whether someone is more inclined to develop autonomy or be controlled by external stimuli (Alderman, 2004). It is important to understand, though, that students can possess intrinsic and extrinsic motivation simultaneously, implying that there may be extrinsic factors such as rewards or teacher praise that motivate a student who is also intrinsically motivated by factors such as his or her own curiosity (Guthrie et al., 1996).

While students can be both extrinsically and intrinsically motivated to read, new discussions in research are taking place about which of these is more preferable for fostering a lifelong love of reading (Malloy & Gambrell, 2006). Guthrie et al. (1996) found that intrinsic motivation was linked to the amount of reading in which a student engages. “Though children can be motivated for both extrinsic and intrinsic reasons, researchers suggest that intrinsic motivation is more beneficial to long-term learning” (Marinak et al., 2015, p. 58). The important
idea for teachers to understand is that the classroom is comprised of students with multiple motivations for reading (Marinak et al., 2015), as motivations are just as diverse as the body of students with whom they reside. Nevertheless, the overall goal of the practices employed within the classroom should accelerate reading motivation in order to foster a lifelong love of reading (Guthrie et al., 1996).

**Reading Engagement**

The reading engagement perspective posits that motivation and cognition are inherent in reading (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Engagement consists of involvement, participation, and commitment to some set of activities (Guthrie, Wigfield, & You, 2012). More specifically, reading engagement involves students interacting with texts in ways that are both strategic and motivated (Guthrie et al., 2012). Reading engagement, then, emphasizes the importance of students having a repertoire of skills and strategies for reading in addition to being motivated to engage in implementing those skills and strategies.

The joint functioning of motivational processes and cognitive strategies during reading comprehension activities is what engages readers, which highlights the importance of reading engagement in reading comprehension (Guthrie, Hoa, Wigfield, Tonks, & Perencevich, 2006). “Engaged readers are intrinsically motivated to read for a variety of personal goals, strategic in their reading behaviors, knowledgeable in their construction of new understanding from text, and socially interactive about the reading of text” (Gambrell, 2011, p. 172). Students who are motivated will employ the cognitive strategies necessary for understanding a text (Guthrie et al., 2012; Wigfield et al., 2008).

Engagement is a multidimensional construct that includes behavioral, cognitive, and affective attributes associated with being deeply involved in an activity such as reading (Guthrie
et al., 2012). Motivation is a more specific construct that is needed in order to engage, but should not be used synonymously with engagement (Malloy et al., 2013). When students are positively motivated to read, they will be more engaged in reading (Guthrie et al., 2012). “We believe it is theoretically and practically useful to define reading engagement as a construct that fuses motivational, cognitive, and behavioral attributes of students. The engaged reader is internally motivated to read” (Guthrie et al., 2007, p. 238). Reading engagement, therefore, is manifested in classrooms in a way that is observable and points to the less observable levels of reading motivation comprised by the students in those classrooms (Guthrie et al., 2007).

Engaged readers are intrinsically motivated to read regularly, independently, and for a variety of purposes (Guthrie, Wigfield, Metsala, & Cox, 1999). Baker, Dreher, and Guthrie (2000) asserted that engagement involves competence and motivation. Thus, engagement requires that students have both the skills and the drive to attempt and persist in a given activity (Malloy & Gambrell, 2006). When students are engaged, they are engrossed, interested and involved in what they are doing (Malloy et al., 2013).

The engaged reader is knowledgeable, motivated, strategic, and socially interactive (Gambrell, 1996). Further, the engaged reader is also one who is motivated to read for a variety of purposes (Gambrell, 1996). Malloy et al. (2013) suggested that reading engagement is characterized by students being on task and actively attending to the reading task at hand. As such, when students exhibit these behaviors, they are manifestations of students who are motivated (Malloy et al., 2013).

In order for students to be motivated readers, it is essential that teachers consider engaging students in appropriate reading activities when planning instruction (Lutz, Guthrie, & Davis, 2006). “Improved engagement and achievement as well as motivation are reasonable
goals for instructional methods that incorporate explicit, multiple supports for strengthening student motivation” (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014, p. 24). In a study analyzing literacy tasks, student engagement, and teacher scaffolding, Lutz, Guthrie, and Davis (2006) found that the classes that showed the greatest increases in reading comprehension were the classes with the greatest number of complex tasks. In classrooms with complex tasks, the students were more engaged (Lutz et al., 2006). Students need to be engaged in meaningful reading tasks that will, in turn, motivate them to continue reading more (Lutz et al., 2006). In order to ensure that classrooms are filled with meaningful tasks, teachers must be careful and purposeful in planning instruction (Lutz et al., 2006).

Engagement is vital in classroom literacy practices because the more that students read, the more they will comprehend (Lutz et al., 2006). Pressley (2002) stated, “When students are skilled in reading and writing and their motivation is maintained through appropriately challenging literacy experiences, they read and write more” (p. 223). Thus, it can be said that by increasing students’ engagement in reading, their long-term motivation increases as well as their comprehension abilities (Wigfield, 2007).

In summary, motivation and engagement are deeply interrelated (Guthrie et al., 2012; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006). In order for teachers to motivate students to read, the relationship between motivation and engagement must be understood as being dynamic and deeply dependent upon one another (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014). “We believe it is theoretically and practically useful to define reading engagement as a construct that fuses motivational, cognitive, and behavioral attributes of students. The engaged reader is internally motivated to read” (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014, p. 238). As such, it is essential for teachers to understand that in order for students to become motivated to read, literacy instruction must be infused with engaging opportunities for
students, so that their reading motivation increases and subsequently their achievement levels increase as well (Pressley, 2002; Lutz et al., 2006).

**Pedagogical Implications**

Once teachers understand what exactly reading motivation and engagement are and how they relate to student achievement, it becomes incumbent upon those teachers to employ pedagogical practices aimed at motivating students to read. Cope and Kalantzis (2000) defined pedagogy as, “a teaching and learning relationship that creates the potential for building learning conditions leading to full and equitable social participation” (p. 9). Classroom pedagogy must be evaluated and oriented to focus on how cultural influences within the classroom affect literacy instruction, namely reading motivation (Li, 2011). As alluded to in the Self-Determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) theoretical framework, students bring to the classroom a multitude of reading behaviors and beliefs and values that influence their motivation to read. If the classroom does not present a context that values participation in reading activities, then the students in that classroom will be less likely to engage in reading (Hickey & Granade, 2004).

From a sociocultural perspective, literacy is defined by the social groups represented in a classroom (Harste, 2003). From this perspective, it becomes necessary for teachers to not only employ practices for motivating students to read, but to also teach in such a way that acknowledges classroom culture in shaping literate students through these practices. If teachers are going to enact culturally relevant pedagogical practices, it is important for them to consider students’ “funds of knowledge” (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). Funds of knowledge are comprised of the resources available to a student by way of his or her home environment and outside, cultural experiences (Gonzalez et al., 2005). The job of the teacher is to acknowledge these funds and design instruction and activities that can build upon these funds for expanding
knowledge and motivating students. When teachers acknowledge students’ funds of knowledge, learning experiences become relevant and authentic, thus motivating students to engage (Gay, 2000).

Considering the various social and cultural aspects of literacy makes all the difference in this study of classroom practices. This study conceptualizes literacy as a practice of culture (Alvermann, 2011; Harste, 2003; Hickey & Granade, 2004), meaning we cannot research nor consider literacy without also considering the culture of the classroom. Li (2011) suggested that when teachers do not consider what is personally meaningful to the students, reading motivation is decreased. The practices we employ within classrooms, therefore, should be meaningful to the students and should engage them in becoming equitable and integrated members of their society.

**Culturally Responsive Teaching**

The way by which teachers enact pedagogical practices that acknowledge the sociocultural influences of the classroom is Culturally Responsive Teaching (Gay, 2000). Teaching in a culturally responsive way involves teachers understanding that culture is at the center of every aspect of education (Gay, 2000). Thinking, behaving, teaching, and learning are all inevitably influenced by culture (Gay, 2000). From this perspective, reading motivation becomes a cultural practice, and must be studied within that context. In other words, the students’ reading experiences and values should help shape the reading instruction for the classroom. Gay (2000) discussed Culturally Responsive Teaching as being the means by which teachers assist students in becoming equitable members of their community. Reading instruction, then, should offer students authentic opportunities to engage in learning that is personally useful and socially valued.
Another important pedagogical implication for Culturally Responsive Teaching (Gay, 2000) comes through understanding the role of language in literacy learning. For example, Heath (1994) discussed how mainstream education struggles with what children from different sociocultural backgrounds learn at home prior to entering school. Heath (1994) suggested that children’s learning follows community patterns of language socialization. Many times, students come to school and do not really grasp the language of school (Heath, 1994). Children are learning through the literacy practices they see enacted in the home, making literacy a practice of culture (Beals, De Temple, & Dickinson, 1994; Dyson, 2003).

If there is a disconnect between the language of school and the language of home and community, then it can be reasoned that students will have less access to what happens at school unless a teacher assists in bridging the discourse and language gap. Gee (1989) stated, “A learner’s social world can be categorized into two over-arching domains: the primary Discourse of the home and community, and the secondary Discourses of the public sphere- institutions such as the public schools” (p. 516). Framing the classroom as a place permeated with cultural influences implies that language becomes a key factor in students’ literacy practices.

The mediating agent in learning is language. Therefore, learning is inherently social (Kozulin, 2003). If language is influenced by the culture in which we live, then it becomes necessary to think about learning more from a sociocultural perspective than an individualistic perspective. Kozulin (2003) stated, “Vygotskian theory stipulates that the development of the child’s higher mental processes depends on the presence of mediating agents in the child’s interaction with the environment” (p. 17).
When students from various backgrounds come to the classroom, they bring with them a repertoire of experiences and tools and ways of making meaning. Language is the means by which students hold together all of those experiences and tools and ways of making meaning. “Language and literacy practices do not exist in isolation from each other, just as cultures and communities do not exist as discrete entities, but rather interact in various degrees of complementarity or conflict” (Lam, 2004 as cited in Li, 2011, p. 517). Heath’s (1994) assertion that as culture varies, language varies as well, implying that the way that students communicate and make meaning will vary as well. In diverse classrooms, the language surrounding literacy practices may or may not be accessible to students, inevitably impacting students’ motivation to read (Gee, 1989).

**The Role of Multiliteracies**

The New London Group (1996) presented the challenge to rethink the social outcomes of literacy. They stated, “A pedagogy of multiliteracies…focuses on modes of representation much broader than language alone. These differ according to culture and context, and have specific cognitive, cultural, and social effects” (p. 64). The term “multiliteracies,” they said, is a way to focus on the realities of increasing local diversity and global connectedness (The New London Group, 1996). Considering multiliteracies, then, is a pedagogical necessity for teaching in a way that acknowledges the inherent culture of the classroom.

Thinking about classroom instruction as well as how we afford students opportunities to showcase meaning or learning now requires that teachers reevaluate the various modes of meaning-making. For example, rather than solely relying upon the traditional written word for communicating meaning, our ways of communicating should now be expanded to include multiple modes of making meaning (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). Understanding multiliteracies
also becomes important in selecting materials used in teaching. Malloy and Gambrell (2006) advocated for the use of technology tools to enhance instruction and engage students. New technologies are categorized as a new type of literacy encompassed in the idea of multiliteracies (Malloy & Gambrell, 2006), making the use of technology in the classroom yet another means by which students can represent and make meaning. The pedagogical implication of multiliteracies in the classroom impacts reading motivation by requiring teachers to redefine what it means to be literate (Gambrell, 2005). Reading and writing print material are but two ways to showcase literacy; multiple literacies extend the possibilities to other ways that students can engage with texts and become motivated readers.

**Current Practices for Motivating Students**

A lack of motivation may be the greatest hindrance to literacy development (Ortlieb, Grandstaff-Beckers, & Cheek, 2012), making it incumbent upon teachers to understand which practices are exemplary in motivating students to read. Evidence suggests that in order to increase intrinsic motivation, teachers must implement classroom practices that support student choices, collaborations, use of interesting texts, and real-world interactions related to literacy (Guthrie & Humenick, 2004).

Edmunds and Bauserman (2006) conducted a study in which they literally asked the students themselves what motivated them to read. Ninety one fourth grade students were interviewed, and the data was analyzed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). From the data, emerged six categories including factors that motivated students to read. Based on the findings from the six categories of reading motivational factors for students, Edmunds and Basuerman (2006) recommended five approaches to be implemented in the classroom to increase reading motivation. The five approaches included: self-selection, attention
to characteristics of books, personal interests, access to books, and active involvement of others (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006).

Furthermore, Pressley (2002) concluded that students who are in non-competitive classrooms that promote trustworthiness and belonging are more motivated to learn. Gambrell (2011) also offered seven rules of engagement that consist of reading tasks and activities relevant to the students, access to a wide range of reading materials, ample opportunities to engage in sustained reading, opportunities to make reading choices, social interaction with others about texts, opportunities to be successful with challenging texts, and classroom incentives that reflect the value and importance of reading.

Guthrie and Klauda (2014) conducted a study with 615 middle school students, hypothesizing that the students who were instructed using Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI), fusing literacy with history, would show higher informational text comprehension than students undergoing traditional instruction. Guthrie and Klauda (2014) found that multiple motivational-engagement supports combined with strategy instruction for informational text increased achievement for the middle school students. The motivational-engagement supports consisted of affording students choice and autonomy along with classroom activities that supported students’ values for reading. Finally, the motivational-engagement support of collaboration was implemented as well. Based on the aforementioned research, the sections below highlight exemplary classroom practices for motivating students to read.

**Rewards and Incentives**

Rewards and incentives are often used to motivate students to read (Guildford, Hilden & Jones, 2011). While this is a noteworthy effort, it is vital to understand that rewards and incentives are a type of extrinsic reward (Guildford, Hilden & Jones, 2011), and many times
teachers rely too heavily upon extrinsically motivating students in these ways (Alderman, 2004). The problem is that teachers implement rewards and incentives in an attempt to increase motivation, but in doing so, certain rewards and incentives can actually serve to decrease intrinsic motivation (Guthrie, Alao, & Rinehart, 1997). Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) indicated that when students are in an environment that is permeated with extrinsic rewards, the more likely they will be to memorize, guess, and give up on tasks that seem challenging.

Attempts at extrinsically motivating students really only serves to link the successful completion of a particular task to an already-valued outcome or reward (Brophy, 2004). Intrinsic motivation will decrease when rewards are highly attractive, not contingent to a specific goal, and unnatural outcomes of the desired behavior (Brophy, 2004). Ice cream, for example, is very attractive to students. Ice cream parties or coupons for ice cream are often given after having read a certain number of books, and ice cream is not a natural outcome of reading. The ice cream party example points to an extrinsic motivation strategy that actually inhibits intrinsic motivation for children. Not only do rewards like this example slowly lose their appeal and require that bigger and better be offered, but these types of rewards lead students to believe that reading is not a task that offers a reward in and of itself (Brophy, 2004).

Rather than totally eliminating extrinsic rewards from the classrooms and schools, Brophy (2004) proposed that these rewards be used carefully and only in order to support students’ intrinsic motivation. For example, rather than an ice cream coupon or party, extra reading time or a bookstore gift certificate could be given when a student reads a book and comprehends on his or her own reading level. Guildford, Hilden and Jones (2011) suggested research-based reward initiatives such as books for prizes and making reading social as being the best for achieving lasting success with cultivating reading motivation. Marinak and Gambrell
(2008) found that rewards should align closely with the desired behavior in order for motivation to be increased. If the goal of a reward or incentive is to increase reading motivation, then it is necessary for teachers to be thoughtful in their choosing of those rewards and incentives (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008).

**Student Choice**

Spaulding (1992) recognized the highly influential relationship between providing students with choice and their motivation to read. Providing students with choice as well as reading programs that are independent of specific content or curriculum helps in motivating students to read (McGaha & Igo, 2012). In a year-long study, Palmer, Codling, and Gambrell (1994) discovered that third and fifth grade students reported that choice in books to read was highly motivating. The findings implied, “Children are highly motivated to read books of their own choosing. Self-selection of reading material is clearly linked to enjoyment and sustained reading experiences” (Palmer et al., 1994, p. 178).

Providing students with choice supports autonomy, but students are further supported when they are equipped with strategies for making reading choices (Gambrell, 2011). Students need to learn how to choose books for independent reading that are neither too difficult nor too easy, and becoming proficient at choosing books that are just right most often requires ample scaffolding and teacher feedback (Gambrell, 2011).

**Collaboration and Interaction**

Practices that offer students the opportunity to both collaborate and interact with and about texts have the potential to motivate students to read (Guthrie et al., 2007). Social interaction, as defined by Guthrie et al. (2007), consists of students reading books together,
borrowing books, talking about books, and writing about books with classmates. Instruction that incorporates these types of social activities increases intrinsic motivation (Guthrie et al., 2007).

One such practice is learning clubs (Casey, 2008). Learning clubs are effective because they develop in response to the unique literacy needs and interests that exist within each classroom. Casey (2008) stated that learning clubs have the “potential to be a powerful vehicle for motivating engaged and interested learners across content areas to use literacy to build learning” (p. 293).

Besides learning clubs, activities such as literature circles, where students have the opportunity to share with other students about their reading, have positive impacts on reading motivation (Pitcher et al., 2007). Edmunds and Bauserman (2006) noted that students’ motivation to read is influenced by the access they are given to a variety of books as well as the social value they find in talking about those books with peers. Furthermore, Gambrell (1996) stated, “Opportunities for sharing and talking about books is an important factor in developing engaged, motivated readers and supports the contention that social interactions have a positive influence on reading achievement” (p. 22).

Emerging from Edmunds and Bauserman’s (2006) study of what students said motivated them to read was social interaction with texts. In the discussion of their findings, Edmunds and Bauserman (2006) suggested several ways that teachers can accomplish social interactions about books, including library read-alouds and discussions, book swaps, and literature circles. While there are myriad ways to afford students the opportunity to engage in social interactions, the important factor remains that effort must be put forth to center these interactions around texts, thusly motivating students to read (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006).
Access to Various, Interesting Texts

Giving students the opportunity to both have access to books as well as time for talking about books with peers will influence students’ motivation to read (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Classrooms must have books made available to students. Teachers must also find ways to facilitate various discussions and interactions about those books. Gambrell (1996) noted, “A book-rich classroom environment is essential to nurturing and supporting young readers” (p. 21).

In a study looking at a summer reading program for high school students, the researchers found that providing books as incentives for the students had a positive influence on their reading motivation (McGaha & Igo, 2012). Conversely, when students are required to do round robin reading, read difficult text out loud, and do worksheets, student motivation is decreased (Gentile & McMillan, 1987). Teacher-led read alouds and book-rich classrooms are factors demonstrated to increase reading motivation (Carlson, 2011). Since access to books fosters motivation to read, time for students to explore classroom libraries and school libraries should be highly prioritized along with other activities that provide students access to a variety of texts (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006).

Autonomous Reading Habits

Autonomous reading is made possible by offering students time to spend reading independently, and this habit leads to a motivated and engaged reader (Gambrell, 2011). “Interventions aimed at fostering reading motivation as children grow older should especially focus on enhancing autonomous reasons for reading, because autonomous reading motivation in particular leads to more qualitative reading behavior and better reading performance” (Naeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, & Rosseel, 2012, p. 1019). Furthermore, “There is a strong
relationship between the amount of out-of-school reading a student engages in and his or her success in school reading” (McKool, 2007, p. 111).

McKool (2007) studied 199 fifth grade students’ out-of-school reading habits, using a mixed methods study that employed a survey followed by interviews. The findings indicated that students’ voluntary reading habits could be improved by teachers’ recommendations of new and interesting reading materials, the librarians’ purchasing of those materials, daily opportunities to self-select texts, being read aloud to at home, seeing parents read at home, and by parents being aware of television time and other activities as impeding students’ voluntary reading time. The importance of autonomous reading habits was substantiated by the findings of Guthrie et al. (1999) that reading comprehension achievement is largely predicted by the amount of time that students spend reading both in school and out of school.

Teachers can accomplish supporting independent reading by encouraging students to take books home and by also making sure that there is substantial time during the actual school day for students to read (Gambrell, 2011). “Classroom cultures that support motivation to read and provide sufficient amounts of time to read create the necessary foundation that is essential for supporting students in becoming proficient readers” (Gambrell, 2011, p. 8).

**Integrated Instruction**

Integrated instruction is a whole-theme approach to teaching all content areas (Baker et al., 2000). Literacy practices, such as access to various and interesting texts motivate students to read and come together in the form of integrated instruction (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008). Given the new and rigorous Alabama College and Career Readiness Standards (2010), it becomes easy to teach a “mile wide and an inch deep” (Brophy, 2008, p. 137). While this type of teaching is common, the myriad standards can still be taught in a motivating fashion by planning integrated
units of instruction (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008). Coherence of instruction fosters student engagement and involves connecting all instructional elements in order to promote students’ abilities for making connections (Guthrie et al., 2000).

Integrated instruction supports students in becoming motivated readers by providing environments that support the aforementioned exemplary instructional practices. In contrast to teaching a scripted program to fidelity, integrated instruction provides authentic opportunities for education professionals to consider the students in the classroom and their diverse learning needs when planning and implementing instruction. Integrated instruction, then, enacts the Culturally Responsive Teaching (Gay, 2000) previously discussed, as it provides authentic opportunities to engage in learning that is personally useful and socially valued.

Guthrie, McRae, and Klauda (2007) studied Concept Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI). CORI is an integrated approach to teaching that aims to increase reading comprehension for students in grades 3-5 by increasing engagement, students’ knowledge of life science, and students’ motivation to read (Guthrie et al., 2007). CORI’s approach integrates choice, access, and social interaction into well-organized literacy in content instruction (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008). Thematic units that encompass motivational factors to teach content area literacy represent the integrated approach to instruction referred to in this review.

Guthrie et al. (2009) investigated the extent to which Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) increased reading comprehension, content knowledge, word and passage fluency, and reading motivation for a group of fifth grade students compared with another group of fifth grade students receiving traditional instruction. The effects of CORI instruction were further analyzed in this study to determine whether they occurred for both low and high-achieving students. Guthrie et al. (2009) found that integrated instruction not only increased
reading comprehension among low-achieving students, but to also increased gains on standardized assessments for both low and high achievers. The results of this study serve to underscore the importance of integrated instruction, especially with regards to motivating students to read. Guthrie et al. (2009) stated, “A thematic unit is motivating because students are excited to become knowledgeable about the domain, and thus, their efforts to read for meaning are rewarded” (p. 202).

Summary

The review of the literature on reading motivation has established that classrooms that are book-rich, provide rewards or incentives within close proximity to reading, encourage social interactions about texts, support autonomous reading habits, and integrate instruction are motivating to students. Further, reading motivation and engagement were discussed, and a delineation of how these ideas are constructed upon a sociocultural constructivist framework was offered. Finally, a description of teacher practices for motivating students to read was described. Furthermore, it has been established that the current literature lacks studies pertaining to reading motivation in the primary grades (Baker et al., 2000; Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). This study was designed to help fill that gap by exploring how local primary teachers motivate students to read.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Introduction

This chapter features the research design and methods that frame this study, which explores the instructional practices primary-grade teachers are using in their classrooms to motivate students to read. In the first section, a theoretical framework by which the research design was constructed is described. Next, the research questions are named along with the research design selected to answer those questions. After that, the participant selection and data collection process is delineated. The chapter then concludes with data analysis procedures and a summary of the study.

Theoretical Framework

Woven within my research philosophy are the ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological assumptions that guide my thinking about what reality is, how knowledge is known, how values are acknowledged, and how research is conducted (Creswell, 2013). Creswell (2015) stated that it is important to acknowledge that our values and beliefs shape our orientation to research, how data is gathered and the biases inherent in research. Creswell (2015) went on to note that researchers bring worldviews into research, and that theoretical framing is important for mixed methods research.
The framework for the study acts as a foundation upon which all methods and data collection and analyses are built. As explained in Chapter One, this study was constructed using a Sociocultural Constructivist framework (Narayan, Rodriguez, Araujo, Shaqlaih, & Moss, 2013; Hickey & Granade, 2004). While there are many subcategories of Constructivism, the basic idea remains the same. That is, “Constructivism is a way of thinking about knowing, a referent for building models of teaching, learning and curriculum. It thus functions as a philosophy of learning as well as a philosophy of teaching” (Narayan et al., 2013, p. 173). Constructivism has implications for the teacher, not just the learner. A teacher operating under a Constructivist approach to teaching views his or her role in the classroom as being one who provides opportunities for co-construction of new learning rather than being a disseminator of knowledge. “Constructivists foster authentic learning methods such as inquiry and experiential learning, role playing and case studies” (Narayan et al., 2013, p. 170). Teachers in a Constructivist learning experience take on the roles of coordinators, facilitators, resource advisors, tutors or coaches.

A Sociocultural Constructivist framework is important in terms of the methods used for conducting this study, because it theorizes learning and, thus, reading motivation as being situated within certain cultural contexts. Reading motivation, like learning, is socially mediated, meaning that the activities that occur in the classroom are a valuable focal point when exploring this topic (Narayan et al., 2013; Hickey & Granade, 2004). In adhering to the Constructivist idea that learning is co-constructed, the implication for researching how primary grade teachers motivate students to read is that the researcher must connect in some way with the classroom teachers. Creswell and Plano-Clark (2007) identified Constructivism as being a worldview that supports methodologically thinking about the participants’ subjectivities. That is, data gathered
from participants is shaped via social interaction and largely influenced by their personal experiences (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

**Researcher Positionality**

The Constructivist approach requires researchers to reflect upon the context in which they are researching (Creswell, 2015). The positionality of the researcher becomes important, as the researcher is subjective in his or her interpretation of the data being gathered (Creswell, 2015). I believe that each individual experiences his or her own reality situated within particular cultural factors and contexts. In order to research and understand the contexts of this study, I must first acknowledge my position within this study. I must acknowledge that I am a researcher bringing with me a plethora of experiences and values that inevitably influence my research.

Besides acknowledging positionality, I must be diligent in striving to bring together the data I gather from my participants in a way that makes sense and affirms what the participants are conveying during the data collection process. In order to accomplish this smooth and accurate data collection and analysis feat, the methodology of this study was centered on gaining as much information about the contexts of the classrooms as possible. The methodology also involved gaining as much information as possible from a variety of sources using various data collection tools in order to ensure that the explanation of the classroom practices was thorough and accurate.

**Methods**

We understand that reading motivation can begin to erode as early as the second grade (Marinak et al., 2010). Marinak et al. (2010) also reinforced that a gap currently exists in the literature pertaining to reading motivation for students in kindergarten through second grade. Given the importance that reading motivation plays in students’ overall academic achievement
(Cambria & Guthrie, 2010), the necessity for filling the gap in the literature becomes more apparent. Since the impact of reading motivation on achievement outcomes affects students in both early elementary and later in college and career readiness (Common Core State Standards, 2010), it is necessary to understand the practices that teachers are implementing in the primary classrooms for motivating students to read. As explained in Chapter Two, the need for this study became obvious in light of the fact that most of the work exploring reading motivation has been done with students in the middle school to high school grades. Upon considering the questions that have been left unanswered, it was determined that an explanatory sequential design mixed methods study would provide ample data and insight for explaining what local primary teachers are doing to motivate students to read.

The purpose for this study, therefore, was to explain what primary teachers are doing to motivate young children to read. This purpose helps fill an existing gap in the reading motivation literature and will provide local teachers and leaders with some insight into what is occurring in local primary grade classrooms. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design was used for this study (Creswell & Plano-Clarke, 2011). This particular design involved collecting quantitative data first, followed by qualitative data. The intent was to use the qualitative data for the purpose of helping to explain the quantitative data in order to answer the research questions. The preliminary phase of the study involved collecting survey data from primary teachers across a southeastern state. The survey aimed to gather data on literacy practices in the classrooms. The second, qualitative phase included interviews and observations of local, primary teacher exemplars, and the expectation was that the qualitative data would help explain the survey data and yield valuable information pertaining to classroom practices for motivating students to read.
Mixed Methods

A mixed methods design, including both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to thoroughly answer the research question, was implemented. The basic premise of using mixed methods for research is that this method integrates qualitative and quantitative data for the purpose of drawing conclusions from the strengths of both data sets to explain a research phenomenon (Creswell, 2015).

Mixed Methods has roots in the late 1980’s (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). In its infancy, mixed methods research was basically viewed as the mixing of quantitative and qualitative methods. Later, Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) expanded the definition to encompass a methodological orientation, meaning that mixed methods became more of an approach to research involving philosophical worldviews along with data collection and analysis procedures.

Creswell (2015) noted four characteristics of mixed methods research: 1) collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data for the purpose of answering a research question, 2) implementing rigorous research methods, 3) integrating the quantitative and qualitative data using a specific mixed methods design, and 4) framing the design philosophically or theoretically. Furthermore, Creswell (2015) highlighted that a core assumption of mixed methods research is that the collective strength offered by both quantitative and qualitative data yields a better understanding of the research problem that one form of data would on its own.

Research Design

An explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007) was used for this study, using qualitative data gained from interviews and some observations along with quantitative data from a survey in order to explain what primary teachers are doing to motivate students to read. Two phases unfolded during this study. The first phase consisted of an
An explanatory sequential design was selected for this study because the purpose of this particular design is to use qualitative data to help explain quantitative data (Creswell, 2015). More specifically, an explanatory sequential design is often used when researchers want to look at broad trends quantitatively and then link those trends to a smaller group via qualitative data (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). When a researcher needs qualitative data to explain quantitative significant, insignificant, outlier, or surprising results, an explanatory sequential design is appropriate (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Specifically, this study aimed to look quantitatively at primary teachers from across a southeastern state, and then use qualitative data gathered from local primary teachers to explain anything surprising, significant, or insignificant.

An explanatory sequential design initiates with a quantitative phase. After the quantitative data has been gathered, the researcher analyzes the data in order to determine what results need to be highlighted or explained using the qualitative data (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Once the quantitative data has been used to help develop and refine and qualitative phase, the researcher then moves to collect and analyze the qualitative data. Finally, the results offered by the quantitative data and qualitative data for purpose of explaining a phenomenon is delineated (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

Because the intent of the explanatory sequential design is to use the qualitative data to inform or explain the quantitative data, the data collection process that unfolds is not independent (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). The implication for the interdependence of the data collection process inherent in the explanatory sequential design is that the participants for the
second, qualitative phase should be individuals who also participated in the quantitative phase (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Unlike a convergent design, the explanatory sequential design does not involve merging the data, so there is no need to have equal sampling sizes during the data collection process (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Table 1 below displays the phases of this study along with the procedure and product inherent within those phases.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Data Collection</td>
<td>Electronic survey</td>
<td>Numeric data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>SPSS &amp; Qualtrics software</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Participant</td>
<td>Purposeful selection of local teacher</td>
<td>Interview protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Protocol</td>
<td>exemplars (n = 12)</td>
<td>Observation protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development of qualitative protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Data Collection</td>
<td>Individual interviews with 12 participants</td>
<td>Interview transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One week of classroom observation</td>
<td>Classroom observation notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codeweaving</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of Integration</td>
<td>Interpretation of the quantitative and</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qualitative results</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of the quantitative and qualitative results</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative Strand

Quantitative Data Collection

The initial, quantitative phase of the data collection process consisted of an electronic survey. The survey process initiated with an electronic survey consent and link sent to the 138
superintendents of education in a southeastern state. Every school district superintendent was asked to forward the research request and survey link to the local school principals and then on to the general education primary teachers. A total of 95 teacher respondents from varying districts within the state participated in the survey.

More specifically, in order to gather both simple descriptive data on primary teacher literacy practices in the local school system, *The First R* (Baumann, Hoffman, Duffy-Hester, & Ro, 2000) (see Appendix A), a research-based survey, was administered. “Surveys are popular methods of collecting information from individuals and the preferred means to address a research question when it is most efficient to simply ask those who can inform the question” (Duke & Mallette, 2011, p. 288). Because the central research question of this study focuses on how primary-grade teachers motivate students to read, the use of a survey describing reading and literacy practices was appropriate (Duke & Mallette, 2011). In order to explain how classroom teachers are supporting reading motivation for young children, *The First R* survey was chosen to gain insight into the reading practices occurring within classrooms, with the hope of being able to use the information about those practices to explain how classrooms are supporting students in becoming motivated readers.

The original *First R* survey was developed in the early 1960’s by Mary Austin and Coleman Morrison at Harvard University (Baumann et al., 2000). The original survey was used to determine the status of reading instruction in U.S. public schools and was modified by Baumann, Hoffman, Duffy-Hester, and Ro (2000) in 2000 for the same purpose.

Several studies (Barr & Sadow, 1989; Sosniak & Stodolsky, 1993) indicated that survey data gathered on reading instructional practices is supported with data gathered via observations and interviews. It is also important to note that social desirability bias is often times inherent in
data yielded from surveys (Warwick & Lininger, 1975). Social desirability implies that the teachers answering surveys may do so in a way that reflects what they deem to be acceptable educational practices versus their own classroom practices (Barr & Sadow, 1989; Sosniak & Stodolsky, 1993). In order to lessen the likelihood of social desirability bias, the survey was given in an anonymous, electronic format to be answered privately by the teachers.

*The First R* helped to answer the central research question, and also provided data describing specific instructional practices, adding to the thick and rich description needed for a quality study. *The First R* survey is comprised of 55 questions divided into the following domains: Teacher Education and Professional Development, School and Student Demographics, Teacher Beliefs and Philosophical Orientation, Instructional Time, Organizing for Instruction, Accommodating Gifted and Struggling Readers, Assessing Reading Development, Home-School Connections, Overall School and Classroom Reading Programs, and Level-Specific Questions. Since *The First R* was developed to give a broad overview of classroom literacy practices, the questions from the survey were analyzed to determine which ones were best suited for thinking about what specific practices teachers are implementing for supporting students’ reading motivation. Table 2 specifies the specific questions within the domains that worked directly to answer the research questions.

**Table 2**

*Questions within The First R Survey Directly Answering the Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Domains</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain One: Teacher Beliefs and Philosophical Orientations</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Two: Instructional Time</td>
<td>24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Three: Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>35, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Four: Accommodating Gifted and Struggling Readers</td>
<td>37, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Five: Assessing Reading Development</td>
<td>41, 42, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Six: Home-School Connections</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Seven: Overall School and Classroom Reading</td>
<td>47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Eight: Level Specific Questions</td>
<td>49, 50, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Quantitative Data Analysis**

In an explanatory sequential design mixed methods study, the analysis of data occurs at different points in the data collection process (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). Following the survey, data were analyzed for the purpose of developing the qualitative phase of the study. The next phase of data analysis occurred after the collection of qualitative data. Finally, the point of interface (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007) occurred, where the quantitative and qualitative data were linked together for the purpose of answering the research question. The specifics of how the data were analyzed are discussed below.

The analysis of the survey data included a descriptive statistics measure including graph and table data showing teacher response percentages, provided by the Qualtrics survey program. Basic descriptive measures were appropriate for analysis of these data because the research question lends itself to a descriptive explanation of teacher practices. The Qualtrics survey program also provided percentage analyses of various questions, yielding more detailed information about the categories that more closely supported the research question. The open-ended portion of the survey was analyzed using qualitative coding measures defined in the data analysis section below.

**Qualitative Strand**

**Study Participants**

The participants for this study were primary-grade teachers within a southeastern state along with local county primary-grade teacher exemplars. The qualitative participant selection process began with a request to the local city and county superintendents of education. A letter was sent to the superintendents (Appendix B) describing the researcher as well as the research questions and plan. The letter requested that the superintendents forward the survey consent with
embedded survey link to the principals in their districts and also asked for permission to seek out
primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominees for their participation in interviews as teacher
exemplars.

Initially, the request for participation in the study was sent to both the local city and
county school systems. The city, however, declined, so the study was only conducted with
county employees. Upon receiving approval from the county superintendent of education, the
primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominees from the local county school system were
contacted to request their participation in the study. Of the fifteen county nominees from the last
two years, only one was willing to participate. Due to the low response rate, Teacher-of-the-Year
nominees from prior years were sought out, and eleven agreed to participate. The one Teacher-
of-the-Year nominee who responded initially was willing to allow classroom observations. The
others were willing to participate in interviews.

There were a total of twelve qualitative participants from various elementary schools
around the local county school system. The local county education system employees
participants involved in this study were selected as simply a judgmental sample (Yin, 2014),
meaning that generalizations should not be drawn from the afforded data. In other words, the
participants for this study were local teachers selected in order to learn more about the teacher
practices in the local area, and should not be considered a sufficient sample for drawing
statistical conclusions (Yin, 2014).

The twelve local qualitative participants reportedly participated in the statewide survey,
but their results remained anonymous. In particular, the twelve teachers were chosen by their
colleagues as Teacher-of-the-Year nominees over the course of the last four years, and were
chosen to participate in interviews and observations for this study because the Teacher-of-the-
Year nominee criteria set them apart as teacher exemplars. In order to preserve confidentiality, pseudonyms were used to protect identities. No data were gathered prior to receiving signed consent from the participants. Furthermore, all confidentiality standards in place by The University of Alabama as well as the school system were maintained.

**Qualitative Data Collection**

**Observations.** Qualitative data was gathered via interviews and observations. The observations took place in the classroom of one primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominee. Observations took place during the regular school day over the course of a week in order to gather data explaining what the teacher was doing with regards to reading in the classroom. The classroom observations were guided using a protocol fashioned after *The Reading Lesson Observation Framework* (Henk, Moore, Marinak, & Tomasetti, 2000). This particular framework was developed to encourage continuity and common goals for a reading lesson in a Pennsylvania school district. The observation tool made the observation of teachers’ reading lessons less daunting because teachers understood what was expected (Henk et al., 2000).

*The Reading Lesson Observation Framework* was designed to be used for evaluative purposes and focuses more solely on an actual reading lesson. Therefore, a similar protocol was formed, removing the evaluative component and adding a field note component to allow for a more exploratory observation of a school day in its entirety. *The Reading Lesson Observation Framework* is comprised of the following seven components: Classroom Climate, Prereading Phase, Guided Reading Phase, Post-Reading Phase, Skill and Strategy Instruction, Materials and Tasks of the Lesson, and Teacher Practices (Henk et al., 2000). The adapted framework used for this study included the following components: Classroom Climate, Reading Instruction
Interviews. In addition to the observations, semi-structured interviews were conducted with county primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominees. The interview questions used in the qualitative strand of the research were informed by the findings of the quantitative strand. As the qualitative strand of the research unfolded, minor adjustments were made to some of the research questions. Since the main focus of the research was teacher practices, the qualitative participants were afforded the opportunity to develop topics and raise questions or highlight ideas that they felt were important, making the interviews less structured.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Coding approach. For analyzing the data, Yin (2014) outlined four principles for a high-quality analysis: (a) consider all of the evidence, (b) address all plausible rival interpretations, (c) make sure the analysis addresses the most significant aspect of the study, and (d) use prior expert knowledge. In order to adhere to the high-quality data analysis standards, the process of analyzing the qualitative data was completed using three different cycles of coding. When researchers code, short words or phrases are assigned to the data in order to draw a summary and create a word visual of the data (Saldaña, 2013). In other words, coding is the means by which explanations of meaning are drawn from the raw data (Charmaz, 2001). Coding is, then, the process and bridge between the gathering of the data and making sense of the data (Charmaz, 2001).

In vivo coding. The initial cycle of the three cycle coding approach was In Vivo coding (Saldaña, 2013). In Vivo coding consists of themes drawn from “the very words used by the
participants (Strauss, 1987).” In Vivo coding places thematic value upon the actual language of the participants, and, as such, gives voice to the participants in the study.

Prior to engaging in the second cycle of coding, the codes that emerged from the first cycle of coding were organized into categories and then into more concrete themes or concepts (Anfara, 2008). Saldaña (2013) stated, “Several qualitative data display strategies exist for enhancing the credibility and trustworthiness- not to mention organization- of your observations as analysis proceeds toward and progresses during Second Cycle coding” (p. 194).

**Pattern coding.** The second cycle of coding involved Pattern coding (Saldaña, 2013). Pattern codes are “explanatory or inferential codes, ones that identify an emergent theme, configuration, or explanation. They pull together material into a more parsimonious unit of analysis. Pattern coding is a way of grouping summaries into a smaller number of sets, themes, or constructs” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 69). Pattern coding allowed for a more thorough analysis of the concrete themes and concepts by pulling them together into predominant themes or explainable chunks (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

**Codeweaving.** The final step in the data analysis process consisted of codeweaving and theorizing. “Codeweaving is the actual integration of key code words and phrases into narrative form to see how the puzzle pieces fit together” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 248). Codeweaving is a process of looking at the data that has been coded, organized, and themed, more holistically. A holistic approach to the data offers the researcher the opportunity to look for broader themes for discussion (Saldaña, 2013). The final theorizing step involves the researcher using these broad themes to offer an explanation of a phenomenon. The theorizing process involved using the themes to explain what is occurring in the primary classrooms to motivate students to read.
Validity

In mixed methods research, the issue of validity deals with both the design of the study as well as the interpretation of the results (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Specifically, in order for validity to be established, the study design must be appropriate for answering the research question. For this particular study, the research question requires that an explanation be offered for what teachers are doing to motivate children to read. In order to answer the question, an explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011) study was established as best suited for this study.

Furthermore, Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) address validity in mixed methods research in terms of identifying strategies used in data collection and analysis and interpretation of results that might compromise the connection of quantitative and qualitative data. Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) specify certain threats that have the potential to disturb validity in mixed methods studies. For example, one threat that might present itself in the data collection phase of research is the selection of inappropriate individuals for the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. In order to ensure that validity is not compromised by inappropriate participant selection methods, Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) suggest that participants for the distinct phases of a mixed methods study be taken from the same sample. In this study, participants for the quantitative phase and the qualitative phase were all self-reported primary teachers from a southeastern state.

Another potential threat to research validity comes at the data analysis phase, where researchers might make illogical comparisons of the quantitative and qualitative data. In order to overcome this threat, Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) recommend finding specific quotes within the qualitative data that match the quantitative results. For example, the report of findings...
to follow in this study consist of direct participant quotes used for the purpose of explaining findings from the survey.

Finally, the interpretation of results phase in a mixed methods study can present potential threats to validity by not discussing the research question and by giving more weight to one fore of data over another. In an effort to make sure that these threats were minimized in this study, the findings are presented alongside a rationale about why those particular findings are important in light of the research questions. Furthermore, the report of findings includes a rationale for why the qualitative data provided a clearer understanding about what teachers are doing to motivate students to read (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011).

Summary

Academic achievement and literacy achievement, specifically, are inhibited by a lack of motivation to read (Ortlieb, Grandstaff-Beckers, & Cheek, 2012). The essential understanding is that in order for students to become motivated to read, literacy instruction must be infused with engaging opportunities for students, so that their achievement levels increase as well as their reading motivation (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008). It is vital for teachers to understand what classroom practices contribute to motivating students to read. The problem, however, is that there is very little research pertaining to reading motivation in the primary-grades (Baker, Dreher, & Guthrie, 2000; Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006).

An explanation of what local primary teachers are doing to motivate students to read was the goal for this dissertation study. Using a mixed methods design, this study explored the phenomenon by gathering data from multiple sources, analyzing the data, and discussing the findings. More specifically, an explanatory sequential design, bringing together quantitative survey data with qualitative interview and observation data, was implemented in order to explain
teacher practices. The purpose of this research was not only to fill a gap in the literature, but also to bring a greater awareness to our local primary teachers and leaders about what our teachers do to motivate young students to read.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results for the previously outlined study designed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do teachers support the reading motivations of young children?

2. What teacher practices are being employed by primary-grade teachers to motivate young children to read?

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed-methods study (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007) was to explore and explain what local primary teachers are doing to motivate their students to read. In order to accomplish this goal, both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered. The research design included an electronic survey administered using Qualtrics and analyzed using SPSS and Qualtrics. The analysis provided frequencies and descriptive statistics, offering percentage representations of the answers provided by the respondents compiled in basic tables. Qualitative data were gathered using interviews and observations for the purpose of further explaining primary-grade teacher practices for motivating students to read.

The results section begins with a description of the participants involved in the quantitative strand of this study, followed by the results of the survey. Next, a description of the qualitative participants is offered followed by the findings from the interviews and observations.
Quantitative Strand

The research began with the quantitative strand of data collection and analysis, using an electronic survey. The research-based survey, *The First R* (Baumann, Hoffman, Duffy-Hester, & Ro, 2000) (see Appendix A), asked participants to respond to various questions pertaining to classroom literacy practices. The quantitative strand of the study was implemented in order to answer the following research questions: How do teachers support reading motivations of young children? What teacher practices are being employed by primary-grade teachers to motivate young children to read?

Participants

Quantitative data were gathered via an electronic survey sent to all 138 school districts within Alabama. The 138 superintendents of education across the state received the research request and survey link and were asked to forward the information to the local school principals and then on to the general education primary teachers. A total of 95 teacher respondents from varying districts within the state completed the survey to various degrees, as the survey was set up so as not to require participants to complete it in its entirety if they did not wish to do so.

Table 3 presents the demographic data regarding the survey participants in the online survey. Of the 95 survey respondents, the majority identified themselves as female (99%) (n=89), while 1% (n=1) of the respondents were male. There were six African American and 83 Caucasian teacher survey participants. When the survey asked about the total number of years spent as an elementary teacher, the respondents indicated a mean of 14 years of teaching experience with the maximum number of years taught being 35 and the minimum being .5 years. Thirty-two of the respondents reported teaching kindergarten, thirty indicated they were first grade teachers, and twenty-three indicated they were second grade teachers. The data also showed
that 66% (n=59) of the respondents hold Master’s degrees in education, with 14% (n=13) holding Specialist degrees, and 3% (n=3) also holding doctorate degrees.

Table 3

Quantitative Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Held</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative Results

The following section addresses how the survey responses helped to answer the research questions for this study. In order to gather both simple descriptive statistics, including percentages and tables, on primary teacher literacy practices in the local school system, a research-based survey, *The First R* (Baumann, Hoffman, Duffy-Hester, & Ro, 2000) was administered (see Appendix A). “Surveys are popular methods of collecting information from individuals and the preferred means to address a research question when it is most efficient to simply ask those who can inform the question” (Duke & Mallette, 2004, p. 288). Several studies (Barr & Sadow, 1989; Sosniak & Stodolsky, 1993) indicated that survey data gathered on reading instructional practices is supported with data gathered via observations and interviews. Because the central research question of this study focused on how primary-grade teachers motivate students to read, the use of a survey describing reading and literacy practices was appropriate (Duke & Mallette, 2004).
More specifically, in order to explain how classroom teachers are supporting reading motivation for young children, *The First R* survey was chosen to gain insight into the reading practices occurring within classrooms, with the intention of using the information about those practices to explain how classrooms are supporting students in becoming motivated readers. *The First R* survey is comprised of 55 questions divided into the following ten domains: Teacher Education and Professional Development, School and Student Demographics, Teacher Beliefs and Philosophical Orientation, Instructional Time, Organizing for Instruction, Accommodating Gifted and Struggling Readers, Assessing Reading Development, Home-School Connections, Overall School and Classroom Reading Programs, and Level-Specific Questions. Table 4 identifies the specific questions within the eight specific domains that worked directly to answer the research questions for this study.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Domains</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain One: Teacher Beliefs and Philosophical Orientations</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Two: Instructional Time</td>
<td>24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Three: Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>35, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Four: Accommodating Gifted and Struggling Readers</td>
<td>37, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Five: Assessing Reading Development</td>
<td>41, 42, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Six: Home-School Connections</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Seven: Overall School and Classroom Reading</td>
<td>47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Eight: Level Specific Questions</td>
<td>49, 50, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain one: Teacher beliefs and philosophical orientation.** Two questions in the first domain worked to answer the central research questions. Question number 22 asked respondents to mark one or multiple responses to indicate various perspectives, philosophies, or beliefs toward the teaching and learning of reading. Table 4 identifies the nine response options from which the survey participants could choose. A total of 66 participants responded to this question.
As indicated below in Table 5, a majority (80%) (n=53) reported they believe that phonics needs to be taught directly to beginning readers in order for students to become fluent, skillful readers. More specifically, of that majority, 40% (n=21) were kindergarten teachers, 34% (n=18) were first grade teachers, and 22% (n=5) were second grade teachers. Furthermore, 76% (n=50) reported they believe students need to be immersed in literature and literary experiences in order to become fluent readers. Of the 76% (n=50) who reported their belief in literary immersion, 40% (n=20) were kindergarten teachers, 33% (n=16) were first grade teachers, and 14% (n=7) were second grade teachers.

Seventy-four percent (n=49) indicated they believed in a balanced approach to reading instruction, which combines skills development with language-rich activities. Of the 74% (n=49), 39% (n=19) were kindergarten teachers, 31% (n=15) were first grade teachers, and 10% (n=5) were second grade teachers. An “eclectic” attitude toward reading instruction was indicated by 67% (n=44), meaning the teachers draw from multiple perspectives and sets of materials when teaching reading. Thirty-two percent (n=14) of those who reported having an eclectic attitude toward reading were kindergarten teachers, 41% (n=18) were first grade teachers, and 9% (n=4) were second grade teachers.

Fifty-nine percent (n=39) reported believing that one of the most important goals for early reading instruction is to teach students to decode words. Forty-one percent (n=16) were kindergarten teachers, 36% (n=14) were first grade teachers, and 10% (n=4) were second grade teachers. A literature-based approach to reading instruction, in which trade books (i.e. children’s books or library books) would be used exclusively or heavily was selected by 35% (n=23). Of that 35%, 22% (n=5) were kindergarten teachers, 35% (n=8) were first grade teachers, and 22% (n=5) were second grade teachers. Thirty-two percent (n=21) indicated a belief that basal reading
materials are useful tools for teaching students to read, either as primary instructional material or along with trade books (i.e. children’s books or library books). Twenty-four percent (n=5) of those respondents were kindergarten teachers, 38% (n=8) were first grade teachers, and 14% (n=3) were second grade teachers. Lastly, 14% (n=9) reported they would describe themselves as whole language teachers, with 11% (n=7) who reported they would describe themselves as a “traditionalist” when it comes to reading methods and materials.

Table 5

Question 22: Teacher Perspectives, Philosophies, or Beliefs toward Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectives, Philosophies, or Beliefs Toward Reading</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would describe myself as a “traditionalist” when it comes to reading methods and materials when teaching reading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an “eclectic” attitude toward reading instruction, which means that I would draw from multiple perspectives and sets of materials when teaching reading</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would describe myself as a whole language teacher.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an “eclectic” attitude toward reading instruction, which means that I would draw from multiple perspectives and sets of materials when teaching reading</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in a balanced approach to reading instruction, which combines skills development with language-rich activities.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that teaching students to decode words is one of my most important goals for early reading instruction.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that phonics needs to be taught directly to beginning readers in order for students to become fluent, skillful readers.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in a literature-based approach to reading instruction in which trade books (i.e. children’s books or library books) would be used exclusively or heavily.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that basal reading materials are useful tools for teaching students to read, either as primary instructional material or along with trade books (i.e. children’s books or library books).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that basal reading materials are useful tools for teaching students to read, either as primary instructional material or along with trade books (i.e. children’s books or library books).</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe students need to be immersed in literature and literacy experiences in order to become fluent readers.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe students need to be immersed in literature and literacy experiences in order to become fluent readers.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question number 23 asked respondents to mark one or multiple responses representing various goals or objectives that teachers might have for a reading instructional program. A total of 60 participants responded to this question. Most of the respondents indicated on this section that their primary goal for reading instruction was to develop readers who are both skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and comprehension (86%) (n=56). Of the 86% who
reported this as a primary goal, 38% (n=21) were kindergarten teachers, 34% (n=19) were first grade teachers, and 11% (n=6) were second grade teachers.

A second primary goal was to develop readers who are independent and motivated to choose, appreciate, and enjoy literature (86%) (n=56). Thirty-eight percent (n=21) of those who indicated a primary goal of developing motivated readers were kindergarten teachers. Thirty percent (n=17) were first grade teachers and 13% (n=7) were second grade teachers. A third goal was identified by 77% (n=50) to develop readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which we live was identified for reading instruction. The goal with the least number of responses was to develop readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types and structures (52%) (n=34).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Objectives for a Reading Program</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is my goal to develop readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and comprehension</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my goal to develop readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which we live.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my goal to develop readers who are independent and motivated to choose, appreciate, and enjoy literature.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my goal to develop readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain two: Instructional time.** The second survey domain focused on instructional time and consisted of 8 questions that aimed to answer how primary teachers support reading motivation for young children as well as what practices are being employed by these teachers to
motivate children to read. Respondents were asked a series of questions in this domain to determine how instructional time is spent within the classroom with regards to literacy instruction.

Question 24 asked the respondents to estimate the number of minutes spent each day for reading and language arts activities. Sixty-three respondents answered this question, and the following findings are depicted in Table 7 below. A mean of 65 minutes spent daily on reading instruction that includes meeting with small groups, skill and strategy lesson, and teacher-guided reading was reported. A mean of 40 minutes was indicative of the time spent daily extending and practicing reading instruction by means of read alouds, students’ independent reading, student-led reading groups, and cooperative reading activities. Finally, a mean of 33 minutes spent daily on language arts instruction and practice, including writing workshop, journals, spelling, and oral language activities was reported.

When looking at specific grade levels, kindergarten teachers reported a mean of 63 minutes per day spent on reading instruction in small groups, skill and strategy lessons, and teacher-guided reading. First grade teachers who participated in this question indicated a mean of 70 minutes spent on these components of reading instruction, and second grade teachers reported a mean of 62 minutes. Kindergarten teachers reported a mean of 36 minutes spent daily extending and practicing reading instruction. First grade teachers reported a mean of 40 minutes, and second grade teachers reported a mean of 37 minutes in this particular area. Finally, kindergarten teachers reported spending a mean of 30 minutes on language arts instruction and practice. First grade teachers reported spending a mean of 33 minutes, and second grade teachers reported a mean of 31 minutes with this component.
Table 7

Question 24: Reading Instructional Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Time</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time spent daily on reading instruction that includes meeting with small groups, skill and strategy lesson, and teacher-guided reading</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent daily extending and practicing reading instruction by means of read alouds, students’ independent reading, student-led reading groups, and cooperative reading activities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent daily on language arts instruction and practice, including writing workshop, journals, spelling, and oral language activities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on phonics and decoding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the question about the instructional time, question 25 asked respondents to report using a Likert scale the amount of instructional time devoted to the development of various components and activities of a language arts program. For the various components, respondents could answer that they spent considerable time, moderate time, little, or no time on each. The findings are outlined in Table 8 and suggest that the component of reading and language arts instructional time on which respondents spend the most considerable amount of time is phonics and decoding (72%) (n=43) with an average time of 43 minutes spent on this component daily. Secondary to phonics and decoding was reading comprehension (67%) (n=40), with an average time of 40 minutes. Literature circles, book clubs, and discussion groups was the component to which most respondents reported devoting no time (20%) (n=12), with another 49% (n=29) indicating they only devote little time to it. Another 62% (n=37) indicated study skills as being a component of language arts with which they spent little to no time.
Table 8

**Question 25: Instructional Time Devoted to Language Arts Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Arts Components or Activities</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reading vocabulary</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical reading</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral reading</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent reading</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study skills</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading in the content areas</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics/decoding</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading aloud to students</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students reading independently</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral or written response to literature</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature circles, book clubs, literature discussion groups</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading strategies instruction</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process writing or Writing Workshop</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language experience stories or charts</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling lists, activities, or games</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwriting instruction or practice</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological applications to literacy</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 9, 10, and 11 below outline the findings of question 25 according to grade level. Specific grade level data indicate 95% (n=21) reported spending the most considerable amount of time with phonics and decoding. There were 17 first grade teacher respondents, and 77% (n=13) also reported spending the most considerable amount of time with phonics and decoding. Furthermore, 71% (n=5) of the second grade respondents reported spending the most considerable amount of time with comprehension.

Table 9

| Question 25: Kindergarten Instructional Time Devoted to Language Arts Components |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|
| **Language Arts Components or Activities**      | **Considerable** | **Moderate** | **Little** | **None** | **N** |
| reading vocabulary                              | 6 (27%)          | 11 (50%)    | 5 (23%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| comprehension                                   | 15 (68%)         | 7 (32%)     | 0 (0%)    | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| critical reading                                | 2 (9%)           | 16 (73%)    | 4 (18%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| oral reading                                    | 7 (32%)          | 14 (64%)    | 1 (5%)    | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| silent reading                                  | 2 (9%)           | 9 (41%)     | 8 (36%)   | 3 (14%)  | 22    |
| study skills                                    | 1 (5%)           | 6 (27%)     | 7 (32%)   | 8 (36%)  | 22    |
| reading in the content areas                    | 4 (18%)          | 12 (55%)    | 6 (27%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| phonics/decoding                                | 21 (95%)         | 1 (5%)      | 0 (0%)    | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| reading aloud to students                       | 16 (73%)         | 5 (23%)     | 1 (6%)    | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| students reading independently                  | 2 (9%)           | 16 (73%)    | 4 (18%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| oral or written response to literature          | 3 (14%)          | 13 (59%)    | 6 (27%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| literature circles, book clubs, literature discussion groups | 0 (0%)         | 3 (14%)     | 12 (57%)  | 6 (29%)  | 21    |
| reading strategies instruction                  | 13 (59%)         | 8 (36%)     | 1 (6%)    | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| process writing or Writing Workshop             | 11 (50%)         | 9 (41%)     | 2 (9%)    | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| language experience stories or charts            | 7 (32%)          | 10 (45%)    | 5 (23%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
| spelling lists, activities, or games            | 5 (23%)          | 6 (27%)     | 8 (36%)   | 3 (14%)  | 22    |
| handwriting instruction or practice             | 5 (23%)          | 14 (64%)    | 3 (14%)   | 0 (0%)   | 22    |
### Table 10

**Question 25: First Grade Instructional Time Devoted to Language Arts Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Arts Components or Activities</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reading vocabulary</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>9 (53%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical reading</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral reading</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent reading</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study skills</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading in the content areas</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics/decoding</td>
<td>13 (77%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading aloud to students</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students reading independently</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>10 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral or written response to literature</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature circles, book clubs,</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature discussion groups</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading strategies instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process writing or Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (65%)</td>
<td>18 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language experience stories or charts</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling lists, activities, or games</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwriting instruction or practice</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological applications to literacy</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11

**Question 25: Second Grade Instructional Time Devoted to Language Arts Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Arts Components or Activities</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reading vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading in the content areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics/decoding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading aloud to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students reading independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral or written response to literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature circles, book clubs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature discussion groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading strategies instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process writing or Writing Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language experience stories or charts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling lists, activities, or games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwriting instruction or practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological applications to literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 26 in the Instructional Time domain asked respondents to indicate what types of reading instructional materials they use and with what frequency, with the Likert scale indicators being exclusively, predominantly, moderately, infrequently, or never. The findings are outlined in Table 12 below. Interestingly, only 4% (n=2) reported they use a single basal reading series exclusively, with the majority (47%) (n=25) indicating they use nonfiction trade books predominantly. Table 13 displays kindergarten instructional materials, Table 14 displays first grade instructional materials, and Table 15 displays second grade instructional materials.
### Table 12

**Question 26: Instructional Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Materials</th>
<th>exclusively</th>
<th>predominantly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>infrequently</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a single basal reading series</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple basal reading series</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature anthologies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction trade books</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfiction trade books</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial classroom libraries</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics workbooks</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general reading skills workbooks</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines and newspapers</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big books</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture trade books</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapter trade books</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer hardware and software</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other instructional media</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13

**Question 26: Kindergarten Instructional Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Materials</th>
<th>exclusively</th>
<th>predominantly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>infrequently</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a single basal reading series</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple basal reading series</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature anthologies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction trade books</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfiction trade books</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14

**Question 26: First Grade Instructional Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Materials</th>
<th>exclusively</th>
<th>predominantly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>infrequently</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a single basal reading series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple basal reading series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature anthologies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction trade books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfiction trade books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial classroom libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics workbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general reading skills workbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines and newspapers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture trade books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapter trade books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Materials</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics workbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general reading skills workbooks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines and newspapers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture trade books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapter trade books</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer hardware and software</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other instructional media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subsequently, question 27 in the Instructional Time domain of the survey asked the teachers how they use basal reading materials and trade books in their classroom reading program. Fifty-one respondents participated in this particular question on the survey. Most (39%) (n=20) reported they use basal reading materials as the foundation of their reading program, but
they incorporate trade books as well. Thirty-seven percent (n=19) indicated that they use trade books as the foundation for their reading program, but supplement with basal books. Trade books were reported as being the only reading instructional materials in the classrooms of 20% (n=10) of the respondents, with 4% (n=2) who reported using only basal materials for teaching reading with no trade book supplementation. The results from question 27 are outlined in Table 16 below.

Table 16

**Question 27: Reading Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Basal Reading Materials and Trade Books are Used</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use basal reading materials as the only reading instructional materials in my classroom; that is, I use no trade books to teach reading.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use basal reading materials as the foundation of my reading program; in other words, my reading program is structured around the basal, but I incorporate trade books within the basal program.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use trade books as the foundation for my reading program; in other words, my program is trade book based, but I use basals some of the time to supplement the trade books.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use trade books as the only reading instructional materials in my classroom; that is, I use no basal materials to teach reading.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 29 asked respondents how, if at all, they teach reading skills and strategies in relation to the reading instructional materials referred to in question 27. One or multiple responses could be selected to answer this question, and a total of 52 participants responded.

Table 17 below shows the data yielded from question 29.

Table 17

**Question 29: How the Teaching of Reading Relates to the Classroom Instructional Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How the Teaching of Reading Relates to the Classroom Instructional Materials</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I teach skills and strategies as presented in the basal program.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I select skills and strategies from the basal program, teaching only those skills that I feel my students need to learn.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the basal as a general guide for teaching skills and strategies, but I adapt or extend instruction from the basal significantly.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I supplement the basal program by teaching additional skills not covered</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I use the basal to identify reading skills, but I teach them in the context of trade books we are using.  

I have constructed my own skills program, which I teach in conjunction with trade books we are reading.  

I teach skills and strategies on the basis of ongoing informal observations and assessments of my students’ learning.  

I teach reading skills very little or not at all—either from the basal or through trade books.

Question 30 asked the respondents to indicate to which degree they use trade books to support content area studies in science, social studies, and mathematics; for example, using historical fiction and informational books in a social studies unit. The criteria options were as follows: always, often, sometimes, seldom, and hardly ever. Table 18 below displays the results for this question.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>always</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>seldom</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>hardly ever</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In science</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In social studies</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In math</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question in the domain on instructional time related to library facilities.

Question 31 specifically asked respondents to indicate whether they have a central library in their school and whether they have a personal classroom library. Ninety-six percent (n=51) of the respondents reported that they have a central library in their school. A personal classroom library was selected by 96% (n=51) as well. The results from question 31 are displayed in Table 19 below.
Table 19

*Question 31: Library Facilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Facilities</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a central library in my school.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have my own classroom library.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Instructional Time domain culminated with questions pertaining to the school library. Question 32 asked respondents to select all of the statements that applied to their personal school libraries. Of the fifty-two respondents, 81% ($n=42$) reported that the number of books in the library collection is adequate or better and that the library is open and accessible to all students. Furthermore, 73% ($n=38$) indicated that the book collection in their school library is current and up to date. On the answer choices pertaining to how the librarian supports the students’ reading, 54% ($n=28$) answered that the librarian teaches skills directly to the students, and 63% ($n=33$) answered that the librarian conducts book talks with the children. Sixty-nine percent ($n=36$) reported that there is sufficient space for the students to browse and do research and for the library to offer lessons, and 92% ($n=48$) reported having a part- or full-time professionally trained librarian or media specialist as well. The results of question 32 are displayed in Table 20 below.

Table 20

*Question 32: School Library*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Library Questions</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of books in the library is adequate or better.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collection is current and up to date.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library is open and accessible to all students.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a part- or full-time professionally trained librarian or media specialist in our library.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient space for the students to browse and</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
do research and for the library to offer lessons.
The librarian teaches skills directly to my students.  28  54%
The librarian conducts book talks and reads to my students.  33  63%

**Domain three: Organizing for instruction.** Following the Instructional Time domain, the Organizing for Instruction domain of the survey asked the respondents about the structures in place within classrooms for organizing literacy instruction. There were two specific questions within this domain that worked at answering the central research questions about how primary teachers support reading motivation for young children and what practices those teachers employ for motivating students to read.

Question 35 provided statements describing various ways to organize classroom reading instruction, and asked the respondents to indicate all statements that described the organizational plans regularly employed in their classrooms. Forty-eight participants responded to this particular question, and the results are described here and in Table 21 below. Sixty-nine percent (n=33) reported that they use ability groupings to teach reading; for example, placing all the “highest” readers in one group, all the “middle” readers in a second group, and all the “lowest” readers in a third group. Flexible grouping was indicated by 58% (n=28). With flexible grouping, students may be grouped according to interest, genre, or skill need, but the groupings are not fixed and change regularly. Eight percent (n=4) indicated that they teach reading as an individualized activity, designing special programs for each of the students and not formally grouping children for instruction. Twenty-five percent (n=12) indicated that they teach reading as a whole-class activity; that is, students are generally grouped for reading instruction. Finally, three respondents (6%) reported that they use some other organizational strategy.
Table 21

**Question 35: Organizational Structures for Reading Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structures</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use ability groupings to teach reading; for example, placing all the “highest” readers in one group, all the “middle” readers in a second group, and all the “lowest” readers in a third group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use flexible reading groups in my classroom; that is, students might be grouped according to interest, genre, or skill need, but these groupings are not fixed and change regularly.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach reading as an individualized activity, designing special programs for each of my students; therefore, I do not formally group children for instruction.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach reading as a whole-class activity; that is, I do not generally group students for reading instruction.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use another organizational plan.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 36 asked respondents which of the organizational structures described in question 35 were used most frequently in the classroom reading program. There were 49 respondents who answered this question, and the results are detailed in Table 22 below.

Table 22

**Question 36: Frequency of Organizational Structures for Reading Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structures</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ability groupings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible groupings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individualized instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole-class instruction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other organizational plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain four: Accommodating gifted and struggling readers.** The domain on accommodating gifted and struggling readers yielded two questions that worked to answer the research questions about how teachers support reading motivation for young children as well as what classroom practices are in place for motivating students to read.

Question 37 provided statements describing various ways to accommodate the needs of children who may be gifted, talented, or accelerated readers. Respondents could select one or multiple responses, and 48 participants responded to the question. The following statements were
available for selection: There is a pull-out program for my gifted readers, which is taught by a special teacher for gifted and talented students; A special teacher for gifted and talented students comes to my classroom and works with me to accommodate my most capable readers; I adapt my classroom curriculum and my instruction to accommodate the special needs of my gifted and talented readers.

The majority (88%) (n=42) reported that they adapt instruction to meet the needs of struggling and gifted readers. Twenty-one percent (n=10) reported that there is a pull-out program for their gifted readers, which is taught by a special teacher for gifted and talented students. Finally, 4% (n=2) indicated that a special teacher for gifted and talented students comes to the classroom and works with the teacher to accommodate the most capable readers. The results from question 37 are organized in Table 23 below.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a pull-out program for my gifted readers, which is taught by a special teacher for gifted and talented students.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A special teacher for gifted and talented students comes to my classroom and works with me to accommodate my most capable readers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I adapt my classroom curriculum and my instruction to accommodate the special needs of my gifted and talented readers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to question 37 that referred to the accommodations for gifted or accelerated readers, question 39 provided multiple statements describing how teachers support struggling readers. Respondents could select one or multiple responses, and 49 participants responded to the question. The following statement choices were presented: There is a pull-out program for my struggling readers, which is taught by a special teacher for students experiencing difficulty in learning to read; A special teacher trained to work with children who experience reading difficulties comes to my classroom and works with me to accommodate my struggling readers; I
adapt my classroom and my instruction to accommodate the special needs of my students who experience problems learning to read.

The majority, 80% (n=39) indicated that they adapt their classroom and instruction to accommodate the special needs of their students who experience problems learning to read. Fifty-nine percent (n=29) reported that there is a pull-out program for their struggling readers, which is taught by a special teacher for students experiencing difficulties learning to read. Finally, 16% (n=8) indicated that there is a special teacher trained to work with children who experience reading difficulties who comes to the classroom and works with the teachers to accommodate struggling readers. The results from question 39 are displayed in Table 24 below.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a pull-out program for my struggling readers, which is taught by a special teacher for students experiencing difficulty in learning to read.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A special teacher trained to work with children who experience reading difficulties comes to my classroom and works with me to accommodate my struggling readers.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I adapt my classroom and my instruction to accommodate the special needs of my students who experience problems learning to read.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain five: Assessing reading development.** Following the domain on accommodations for gifted and struggling readers, the consecutive domain consisted of three questions pertaining to how teachers assess reading development.

Question 41 asked respondents to select one statement that characterized their overall approach to classroom reading assessment. Respondents could choose from one of the following statements: I rely primarily on conventional assessment measures, for example, basal reader tests and district-administered standardized reading tests; I use a mix of conventional assessment measures (e.g., basal and standardized tests) and some informal assessments (e.g. Informal
Reading Inventory); I am moving toward adopting various forms of alternative reading assessments (e.g. running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories) and/or a portfolio approach to assessment in my classroom; I rely extensively on alternative reading assessments (e.g. running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories) and/or I am using a portfolio approach to assessment in my classroom; and I basically don’t engage in any conventional or alternative reading assessments.

As illustrated in Table 25 below, a total of 44 respondents participated in this question. The majority (45%) (n=20) reported that they use a mix of conventional assessment measures and some informal assessments. Twenty-five percent (n=11) reported moving toward adopting various forms of alternative reading assessments (e.g. running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories) and/or a portfolio approach to assessment in the classroom. Twenty percent (n=9) indicated they rely extensively on alternative reading assessments (e.g. running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories) and/or they use a portfolio approach to assessment. Furthermore, 9% (n=4) reported that they rely primarily on conventional assessment measures, for example, basal reader tests and district-administered standardized reading tests, and, finally, no one indicated that they do not engage in reading assessments.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches to Assessing Reading Development</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I rely primarily on conventional assessment measures, for example, basal reader tests and district-administered standardized reading tests.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use a mix of conventional assessment measures (e.g. basal and standardized tests) and some informal assessments (e.g. Informal Reading Inventory).</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am moving toward adopting various forms of alternative reading assessments (e.g. running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories) and/or a portfolio approach to</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessment in my classroom.
I rely extensively on alternative reading assessments (e.g. running
records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal
inventories) and/or I am using a portfolio approach to assessment in
my classroom.

I basically don’t engage in any conventional or alternative reading
assessments.

Following question 41 on the measures used for reading assessment, question 42 asked to
which degree teachers use the results from various assessments to make instructional decisions in
the classroom. A Likert scale presented assessment options along with the following degrees to
which the assessment results are used, “considerable,” “moderate,” “little,” and “none.” The
results are presented below in Table 26.

Table 26

Question 42: The Degrees to Which Reading Assessments are used for Instructional Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>considerable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group standardized reading tests</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual standardized reading tests</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal reader program unit/level skills test</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal reading inventories</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running records</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/writing portfolios</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students interviews or conferences</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading miscue analysis</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational checklist/anecdotal records</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent literacy surveys/assessments</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final question in Domain 5 was question 45, asking teacher respondents to what degree they modify teaching to conform to mandatory assessments. The Likert scale options included, “very much,” “somewhat,” or “not at all.” A total of 43 respondents answered this question, and the majority (63%) (n=27) reported that they “somewhat” modify teaching to conform to mandatory assessments. There were eight respondents (19%) who reported they modify teaching “very much,” and another eight respondents (19%) who reported they modify their teaching “not at all.” The results are displayed in Table 27 below.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree to Which Teaching is Modified</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very much</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain six: Home-school connections.** One question on the survey was devoted to finding out about the home-school connections. The findings from question 46 are illustrated in Table 28 below. The question asked the teachers to mark one or multiple responses describing activities or programs which they have initiated to involve caregivers in the students’ literacy learning. The following statements were options for selection: I encourage parents/care-givers to read to their children at home regularly; I encourage parents/care-givers to listen to their children read regularly; I encourage parents/care-givers to provide opportunities for their children to write in meaningful ways (e.g., write grocery lists, write down chores, write letter to relatives); I send home notes to parents/care-givers that explain our classroom reading/literacy program and how they can support it at home; I invite parents/care-givers or other relatives (e.g., grandparents,
aunts, uncles) to come to school and help out in the classroom (e.g., listening to children read, reading to children); I regularly send home books from my classroom library for my students to practice reading with their parents/care-givers; I invite parents/care-givers to school for special workshops I conduct on how they can support literacy at home (e.g., reading aloud at home, writing opportunities at home); and other home-school initiatives.

A majority (98%) (n=43) answered that they encourage parents and care-givers to read at home to their children regularly as well as listen to the children read regularly. Notes are sent to the parents and guardians by 91% (n=40) of the teachers, giving an overview of the reading program and how it can be supported at home. Sixty-eight percent (n=30) reported that they regularly send home books from their classroom library for students to practice reading at home, and another 61% (n=27) reported that they encourage parents and caregivers to provide opportunities for their children to write in meaningful ways. Parents/care-givers are invited to come help read and listen to children read at school by 45% (n=20) of the respondents. Some (22%) (n=10) also reported inviting parents and caregivers to school for special workshops conducted on how literacy can be supported at home. Finally, 11% (n=5) answered that they have some other home-school initiatives in place for their classroom. The results are displayed in Table 28 below.

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 46: Home-school Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage parents/care-givers to read to their children at home regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage parents/care-givers to listen to their children read at home regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage parents/care-givers to provide opportunities for their children to write in meaningful ways (e.g. write grocery lists, write down chores, write letter to relatives).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I send home notes to parents/care-givers that explain our classroom reading/literacy program and how they can support it at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to come to school and help out in the classroom (e.g. listening to children read, reading to children).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regularly send home books from my classroom library for my students to practice reading with their parents/care-givers.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I invite parents/care-givers to school for special workshops I conduct on how they can support literacy at home (e.g. reading aloud at home, writing opportunities at home).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other home-school initiatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domain seven: Overall school and classroom reading program. This domain consisted of two questions that asked the teachers to rate both their overall school reading program and their classroom reading program. Questions 47 and 48 asked the teachers to assign a grade of A, B, C, D, or F for each of the following criteria: developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension; developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which we live; developing readers who are independent in choosing appreciating and enjoying literature; and developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types and structures. A total of 43 respondents participated in the both questions 47 and 48. Table 29 illustrates the findings of question 47 pertaining to the overall school reading program ratings.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall School Reading Program</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nineteen kindergarten teachers responded to question 47, rating the overall school reading program. The data yielded from the kindergarten teachers is displayed in Table 30 below. Twelve first grade teachers responded to question 47, rating the overall school reading program, and Table 31 displays the data below. Finally, three second grade teachers responded to question 47, rating the overall school reading program, and Table 32 displays the data below.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall School Reading Program</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall School Reading Program</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

**Question 47: Second Grade Overall School Reading Program Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall School Reading Program</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 illustrates the overall findings of question 48 pertaining to the classroom reading program ratings.

Table 33

**Question 48: Overall Classroom Reading Program Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall Classroom Reading Program</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nineteen kindergarten teachers responded to question 48, rating the overall classroom reading program. The data yielded from the kindergarten teachers is displayed in Table 34 below. Twelve first grade teachers responded to question 48, rating the overall classroom reading
program, and Table 35 displays the data below. Finally, three second grade teachers responded to question 48, rating the overall classroom reading program, and Table 36 displays the data below.

Table 34

**Question 48: Kindergarten Overall Classroom Reading Program Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall Classroom</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35

**Question 48: First Grade Overall Classroom Reading Program Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall Classroom</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36

**Question 48: Second Grade Overall Classroom Reading Program Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Rating the Overall Classroom</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82
Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live

Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature

Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures

**Domain eight: Level-specific questions.** The final domain of the survey opens with an explanation as to which questions should be answered by kindergarten through second grade teachers and those that should be answered by teachers of grades three through five. Since this survey was only sent to primary-grade teachers, all respondents answered the questions pertaining to grades kindergarten through second grade. The domain consisted of four questions that served to answer the central research questions of this study.

Question 49 asked respondents to select one of two statements that best matched their personal philosophies or perspectives about reading programs for young children. The following statements were presented as choices for selection: I believe in a reading readiness perspective; that is, a child’s physical, intellectual, and emotional maturity are directly related to success in reading and writing. Therefore, it is a teacher’s job to provide students appropriate activities (e.g. visual, auditory, motor skill activities) to support or enhance their readiness for reading; I believe in an emergent literacy perspective; that is, all children can benefit from early, meaningful reading and writing experiences (e.g. invented spelling, environmental print, being read to) Therefore, it is a teacher’s job to provide students appropriate activities that will enable them to understand the functions and forms of literacy and to grow into conventional forms of reading and writing.
Forty-three respondents participated in this question, and the majority (72%) (n=31) reported that they believe in an emergent literacy perspective. Of that majority, 48% (n=15) were kindergarten teachers, 29% (n=9) were first grade teachers, and 3% (n=1) was represented by second grade. The results are presented in Table 37 below.

Table 37

**Question 49: Personal Philosophy About Reading Programs for Young Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Philosophy About Reading Programs for Young Children</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe in a reading readiness perspective; that is, a child’s physical, intellectual, and emotional maturity are directly related to success in reading and writing. Therefore, it is a teacher’s job to provide students appropriate activities (e.g. visual, auditory, motor skill activities) to support or enhance their readiness for reading.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in an emergent literacy perspective; that is, all children can benefit from early, meaningful reading and writing experiences (e.g. invented spelling, environmental print, being read to) Therefore, it is a teacher’s job to provide students appropriate activities that will enable them to understand the functions and forms of literacy and to grow into conventional forms of reading and writing.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 50 asked teachers to indicate their opinions about the importance of teaching young children the following word reading strategies: teaching phonic analysis skills/strategies (decoding); teaching structural or morphemic analysis skills/strategies (meaningful parts of words); teaching contextual analysis skills/strategies (what word makes sense in a selection); teaching words by sight (whole words); and teaching meaning vocabulary (word meanings). Question 50 presented a Likert scale including, “essential,” “important,” and “not important” as selection choices for each of the aforementioned word reading strategies. Table 38 depicts the findings below.

Table 38

**Question 50: Opinions about the Importance of Specific Word Reading Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Strategies</th>
<th>essential n</th>
<th>important n</th>
<th>Not important n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Question 51 was a follow-up to question 50, pertaining to what teachers believe about instruction in phonic analysis. Specifically, question 51 asked teachers to select one or multiple responses describing how they teach phonics if they indicated on question 50 that phonic analysis is “essential” or “important.” Forty respondents answered question 50, and the majority (93%) (n=37) reported that they teach synthetic phonics (systematic instruction in which students are taught letter/sound correspondences first and then are taught how to decode words).

Similarly, 88% (n=35) reported that they teach phonics by way of word families or phonograms, and 65% (n=26) indicated that they teach phonics in the context of writing and spelling. Fifty-five percent (n=22) teach phonics in the context of literature, 35% (n=14) teach analytic phonics, and 10% (n=4) teach phonics only as needed. The results of question 51 are presented in Table 39 below.

Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Phonics Instruction</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic phonics (systematic instruction in which students are taught letter/sound correspondences first and then are taught how to decode words)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decode words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials, Techniques, and Strategies</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big books used instructionally</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade books used instructionally</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal readers used instructionally</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children writing and conventional spelling is expected</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children writing and invented spelling is accepted and encouraged</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book handling demonstrations or activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics and word identification lessons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud to children</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral language activities (e.g., songs, chants, poems, rhymes)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, question 52 of the domain on level-specific questions asked teachers to mark one or multiple responses indicating which materials, techniques, or activities are likely to be found in their prekindergarten through second grade classroom regularly. For the purpose of this question, the survey defined “regularly” as three or more times per week. The results are defined below in Table 40.

Table 40

Question 52: Materials, Techniques, and Activities Used Regularly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading workshop time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing workshop time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading response activities (e.g., oral, written, or artistic responses following a reading/listening activity)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free reading periods (e.g., Drop Everything and Read, or Uninterrupted Sustained Silent Reading time)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal writing time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with word cards (e.g., word banks, sentence strips, word sorts, flash cards, pocket charts)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Strand**

**Participants**

Data for the qualitative portion of this study were collected using interviews and observations with some of the survey participants who were also local county Teacher-of-the-Year nominees from the past few years. The initial plan for this study involved interviews and observations with Teacher-of-the-Year nominees from the past two years from both the local city and county school systems. Permission to study in the city system was not secured, so the participant base was narrowed to only include the county school system. Of the fifteen county nominees from the last two years, only one was willing to participate.

Due to the low response rate, Teacher-of-the-Year nominees from prior years were sought out, and eleven agreed to participate. The one Teacher-of-the-Year nominee who responded initially was willing to allow classroom observations. The others were willing to participate in interviews. The twelve teachers participating in the interviews were from various elementary schools around the local county school system. Teacher-of-the-Year nominees are those who are chosen by their colleagues as being outstanding teachers. Once selected as a Teacher-of-the-Year nominee for your school, the candidate is placed in a pool with the nominees from other schools in the district from whom the Teacher-of-the-Year for the district is
chosen. From there, the Teacher-of-the-Year proceeds to represent his or her district at the state level with the potential of being chosen as the state Teacher-of-the-Year representative. The Teacher-of-the-Year nominee status was chosen as criteria for qualitative participation in interviews for this study, as this status qualifies the teachers as being exemplars.

As depicted in Table 41, of the twelve qualitative participants, 100% identified themselves as female (n=12). Four of the participants held Education Specialist degrees, six held Master’s degrees, and all held a Bachelor’s degree. All of the qualitative participants were tenured teachers.

Table 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Results**

This section includes the results of the qualitative strand of the study. Qualitative data were gathered using semi-structured interviews and observations of local primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominees. This section opens with a description of the observation site and teacher along with the major findings gained from the observations conducted within this particular classroom. Next, I describe the interview process along with how the data from the observations and interviews were analyzed and themes determined. The final sections outline the themes that emerged from the qualitative portion of this study.
Observations. The observations took place in the classroom of one primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominee. Observations took place during the majority of the regular school day for a week in order to gather data describing what the teacher was doing with regards to reading in the classroom. The classroom observations were guided using a protocol fashioned after *The Reading Lesson Observation Framework* (Henk et al., 2000). This particular framework was developed to encourage continuity and common goals for a reading lesson in a Pennsylvania school district. The observation tool made the observation of teachers’ reading lessons less daunting because teachers understood what was expected (Henk et al., 2000).

*The Reading Lesson Observation Framework* was designed to be used for evaluative purposes and focused on an actual reading lesson. Therefore, a similar protocol was formed, removing the evaluative component and adding a field note component to allow for a more exploratory observation of a school day in its entirety. *The Reading Lesson Observation Framework* is comprised of the following seven components: Classroom Climate, Prereading Phase, Guided Reading Phase, Postreading Phase, Skill and Strategy Instruction, Materials and Tasks of the Lesson, and Teacher Practices (Henk et al., 2000). The adapted framework used for this study included the following components: Classroom Climate, Reading Instruction (including whole and small group instruction), Content Area Instruction, Daily Materials and Tasks, and Teacher Practices (see Appendix C).

The school, Sunshine Elementary, in which the observations took place is a small, rural, Title I school. Sunshine Elementary is home to 223 students in pre-kindergarten through grade five. In the classroom where observations took place, the teacher, Mrs. R, is married with two children and has twelve years of teaching experience. She holds a Bachelor’s degree and Master’s degree in Elementary Education, and an Education Specialist degree in Curriculum and
Instruction. She is also National Board certified as an Early Elementary Generalist. Her teaching experience has been in grades kindergarten, first, and third. Mrs. R currently teaches one of two kindergarten classes at Sunshine Elementary.

Upon entering Mrs. R’s classroom each day, I was greeted with warm smiles from both the teacher and the twenty children. The colorful classroom held an organized library, a bright rug for gathering the students up front close to the white board and projector. Four rectangular student tables were arranged around the room, and five students sat at each table. The far right corner of the classroom, the teacher’s corner, held a kidney-shaped table for small group and individualized instruction with the teacher. Several anchor charts were displayed for behavior reminders and phonics skills reminders. The top shelves of the classroom library were lined with framed pictures of the students, making the area feel warm and much like a home to a family. Above this area was a classroom word wall, which held the names of the students along with a few sight words. An alphabet line and some short “o” poems were also posted above the white board.

Over the course of the 25 or more hours spent in Mrs. R’s classroom, a range of reading activities and routines were observed. Each morning, Mrs. R gathered the students on the rug for a morning meeting. At this time, she would engage the students in a read aloud followed by a brief time of going over their morning work using the ELMO and projector system. After the morning meeting, Mrs. R would begin her reading intervention time at her small group table. During this time on two of the observation days, Mrs. R called individual children to her table to read and go over a sight word sheet. The other three days, Mrs. R called a group of four children to her table together to read and go over a sight word sheet. She also reviewed the phonics skill
which had been taught the day before. During this time, the children who were not in Mrs. R’s small group were at their tables working on morning work.

After the intervention time, Mrs. R called the class to the front rug for whole group reading time. The whole group time began with the Saxon phonics lesson. Mrs. R engaged the children in a routine called “The Vowel Stomp” to review consonants and vowels before having them sit down to go over the new increment learning. During the observation time, the students were introduced to compound words and the “ar” combination. After the new phonics learning, the teacher transitioned into comprehension time. The children were learning about how to identify main details in both fiction and nonfiction texts. Using Comprehension Toolkit on three of the days, the teacher engaged the children in rich discussions of several nonfiction books and magazines about Helen Keller. Mrs. R made a chart for writing the details from the texts, and she recorded the details on the chart as the children shared.

Whole group reading was followed by a snack break and then a return to the classroom to begin small group instruction and reading stations. Small group instruction took place at the teacher’s table and varied in length of time. During the observation time, the students worked in small groups to build long “a” words using magnetic letters and boards. They also engaged in reading new sight words using a word pyramid in their sight word folders. While small groups met with Mrs. R, the other children were completing their daily phonics sheet and then moving to their reading stations. Stations included reading from individual book boxes, working in pairs on the iPad, writing sight word sentences on a whiteboard table, and working on literacy games on computers. There were also two children with special needs who worked inside the classroom with an aide during this time.
Overall, the daily reading block time was characterized with this schedule. The only read aloud took place at the beginning of whole group reading. Students engaged in reading individualized book boxes holding the phonics decodable readers during station time, and then they also read those texts in small group time with the teacher. The children enjoyed a visit to the library as well, where they were able to explore a book fair and checkout a book of their choice to take home and read.

**Interviews.** Along with the observations, twelve county primary-grade Teacher-of-the-Year nominees participated in semi-structured interviews. Most of the interview questions were developed beforehand using an interview protocol (see Appendix D), but due to the nature of the research questions being largely based on teacher practices, decisions were made to alter the questions as the data collection process unfolded. In other words, the interviews were not tightly structured, thus providing the participants with the opportunity to develop topics and raise questions or highlight ideas which they felt were important.

Interviews were conducted with each of the twelve willing participants and then transcribed using the Dragon Dictation application. After all the interviews were conducted and transcribed, the transcriptions were uploaded to the NVIVO software for analysis. In similar fashion, the observations were conducted using a specific protocol, and then the protocols were subsequently uploaded into the NVIVO software for analysis as well.

The data from both the interviews and the observations were analyzed using In Vivo and Pattern coding followed by the identification of emergent themes. There were four clearly articulated themes that emerged from the coding process: parental involvement, classroom initiatives, the library as a place for reading, and reading throughout content areas. The four themes which emerged served to answer the following research questions: How do primary
grade teachers support reading motivation for young children? What teacher practices are being employed by primary grade teachers to motivate young children to read? The themes are detailed in the subsequent sections.

**Parental involvement.** This research study discovered that parental involvement was one of the primary practices which teachers employed to motivate young children to read. All twelve of the interviewees mentioned parental involvement in their interviews to varying degrees. The common thread, though, despite various levels of parental involvement within the classrooms and schools represented, was a belief held by the teachers that they should be reaching out to the parents in order to help motivate the students to read. For some of the teachers, involving parents was a practice that was established. For others, involving parents was something spoken of as important, but not established as a means by which to motivate their children to read.

One way in which parental involvement was employed was by establishing parent nights at school. For example, one participant indicated that she helped in planning a parent night for her school which was designed to get parents to come read with their children in a relaxed and fun environment. The initiative involved parents and students wearing pajamas and coming to the school to have quality time reading together. The teacher indicated that this was an established outreach which has been occurring for several years. She stated:

> We just feel like this activity is a way to get parents who normally would not come to school to come and be in a relaxed but productive environment. We tell the parents and children to wear pj’s, and we pop popcorn for them to enjoy together. It’s almost like a bonding activity for the parents and children, but it seems to really get the kids excited about reading, and it helps the parents to see that their involvement matters in terms of motivating their children.

A second practice which promoted parental involvement was connecting parents with local services and tutors. Another teacher discussed how she helps connect her parents with local
programs or tutors who help them become literate individuals and support the literacy
development of their children. “One of the biggest issues I face,” she said, “is that a large
number of our parents cannot read themselves. How are we supposed to expect the children to
become readers, much less, motivated readers?” Her initiative for involving parents included
connecting the parents with local services and classes and tutors who can teach them how to
read, interact with texts, and support their children in doing the same.

A third practice which promoted parental involvement was newsletters and open lines of
home-school communication. For example, one kindergarten teacher indicated that despite the
money spent on providing parties for rewarding reading, one main thing that stood out as being
especially helpful for motivating students to read was communication with the parents. She said,
“I send home a weekly newsletter with ideas on how to make reading fun for students. Even
though our parents are pretty involved, I still have many who tell me they need ideas for how to
help their child.” Furthermore, several of the participants with primary school-age children of
their own indicated that even though they are teachers, they really appreciate it when their
children’s teachers reach out to inform and involve them in helping their students become more
motivated readers. For example, a teacher shared that:

I never realized how important it was to communicate with and involve the
parents until I had a child start kindergarten. Mrs. N, Anna’s teacher, sends
a Scholastic magazine home with Anna every month. With the magazine,
she provides a list of ‘Teacher Recommendations,’ to get the students
excited about choosing books to order. The magazine is sent along with a
list of ways that parents can support the students reading at home. She also
attaches a ‘Wish List,’ where she asks that the students pick two books out
of the magazine that they would like to see in the classroom library. She
puts all of the students’ choices into a hat and draws out ten books that she
then purchases each month for the classroom library. Anna just loves seeing
the books that she and her friends have chosen show up in the library.
A fourth practice which promoted parental involvement was teaching parents the importance of reading aloud to their children. One teacher said, “I have parents asking me all the time how they can help their child do better in reading or what tips I can give them for getting their children to read more at home.” This particular teacher mentioned that she communicates to her parents throughout the year that the most important thing they can do at home is read books both on their own and with their children.

In certain contexts, parental involvement was a formidable challenge. One classroom consisted of 18 kindergarten children who reportedly had very little support from parents and the home. The teacher said, “You know, in this school, I feel like motivation is our greatest struggle because we have very little parental involvement.” One teacher stated, “I feel like read alouds are the most important things I do each day because these students do not get them at home. I know there is more that I can and should probably do to involve the parents in the students’ learning, but I just have not been able to figure out exactly what to do.” Another participant indicated, “There is no motivation coming from home at all. I am working on ideas for how to better involve the parents.” She went on to discuss how she finds it difficult to even establish open lines of communication with her parents in general, making it even more challenging to get them on board with motivating the children to read.

While several of the schools represented were characterized by low levels of parental involvement, other schools represented reportedly had substantial parental involvement. Despite the varying levels of parental involvement reported by the teacher participants, the theme of involving parents in order to help motivate the children to read was acknowledged by all as being an important issue with regards to reading motivation.
**Classroom initiatives.** In addition to parental involvement, this research study discovered specific classroom initiatives taken by the teacher for the purpose of motivating students to read. Interestingly, classroom initiatives were primarily discussed in coordination with parental involvement, meaning there were several teachers who mentioned that trying to involve parents in motivating students to read was an actual classroom initiative in place. For some teachers, the classroom initiatives in place were established because the students received no reading support at home, and the teachers wanted to focus effort in the classroom as a way of helping bridge the home-school gap. In other words, there were some teachers who made it a primary classroom initiative to involve the parents, and for others, classroom initiatives were characterized with things such as prizes and reward systems within the classroom for motivating students to read with no direct ties to parental involvement. The specific classroom initiatives which were highlighted in the data from this study are described below.

One teacher who reported that her students had little to no support at home for reading indicated that she believed that anything she found to be successful for motivating her students to read was done completely in the classroom. This teacher reported that she had tried sending home reading logs and library book report assignments along with various other attempts at getting her students to read at home, and her efforts seemed to be futile. She determined that rather than continue what seemed to be ineffective practices, she not only worked with her school to establish various outreach initiatives for getting parents involved with their students’ learning, but she also began to embed all of her efforts for motivating the students to read within the context of the school day and her classroom. She stated, “Anything I have found to be successful in motivating my students to read is done completely in my classroom.”
The first classroom initiative discovered by this study for motivating students to read was the implementation of a classroom tutoring system. One teacher reported that because she had low parental support, she implemented a tutoring system in her classroom with high school and college interns. The high school interns came to the classroom as part of a class on education foundations for aspiring teachers. The college interns came as part of practicum placements for education coursework. Both the high school and college interns spent time reading one on one with the students and provided accountability for the students in selecting books and responding to reading. The teacher indicated that the tutoring system seemed to be an effective initiative for her students because the students appeared to lack individualized academic attention in the home. She stated:

I have found that one of the main things that I do in my classroom to really get my kids motivated to read is to pair them up with tutors. We have a tutoring program at a local high school that sends students over to help in our classrooms. Many teachers have the tutors filing work or maybe helping cut and make copies. I have found, though, that my students really do not have people to read with them at home, so I wanted to use my tutors as reading mentors for the kids. I pair them up, and they both read aloud to the kids and listen to the kids read.

Similar to the high school and college intern tutoring system, a second classroom initiative in place for motivating students to read was school reading buddies. A kindergarten teacher shared that she established reading buddies with first graders, so that her children could have a set time every week where they get to go read with a peer from another grade level. She explained that this initiative is one that really lights her students up about reading. “They look forward to that each week almost more than anything,” she said. She mentioned that she worked together with a first grade teacher to partner their children for reading. After establishing partners, the buddy reading time was established on a weekly basis. The children went to one classroom or the other and sat together and read library books, decodable texts, and fluency
passages. “One of the neatest things that we have seen as a part of this initiative is how excited the children are about sharing their library book choice with their reading buddy.”

A third classroom initiative for motivating students to read was rewards and incentives. Besides reading buddies from different grade levels, several teachers also discussed using classroom and school funds for purchasing tangible reading incentives for the children in an effort to motivate them to read. Because the students are learning to read in grades kindergarten through second grade, the teachers participating in this study pointed out they feel strongly that stickers and candy and various other prizes highly motivate their children to read. They communicated that even though they understand that as the children get older, the tangible incentives may not be as effective for motivating, they really felt the children enjoyed getting something tangible as a reward in the early grades. While most of the interviewees indicated their school has some form of schoolwide reading initiative in place, they all specified they felt the individualized reading rewards and incentives they offered students in the classrooms were more effective for motivating the students to read. All of the teachers except two reported they work on individual reading goals with their students. When the students meet their reading goal, they earn various prizes. One teacher stated:

My students really love getting to go read to our administration and office staff, so that is one of the rewards I offer them when they meet their reading goals. I let them take a book of their choice to the office and choose with whom they will read it. I also have a treasure box full of goodies in my room. I use the treasure box for both behavior and reading reward purposes. Some students like to go read to the office staff, and some like to go get a piece of candy or something from the treasure box as their reward for meeting their goal.

A fourth classroom initiative for motivating students to read was reading performances for office staff and other faculty. Two of the teachers established a practice of allowing two students per day to go and read to any two office staff members. One of
the teachers shared, “After we read the leveled books each day at my small group table, I use my classroom equity sticks, popsicle sticks with students names on them, to select two children to get to go read in the office. They absolutely love it.” She shared that the children seem motivated to read well during small group time because they anticipate getting chosen to go read in the office.

A fifth initiative discussed for motivating students to read was engaging students in the Accelerated Reading program. All of the teachers who participated in the interviews engage the children in their classroom in the Accelerated Reading program to various degrees. “The Accelerated Reading program,” shared one teacher, “is a program that helps hold children accountable for their reading.” As a part of this program, each teacher shared different initiatives in place to help their students increase their volumes of reading. For example, one teacher had an Accelerated Reading folder for each individual child. The folder contained a reading log for the parents to sign indicating their child is ready to take a test on a book. There was also a page in the folder that looked like a contract. On this page, the teacher worked with the individual child to establish a goal for how many Accelerated Reader tests to take in a given amount of time along with what the reward would be received for meeting that goal. She stated:

I don’t like setting classroom goals for AR tests because every child needs something different. What I love about the AR folders and system that I have in place is that it gives me a chance to sit down with the children individually and really work at developing a goal that they can own and accomplish. It gives them a sense of responsibility, and I think that is part of what really helps to motivate them to accomplish the reading goal.

The library as a locus for reading. Besides parental involvement and various classroom initiatives for motivating young students to read, four ideas emerged from the data with regards
to the library as a locus for reading. The four ideas include making the library an exciting and engaging place, facilitating student interaction around texts, shared vision for what the library should be, and making the library a reading-focused place.

The first idea for making the library a locus for reading involved ensuring that the library is an exciting and engaging place. A number of participants suggested that the library should be viewed by students as a place of excitement. Most of the teachers shared personal stories about the library being an exciting place for them growing up. In some way, each teacher discussed how the library impacted her career choice and her independent reading habits in a positive way. When asked about the role that the library currently plays in motivating students to read, the majority of the teachers said that the library is now more of a media center, and students are not getting the exciting library experiences that the teachers themselves once had as young children.

After one teacher vividly described her elementary librarian as being an exciting and passionate person who dressed up as book characters and read stories aloud to the students, she expressed that she believed the library at her school did a great job for motivating students to read, but could potentially do so much more if the librarian played a more prominent role in finding ways to excite the children about reading and engage them in doing so. She stated, “I would love to see our librarian dress up as a book character or do a puppet show or set up a table of books she recommends.” Another teacher shared that her library, while still very focused on incorporating technology, was very focused on making the library an engaging place for the children to read. She explained:

We have different comfortable reading places set up around the library for reading. We go to the library twice per week. One of those times, my class has a computer lesson led by the librarian. The children can also take Accelerated Reading tests during this visit to the library. They also check out books. On our other library day, the children check out books and then go to the reading circle, where the librarian reads them a read aloud of her
choice. A few times she has incorporated puppets or stuffed animals to some degree, but even when she does not do that, the children still love to hear her read.

Secondly, facilitating student interaction around texts was noted as being an important idea for making the library a locus for reading motivation. Several teachers mentioned their thoughts about how to facilitate student interactions around texts in the library. Specifically, read alouds and book talks with the librarian as well as literature circles and book clubs were mentioned as being great ways to engage students in reading and discussing texts. One teacher shared her belief that if the children could have more time to engage with the librarian about the books and topics that interested them, the reading motivation levels would likely increase:

I just know how well my students respond to me when I read aloud to them in the classroom and make book suggestions in my little classroom library, so that makes me think about how much they could gain from spending time in the library hearing the librarian read and make book suggestions. I would be willing to bet that the children would be way more motivated to read if those things were happening.

Another teacher shared, “I know that the children would absolutely love having planned activities that revolve around reading and talking about books in the library. I would love to see more things like that in place to help motivate the children.”

The third idea that emerged was shared vision for what the library should be. Interestingly, one teacher reported that the faculty at her school, “can’t agree on what is valuable,” with regards to the library, so there has been no concerted effort for motivating the children to read. In her opinion, the school library has so much to offer the children for motivating them to read, but the library’s potential has not been taken advantage of because the school faculty cannot seem to agree on how the library should best serve the students for that purpose. She explained:
Some of our teachers seem to not value the library. They are more interested in taking their kids in there and playing on the computers and ipads. Other teachers really want the kids to be able to actually read in the library instead of just going in there to check out and play. I would like to see some comfy reading areas set up in there. We don’t even have chairs for the kids to sit in and read.

Another teacher shared, “I really think that if all our teachers could understand how important the library is for our children, then it would make it so much easier to put practices in place in the library to help motivate the children.” “Maybe what we need is some professional development on how the library can best serve our students now,” commented one teacher. Several other teachers suggested that they just do not think the library time in their school is seen as being an important time for the students.

The final idea that emerged was making the library a reading-focused place. None of the teacher interviewees had children who regularly read in the library. On the contrary, the children now simply go to the library to check out books, and all the reading takes place outside of the library. Rather than story time and various interactions with texts, the teachers shared that their students are now mostly using the library as a computer lab. One teacher shared, “Although my school seems to have high levels of overall student reading motivation, I think so much more could be accomplished with the children if the library were more reading-focused rather than technology-focused.” Another teacher shared that because the library time for her students has evolved into more of a computer time, the students have not really connected with the librarian, leaving, in her words, “so much on the table that could be better,” in terms of exciting the students about reading. All of the participants communicated in various their disappointment with the shift in focus for their school library to being more about digital literacy rather than reading and growing to love reading.
Overall, the teachers indicated a great personal love for the library as a place for reading and being read to as well as a desire that their students would be able to experience the same things. In a few schools, the library played more of a central role in helping students choose and engage with texts, but the majority of the teachers were adamant that the school library should definitely be more of a place of reading in order to motivate their students to read.

**Reading across curricula.** The final theme that emerged from the data was reading across curricula. The participants considered reading in all content areas as being a fruitful way of motivating young students to read. In fact, there was unanimous agreement among the participants with regard to how valuable reading throughout the content areas is for motivating students to read. Every participant gravitated to discussing various ways they implement reading throughout the day and across curricula at some point during their interview. From the data, three distinct strategies became evident.

The first strategy that emerged for reading across curricula in order to motivate students was developing interest centers and teacher’s choice corners. As described by several teachers, an interest center is an area of the classroom set up to include books and other various objects or visuals related to various areas of study. One teacher, for example, shared that she taught a unit on farm animals. She set up a table in the corner of her classroom with lots of books, both fiction and nonfiction, that related to farm animals and farm life. “The children love to go to the interest center table and read about whatever we are learning, and that excites both them and me!” she stated. Many also mentioned that they set up classroom interest centers for the children based on whatever the science or social studies focus may be. Another teacher stated, “I have a table in the front of my classroom that the students can visit during their station time. The table has books
and pictures or items that the children can use to learn more about whatever we are studying.” A kindergarten teacher shared:

Whenever we begin a new unit of study, I make it a point to set up an interest center in my classroom with books pertaining to the unit. I take a few minutes on the day we begin the unit to show the kids the books that I have placed in the center. As a part of their daily literacy station rotations, the kids get to visit the interest center and explore those books. What I really love is that after they explore the center, they love going to library and finding those same books to check out and take home.

Much like interest centers, another teacher mentioned setting up a “Teacher’s Choice” area. She described how she sets up a “Teacher’s Choice” corner in her classroom and fills it with books pertaining to whatever science or social studies content is being taught. She shared, “I really think that the children enjoy reading things that I recommend, so I try to share different ‘favorites’ of mine regularly.”

A second strategy that emerged for incorporating reading across curricula was teaching comprehensive units. One teacher shared that she works with her grade level coworkers to build reading comprehension units using content area texts. In an observation lesson, this particular teacher was teaching about how to identify main details in a nonfiction text. The children were learning about Helen Keller in social studies, so for the comprehension lesson, the teacher pulled a magazine article on Helen Keller. The children lit up at the beginning of the lesson as the teacher placed the magazine on the overhead screen and they all saw that the face on the article cover was a familiar one about which they had been discussing!

Interestingly, none of the teachers used any one particular basal reading program. All of them used a program for teaching phonics systematically, but there were no specific programs in place among the schools represented for teaching comprehension. One teacher explained, “We are really working at our school to develop conceptual units of study into which we plug our
English Language Arts standards for reading comprehension.” Furthermore, another teacher stated, “We are finding it to be the most engaging for our children when we use the science or social studies books for teaching comprehension skills and strategies.”

Finally, the third strategy discovered for reading across curricula was read aloud integration. In every single interview, the teachers shared that one of the things they felt to be most motivating to the students is when they choose books for read alouds that have to do with whatever the students are working to learn in the content areas, such as science and social studies. In the observation classroom, the teacher described how she pulled from two particular comprehension programs, and how she tried to incorporate whatever skill or strategy they were working on in reading comprehension explicit instruction time into other read alouds she did throughout the day. “I like to pull books about whatever we are learning in science and social studies and read them aloud throughout the day. I use this time to reinforce the comprehension skill or strategy we are working on.”

Multiple teachers concluded that their children were highly motivated to both read and listen to texts during various content areas besides reading. For example, two teachers were math team leaders in their school, and they both shared that they love to open a math lesson with a read aloud. The children, they said, are hooked immediately when they pull out a book to share and discuss during math time. “I don’t limit my read alouds to reading time only. I make sure to find books that I can read aloud to the kids all throughout the day, regardless of what I am teaching,” one teacher said.

**Summary**

The local primary Teacher-of-the-Year nominees engaged in interviews and observations to explain what they do in their classrooms to motivate their students to read. The data yielded
information that targeted specific aspects of classroom instructional practices in reading. The themes that were most prominently discussed were parental involvement, classroom initiatives, the library as a locus for reading, and reading across curricula. These big ideas seemed to resonate throughout all interviews as being largely influential components of students’ reading motivation in the early grades.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the classroom practices of local primary-grade teachers for motivating students to read. The study began with a quantitative survey of literacy practices implemented by primary-grade teachers across a southeastern state. The survey was followed by qualitative interviews and observations of local primary-grade teacher exemplars. The data yielded by the survey were compared with the data yielded by the interviews and observations. The goal of comparing the quantitative and qualitative data was to offer an explanation of local classroom practices in place aimed at motivating students to read.

Children who read independently made greater gains in reading achievement, which positively affects future academic success (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010). In order for students to become motivated to read independently, literacy instruction should be infused with engaging opportunities (Gambrell, 2000). It is vital, therefore, for teachers to understand what classroom practices contribute to motivating students to read.

Not only should teachers understand what practices contribute to motivating students to read, but it is also necessary to understand that reading motivation should be considered as important as reading proficiency (Gambrell, 2015). In other words, it does not suffice to simply teach the skills needed to read. It is important, rather, to teach reading skills in coordination with practices that motivate students to put their reading skills to use and read independently.
(Gambrell, 2015). When teachers support the reading motivations of their students and implement practices that support students’ reading proficiency, students’ potential for future academic success increases (Gambrell, 2015).

Given the research that places importance upon reading motivation and its role in the overall achievement of children in school, decreases in motivation to read as children progress through school is problematic (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). It is evident that reading motivation can begin to erode as early as second grade (Marinak et al., 2015). Compounding the problem is the fact that there is little known about specific practices enacted in the primary grade classrooms for motivating students to read. There is little research pertaining to reading motivation in the primary-grades (Baker, Dreher, & Guthrie, 2000; Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006).

Understanding the practices teachers are implementing to circumvent a lack of reading motivation and meet the rigorous educational standards is necessary, since the impact of reading motivation on achievement outcomes affects students both early in elementary school and later in college and career readiness (Common Core State Standards, 2010). If children are to be prepared to be successful in the years to come, reading motivation in the early grades must be studied in order to gain a better understanding of how classrooms can foster a lifetime love of reading. The following sections offer a discussion of the primary findings of this study, followed by the conclusions drawn from the findings. Finally, recommendations for future research and practice are identified.

**Discussion**

In this section, the findings of this study are discussed. Both the quantitative survey and the qualitative observations and interviews yielded findings which were coded and organized
into themes for discussion. More specifically, the discussion of the results is an effort to weave together the established literature on reading motivation presented in Chapter Two along with the findings which emerged from this research study in order to explain what teachers are doing to motivate young children to read.

**Primary Goals for Reading Instruction**

*Developing motivated readers.* The survey findings indicated that it was a primary goal of teachers to develop readers who are independent and motivated to choose, appreciate, and enjoy literature (86%, n=56). This particular goal was highlighted in the first domain of the survey focused on teacher perspectives, philosophies, and beliefs. Domain 7 focused on overall school and classroom reading programs. Forty-two percent (n=18) of the respondents gave their school reading program a grade of “A” in developing readers who are independent and motivated to choose, appreciate, and enjoy literature. Forty percent (n=17) awarded their school reading program a grade of “B” in this area. Furthermore, 51% (n=22) gave a grade of “A” to their classroom reading program in developing readers who are independent and motivated to choose, appreciate, and enjoy literature. Forty percent (n=17) gave their classroom a grade of “B” in this area.

The important understanding based on these findings is that the teachers do consider reading motivation to be a primary goal. Interestingly, however, is the fact that 40% of the respondents gave their own classroom reading program a grade of “B” for developing independent and motivated readers. The grade of “B” indicates that 40% of the teacher respondents believe there is more that could be happening with regard to motivational reading instruction and practices within their own classrooms.
**Developing skillful readers.** Another primary goal for reading instruction was to develop readers who are both skillful and strategic in word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. Specifically, 86% (n=56) identified this as being a primary goal. Yet again, in domain 7 focused on overall school and classroom reading programs, 44% (n=19) of the respondents awarded a grade of “A” to their school reading program in the area of developing readers who are both skillful and strategic in word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. A grade of “B” was given to the school reading program in this area by 44% (n=19) as well.

Furthermore, 49% (n=21) gave a grade of “A” to their classroom reading program, and 44% (n=19) gave a grade of “B” to their classroom reading program in this particular area.

Not only did the respondents indicate their primary goal for reading instruction was to develop skillful and strategic readers, but they also indicated that the component of reading instructional time with which they spent the most time was phonics and decoding. Specifically, 72% (n=43) reported spending an average of 43 minutes per day on this component of reading instruction. The respondents indicated that their primary goal for reading instruction was to develop skillful and strategic readers, and the most considerable amount of instructional time was spent teaching phonics and decoding. This finding reinforces that a primary goal of teachers is to develop skillful readers. Consequently, the majority of instructional time is spent developing foundational reading skills.

The development of foundational reading skills is important because a pertinent finding from the research was that reading motivation is characterized by reading engagement, which involves students being able to apply the skills necessary for decoding and comprehending texts (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997; Wigfield, Guthrie & You, 2012; Malloy & Gambrell, 2006). While
the children in kindergarten through second grade are learning to read, they are no less capable of being motivated to read as well.

If the respondents in the survey have a primary goal of developing readers who are independent and motivated to choose and appreciate literature, then they are providing students with a structure for success by ensuring they have the foundational skills necessary for accomplishing that goal, since we understand that students’ motivation to read is impacted by the level of reading skills those students possess (Morgan & Fuchs, 2007). Not only that, but as students become more proficient readers, they tend to read more, and as they increase volumes of reading, they become more skilled readers (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008; Wigfield, 2007). Therefore, building solid reading foundational skills is a vital component of motivating children to read.

**Immersion in literature.** A third goal for reading instruction was immersion in literature and literary experiences. Seventy-six percent (n=50) of the respondents reported they believe students should be immersed in literature and literary experiences. Interestingly, though, literature circles, book clubs, and reading discussion groups were the components of reading instructional times with which the majority of respondents (49%, n=29) reported spending little time.

While literature circles, book clubs, and reading groups may not be the strategies implemented by the respondents for immersing students in literature, there were other activities reported as being a part of reading instructional time which support students’ immersion in literature. A mean of 40 minutes was indicative of the time spent daily extending and practicing reading instruction by means of read alouds, students’ independent reading, student-led reading groups, and cooperative reading activities. Strategies and supports such as these are literature
experiences which support independent reading by ensuring that there is substantial time during the actual school day for students to read (Gambrell, 2011). It appeared, at least for those involved in this study, that the responsibility for immersing students in literature was believed to be that of the librarian. In other words, while the participants indicated that immersion in literature was of great importance, activities to accomplish that goal were discussed in relationship to the ideal role of the librarian.

**Classroom Practices**

**Home-school connections.** In domain 6 of the survey devoted to home-school connections, 98% (n=43) of the respondents answered that they encourage parents and caregivers to read at home to their children regularly as well as listen to the children read regularly. Notes are sent to the parents and guardians by 91% (n=40) of the teachers, giving an overview of the reading program and strategies to support reading at home. Further, 61% (n=27) encourage meaningful writing at home, and 22% (n=10) invite parents and caregivers to workshops in order to share how they can help their children at home.

The findings of this domain of the survey were strongly represented in the qualitative theme of involving parents in helping motivate students to read as well as implementing classroom initiatives for additional motivation. Every interview participant shared some activity pertaining to involving parents in helping motivate students to read. While the degrees to which the teachers involved parents varied, all participants indicated that involving parents was important. This study discovered that the home-school connection was not a prominent theme in the literature, but was a prominent theme in the qualitative findings. Home-school connections should be explored further in order to determine the relationship between those connections and children’s motivation to read.
**Reading incentives.** In addition to gaining parental involvement, many of the qualitative teacher participants reported that they rely heavily on various classroom incentives for reading. One notable omission in the research pertained to the reasons why the teachers chose certain incentives. In the observation classroom as well as in the findings of the interviews, it appeared that most rewards and incentives, while well-intentioned, were offered randomly. In other words, teachers seemed to be offering various incentives in hopes of finding what would work for motivating students to read.

The haphazard choosing of rewards and incentives is not motivating for students because research indicates that teachers should be thoughtful in choosing rewards and incentives for reading if the goal of the reward or incentive is to increase reading motivation (Marinak & Gambrell, 2008). It is also known that rewards and incentives which are closely tied to reading do facilitate intrinsic reading motivation (Brophy, 2004). Follow-up discussions need to take place in order to determine specific incentives provided for the students and why those incentives were chosen. The teachers who stated that they provide classroom incentives as an initiative for motivating students to read said they choose whatever they think the students will like or enjoy. However, more detailed conversations concerning how those decisions are reached would be insightful.

**Integrating instruction.** Another finding revealed that a majority of the survey respondents often use trade books when teaching science, social studies, and math. Most of the trade book usage was implemented during science and social studies time, with some usage during math as well. The majority (47%, n= 25) of the respondents reported using nonfiction trade books as the predominant instructional material. Furthermore, 39% (n=20) of the respondents reported using basal reading materials as a foundational program in addition to
trade books. This finding was reinforced in the teacher interviews, as one of the major themes which emerged from the data was reading across curricula, or reading throughout the content areas.

Research indicates that integrated instruction is a strategy for motivating students to read (Malloy, Marinak, & Gambrell, 2010). Integrated instruction is a whole-theme approach to teaching all content areas (Baker, Dreher, & Guthrie, 2000). Literacy practices, such as access to various and interesting texts motivate students to read and come together in the form of integrated instruction (Malloy, Marinak, & Gambrell, 2010). Coherence of instruction fosters student engagement and involves connecting all instructional elements in order to promote students’ abilities for making connections (Guthrie et al., 2000). The new and rigorous Alabama College and Career Readiness Standards (2010), can be taught in a motivating fashion by planning integrated units of instruction (Malloy, Marinak, & Gambrell, 2010).

The Library as a Locus for Reading

Four key ideas emerged from the data for making the library a locus for reading. The ideas include making the library an exciting and engaging place, facilitating student interaction around texts, shared vision for what the library should be, and making the library a reading-focused place. The survey asked one particular question pertaining to how the librarian supports the students’ reading, and 54% (n=28) of the respondents answered that the librarian teaches skills directly to the students. Sixty-three percent (n=33) of the respondents answered that the librarian conducts book talks with the children. The interesting aspect of this particular piece of data was that most of the qualitative participants indicated the library has become more of a computer lab and media center than a place for reading. Consequently, in the opinions of the participants, the library does not function to motivate students to read.
Social interaction with texts is a strategy which motivates students to read (Edmunds and Bauserman, 2006). Library read-alouds and discussions, book swaps, and literature circles are practices which increase social interactions related to books (Edmunds and Bauserman, 2006). While there are myriad ways to provide students with opportunities to engage in social interactions, the important factor remains that effort must be put forth to center these interactions around texts, which motivate students to read (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). According to the participants, the library is a great place for achieving this goal.

Furthermore, providing students with the opportunity to have access to books as well as time for talking about books with peers will influence students’ motivation to read (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Since access to books fosters motivation to read, time for students to explore classroom libraries and school libraries should be highly prioritized along with other activities which provide students access to a variety of texts (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Teachers participating in the qualitative portion of this study were in agreement with the data put forth by the aforementioned researchers in their conclusions that the library should be a locus for reading.

**Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was to investigate how primary-grade teachers support reading motivation in young children. The lack of literature pertaining to this topic along with the increased reading demands in place with the new Common Core State Standards (2010) and Alabama’s College and Career Readiness Standards (2010) validated the purpose of this study. Further, this study not only helped to fill a gap in the literature, but also brought an awareness of the importance of classroom reading motivational practices to local teachers and leaders.
An explanation of what local primary teachers are doing to motivate students to read was the goal for this dissertation study. Using a mixed methods design, this study explored the phenomenon by gathering multiple sources of data, analyzing the data, and discussing the findings of the data. More specifically, an explanatory sequential design, involving quantitative survey data along with qualitative interview and observation data, was implemented in order to explain teacher practices. The conclusions drawn from this study are delineated below.

Based on the findings from this study, it can be concluded that a primary goal of teachers in the primary grades is to develop readers who are independent and motivated to choose and appreciate and enjoy literature. With this goal as a primary focus, the study concluded that local teachers are spending much of their time developing foundational readers. If teachers prioritize developing independent and motivated readers, then the majority of instructional time being devoted to building a solid reading foundation enables the students to be more successful. We understand that engaged readers are both strategic and motivated (Guthrie et al., 2012). Students who are motivated will employ the cognitive strategies necessary for understanding a text (Wigfield et al, 2008; Guthrie et al., 2012). The problem, however, is that there seems to be a lack of understanding about what the research has shown actually motivates students to read. The participants in this study indicated that developing motivated readers is of primary importance, but research-based practices were not consistently evident.

A second conclusion from this study is that teachers are incorporating literature across curricula, but there seems to be a lack of knowledge on how to effectively integrate instruction for the purpose of motivating students to read. It appears that the participants in this study confuse reading across content areas with integrated instruction. If teachers are incorporating
trade books across curricula, then one potential area for improvement in integrating instruction for motivating students to read is accomplished by becoming more deeply acquainted with the Alabama College and Career Readiness Standards (2010). A better understanding of the standards will clarify student expectations for learning and will enable teachers to refine and integrate instruction in order to guide students toward rigorous and engaged learning experiences. Another potential missing link between teachers incorporating books across curricula and students becoming motivated readers is a lack of familiarity with what integrated instruction actually is and how integrated teaching can motivate students.

A third conclusion from the study is that the local primary teachers placed great emphasis on the aspect of parental involvement as an impactful factor for reading motivation in young children. Each interview participant mentioned parental involvement as a way to motivate children to read. Since the research is lacking in this area, one is left to wonder about the relationship between parental involvement and reading motivation. For younger students who are learning to read, it could be reasoned that more parental involvement is needed in order to motivate the children to transition from learning to read to reading to learn.

A fourth conclusion from the study is that the survey and interview data were disjointed with regards to the role of the library. The majority of survey respondents indicated that the school librarian interacts with the students in purposeful and intentional ways, but the same was not reported in the interviews. Most interview participants seemed discouraged that the library had become more of a multimedia center and less of a place for reading and learning about books. Further research is needed to explore the school library, its shift to a media center focus, and the role which the library and the librarian play in motivating young children to read.
A final conclusion from this study is that while there was little mentioned in the survey about rewards and incentives for motivating students to read, a resounding theme among the interview participants was that they predominantly use whatever they find to work for their children. More specifically, it appeared that most rewards and incentives, while well-intentioned by the teachers, are presented haphazardly in order to find what works for motivating children to read. Since the research shows that rewards and incentives directly tied to reading are more effective for motivating children to become lifelong, intrinsically motivated readers, further research and discussions are needed to determine the process by which teachers choose rewards and incentives (Brophy, 2004). Discussions need to take place about at what point, if there is a definitive one, that extrinsic rewards and incentives should be diminished. Further, explicit examples are needed of teachers providing rewards and incentives closely tied to reading at the lower grade levels and how these rewards and incentives are working to motivate students to read.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that local primary grade teachers are indeed implementing some practices shown to motivate children to read. The literature presented in Chapter Two established that classrooms which are book-rich, provide rewards or incentives within close proximity to reading, encourage social interactions about texts, support autonomous reading habits, and integrate instruction are motivating to students. While the primary-grade teachers are focused mainly on teaching young children to become foundational, skillful readers, the findings in this study reflected that the teachers also strive to develop motivated readers who choose and enjoy and appreciate literature. In order to achieve that goal, it was discovered that teachers spend a majority of reading instructional time devoted to reading skill development, in addition to engaging students in discussing and collaborating around texts.
The problem, however, appears to be a lack of understanding of what characterizes a motivated reader and what research shows to be effective for motivating that reader.

While there are traces of research-based practices in the primary-classrooms, there remains great room for improvement. It was apparent in the survey data that local teachers do prioritize developing motivated readers. The teachers, however, seem unaware of what the research in the field of reading motivation says works effectively for supporting young readers. What is lacking is intentionality with regards to planning instruction with reading motivation in mind as well as professional development in what the existing research says works most effectively. Teachers appear to be well-intentioned in their efforts but uninformed about how to be entirely effective in motivating young students to read.

**Limitations**

Limitations of this study which should be considered are:

- Qualitative data during the interview and observation phase of this study only included twelve teacher participants.
- The survey was self-reported, therefore, social desirability bias may be inherent.
- Quantitative survey data was only gathered from 95 teachers from across the state. There could be multiple reasons for the lack of both qualitative and quantitative participation, but the timing was probably a main issue. The request for research was dispersed in April, which is the end of the school year and a very busy time. There may have been better participation had the study been conducted about mid-year.
- Because the survey remained anonymous, the qualitative data from the teacher interviews could not be directly linked backed to any specific interview responses.
• The quantitative survey data should not necessarily be highlighted for answering the research question, however it did yield substantial data indicating general literacy practices. The survey was too general to be used for gathering data specific to reading motivation.

**Recommendations**

The findings from this study imply that further research is needed in the area of reading motivation in the primary grades. Since this study was conducted locally and with teacher exemplars, further research could involve expanding the parameters for participant involvement to include more schools and teachers representing a wider variety of demographics.

Furthermore, more research is needed using a tool which is tailored specifically toward practices for motivating students to read. More specifically, a survey created to study reading motivational practices directly would be beneficial. While *The First R* survey yielded ample data pertaining to literacy practices, the data was not specific enough to thoroughly examine reading motivation thoroughly. There is no existing survey instrument designed to study reading motivational practices, so survey development is essential for creating a tool.

Further research is also needed to explore the relationship between parental involvement and students’ motivation to read. The literature is lacking in this area, and all of the qualitative participants voiced strong opinions about the degree to which parents were involved in motivating their children to read. Case studies designed to focus on parental involvement in the primary grades and the effects of that involvement on reading motivation would yield valuable insight. A correlation study could determine whether a significant relationship exists between the variables, “parental involvement” and “motivation to read.” This study could also measure the effect size of such a relationship.
A final area in need of further research is the library. A multi-case study could be conducted to study the role of library and librarian in motivating students to read. The purpose of this study could be to explore how librarians perceive their role and the role of the library in motivating students to read.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to investigate how primary-grade teachers support reading motivation in young children. The lack of literature pertaining to this topic along with the increased reading demands in place with the new Common Core State Standards (2010) and Alabama’s College and Career Readiness Standards (2010) validated the purpose of this study. The study began with a quantitative survey of literacy practices of primary-grade teachers across a southeastern state. The survey was followed by qualitative interviews and observations of local primary-grade teacher exemplars. The findings of the survey were compared alongside the findings of the interviews and observations. The goal of comparing the quantitative and qualitative data was to offer an explanation of the classroom practices aimed at motivating students to read. There are reflections of research-based practices being enacted in the primary classrooms.

The most pertinent finding from this study, though, is that there is a pressing need for teacher professional development in research-based practices for motivating students to read. Furthermore, further research is needed to explore reading motivation in the primary grades with the goal to improve and support teacher practice and, most importantly, students’ reading motivation.
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APPENDIX A

THE FIRST R SURVEY

National Reading Research Center
U.S. Elementary Reading Instruction Survey Classroom Teacher Form

Directions: Please respond to the following questions that inquire about elementary reading instruction in your classroom and school.

Teacher education and professional development

1. What is your current teaching position (circle one number)?
   1. K-5 classroom teacher of just one grade level (teach grade __________)
   2. K-5 classroom teacher in a multi-grade class (teach grades ___)
   3. Prekindergarten teacher
   4. Pre-first-grade/transitional first-grade teacher
   5. Special reading teacher (e.g., Title I)
   6. Special education teacher
   7. Other (specify position ____________________________)

2. Circle the number in front of each education degree you hold. Write (in parentheses) the year you earned each degree.


3. What year did you first teach elementary school? 19__________

4. How many total years have you spent as an elementary teacher (use O if you have never taught elementary school)? ____ years (write number of years)

5. What is your gender (circle one number)?
   1. Female 2. Male

6. What is your racial or ethnic identity (circle one number)?
   1. Black/African American 4. Asian/Pacific Islander 7. Other racial or ethnic group
2. white/European American  5. Native American/Eskimo  (specify group)__________
3. Hispanic/Latino  6. multirace
7. What kind of teacher education program led to your elementary certification (circle one number)?
   1. a regular 4-year B.A. or B.S. certification program
   2. a 5-year B.A. or B.S. program (which might include hours toward a master's degree)
   3. a postbaccalaureate certification program (i.e., you earned a bachelor's degree and then got certified).
   4. a master's degree certification program (i.e., you got certified while earning a master's)
   5. an "alternative" postbaccalaureate certification program (i.e., some other certification route following your completion of a B.A. or B.S. degree outside education)
   6. I am not certified to teach at the elementary level  

*Note: To promote a more logical interpretation of results for item 8, which involves an ordinal scale, response values were reversed during analysis. Specifically, exceptional was assigned a value of 5, very good was assigned 4, adequate was assigned 3, poor was assigned 2, and totally inadequate was assigned 1. This same reverse-scoring process was employed when scoring items 9, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 38, 40, 42, 45, 50, which were also on ordinal scales.
Teacher survey (continued)

8.* What is your evaluation of the quality of your overall elementary teacher certification program (circle one number)?

1. exceptional 2. very good 3. adequate 4. poor 5. totally inadequate

9.* What is your evaluation of the quality of the preparation you received for teaching reading and language arts within your teacher certification program (circle one number)?

1. exceptional 2. very good 3. adequate 4. poor 5. totally inadequate

10. What activities do you engage in to further your professional knowledge and skill in teaching reading and language arts? Circle the number in front of all of the following activities that contribute to your professional knowledge and skills (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. attend workshops, inservices, or staff development courses
2. attend local, state, or regional professional conferences
3. attend national conferences
4. present at local, state, regional, or national conferences
5. enroll in college or university courses in education
6. enroll in a graduate degree program in education
7. read professional magazines or journals (circle each of the following that you read monthly: Instructor, Learning, Teacher, The Reading Teacher, Language Arts, other______________________________
8. write articles for professional education newsletters, periodicals, or journals
9. membership in professional organizations (circle each of the following to which you belong: International Reading Association, National Council of Teachers of English, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Whole Language Umbrella, Orton Society, National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, other______________________________

10. serve in a leadership role in a professional organization (e.g., officer, board member, committee chair)

11. conduct research in your own classroom, either alone or in collaboration with others

11.* How would you describe your own reading habits (i.e., pleasure or leisure reading) outside the school day (circle one number)?

1. avid reader (I read constantly)
2. very active (I read every day and widely)
3. frequent reader (I read most every day)
4. occasional reader (I read sometimes)
5. infrequent reader (I hardly ever read)

School and student demographics

12. What grades are included in your school? Circle each grade for which there is at least one class in your school (PK = prekindergarten; K = kindergarten; Pl = pre-first-grade/transitional first; 1 = first grade, etc.).

PK K Pl 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

13. Approximately how many students are enrolled in your school_______ (write number)

14. In what kind of community is your school located (circle one number)?

1. an urban community 2. a suburban community 3. a rural community

15.* How would you assess your school facilities, for example, overall physical condition, classroom size and condition, special instructional areas, library, playground (circle one number)?

1. exceptional 2. very good 3. adequate 4. poor 5. totally inadequate
16. How many full-time **regular education students** do you have in your classroom? Do not include here children identified as special or exceptional students. (If you teach in a departmentalized organization, describe your homeroom class for items 16 through 21.)

__regular education students (write number of students)

17. How many children identified as **special education or exceptional students** are "included" or "mainstreamed" in your classroom on a full-time or part-time basis (e.g., learning disabled, gifted, physically handicapped, emotional- ly/behaviorally disordered students)? Write below the total number of special/exceptional students. Write O if you have no special/exceptional students in your classroom.

__ children identified as special/exceptional students (write number of students)

18. What is your assessment of the **economic situation** of the families of all regular and special/exceptional students in your classroom? Estimate the percentage of students who fit within each classification. Write O if you have no students within a particular classification. The combination of your answers should total 100%.

__% of my students' families are at a low-income level
__% of my students' families are at a middle-income level
__% of my students' families are at an upper-income level

19. What is your assessment of the **racial or cultural make-up** of all regular and special/exceptional students in your classroom? Estimate the percentage of students who fit within each classification. Write O if you have no students within a particular classification. The combination of your answers should total 100%.

__% black or African American students
__% white or European American students
__% Hispanic or Latino students
__% Asian or Pacific Islander students
__% Native American or Eskimo students
__% multiracial students
__% students of other racial or ethnic groups

20. What is your assessment of the **overall reading achievement** level of all regular and special/exceptional students in your classroom? Estimate the percentage of students who fit within each classification. Use O if you have no students within a particular classification. The combination of your answers should total 100%.

__% of my students are above average readers (reading more than 1 level above their grade placement)
__% of my students are average readers (reading at grade level or within 1 level plus or minus of their grade placement)
__% of my students are below average readers (reading more than 1 level below their grade placement)

21. What is your assessment of the **first language or "home language"** spoken by all of the regular and special/exceptional students in your classroom? Estimate the percentage of students who fit within each classification. Write O if you have no students within a particular classification. The combination of your answers should total 100%.

__% of my students speak English as their first language
__% of my students speak Spanish as their first language
__% of my students speak a language other than English or Spanish as their first language

**Teacher survey (continued)**

**Teacher beliefs/philosophical orientation**
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22. The following statements represent various perspectives, philosophies, or beliefs toward the teaching and learning of reading. Circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to you personally (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

a. I would describe myself as a "traditionalist" when it comes to reading methods and materials.

b. I have an "eclectic" attitude toward reading instruction, which means that I would draw from multiple perspectives and sets of materials when teaching reading.

3. I would describe myself as a whole language teacher.

4. I believe in a balanced approach to reading instruction, which combines skills development with literature and language-rich activities.

5. I believe that teaching students to decode words is one of my most important goals for early reading instruction.

6. I believe that phonics needs to be taught directly to beginning readers in order for students to become fluent, skillful readers.

7. I believe in a literature-based approach to reading instruction in which trade books (i.e., children's books or library books) would be used exclusively or heavily.

8. I believe that basal reading materials are useful tools for teaching students to read, either as the primary instructional material or along with trade books (i.e., children's books or library books).

9. I believe students need to be immersed in literature and literacy experiences in order to become fluent readers.

23. The following statements represent various goals or objectives that teachers might have for a reading instructional program. Circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to you personally (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. It is my goal to develop readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension.

2. It is my goal to develop readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live.

3. It is my goal to develop readers who are independent and motivated to choose, appreciate, and enjoy literature.

4. It is my goal to develop readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures.

5. Additional goal(s) I have

Instructional time

24. Estimate the total average time (in minutes) you spend each school day for the following reading and language arts activities:

___ minutes daily specifically for reading instruction (e.g., reading groups, skill or strategy lessons, teacher-guided reading of selections)

___ minutes daily for applying, practicing, and extending reading instruction (e.g., reading aloud to children, students' independent reading or DEAR periods, student-led response groups, cooperative reading activities)

___ minutes daily for language arts instruction and practice (e.g., writing workshop, response journals, spelling, oral language activities)

Note: These three numbers should reflect an estimate of the total amount of time you spend each day for literacy-related instruction and activities.
Teacher survey (continued)

25.* How much instructional time do you devote to the development of the following components or activities within your classroom reading and language arts program? Circle 1 for Considerable time, 2 for Moderate time, 3 for Little time, and 4 for No time (circle one number for each row).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reading vocabulary</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading in the content areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics/ decoding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading aloud to students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Drop Everything And Read or Reading Workshop time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral or written responses to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature circles, book clubs,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature discussion groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process writing or Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language experience stories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling lists, activities, or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwriting instruction and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological applications to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., microcomputers, video, multimedia)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instructional materials and libraries

26. What reading instructional materials do you use in your classroom? Circle 1 if the material is used Exclusively, 2 if used Predominantly, 3 if used Moderately, 4 if used Infrequently, and 5 if Never used (circle one number for each row).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Exclusively</th>
<th>Predominantly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Never used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a single basal reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple basal reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature anthologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction trade books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfiction trade books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonics workbooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general reading skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines &amp; newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picture trade books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapter trade books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer hardware and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other instructional media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Video/audiotapes and recorders, listening centers, filmstrips, etc.)

27. How do you use basal reading materials and trade books (i.e., children's books or library books) in your classroom reading program (circle one number)?

1. I use basal reading materials as the only reading instructional materials in my classroom; that is, I use no trade books to teach reading.

2. I use basal reading materials as the foundation of my reading program; in other words, my reading program is structured around the basal, but I incorporate trade books within the basal program.

3. I use trade books as the foundation for my reading program; in other words, my program is trade book based, but I use basals some of the time to supplement the trade books.

4. I use trade books as the only reading instructional materials in my classroom; that is, I use no basal materials to teach reading.

28. If basal reading materials are used in your school (whether you use them or not), when were they last adopted? (Write year of last adoption)
29. How, if at all, do you teach reading skills and strategies in relation to reading instructional materials? Circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to you personally (i.e., you may circle multiple responses).
1. I teach the skills and strategies as presented in the basal program.
2. I select skills and strategies from the basal program, teaching only those skills that I feel my students need to learn.
3. I use the basal as a general guide for teaching skills and strategies, but adapt or extend instruction from the basal significantly.
4. I supplement the basal program by teaching additional skills not covered well or at all in the basal.
5. I use the basal to identify reading skills, but I teach them in the context of trade books we are using.
6. I have constructed my own skills program, which I teach in conjunction with trade books we are reading.
7. I teach skills and strategies on the basis of ongoing informal observations and assessments of my students' learning.
8. I teach reading skills very little or not at all—either from the basal or through trade books.

30.* To what degree do you use trade books to support your content area studies in science, social studies, and mathematics; for example, using historical fiction and informational books in a social studies unit (circle one number per row)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. always</th>
<th>2. often</th>
<th>3. so metimes</th>
<th>4. seldom</th>
<th>5. hardly ever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in social studies</td>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. so seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in math</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>. often</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. hardly ever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. What kind of library facilities do you have (circle numbers for one or both items as applicable)?
1. There is a central library in my school.
2. I have my own classroom library.

32. If your school has a central library, circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to it (i.e., you may circle multiple responses).
1. The number of books in the collection is adequate or better.
2. The collection is current and up to date.
3. The library is open and accessible to all students.
4. There is a part- or full-time professionally trained librarian or media specialist in our library.
5. There is sufficient space for students to browse and do research and for the librarian to offer lessons.
6. The librarian teaches skills directly to my students.
7. The librarian conducts book talks and reads to my students.

33. If you indicated that you have your own classroom library, please answer the following:
I have about the following number of books in my classroom library (circle one number below):
1. fewer than 50  2. 51–100  3. 101–300  4. 301–500  5. more than 500

Estimate the percentage of books in your classroom library you have purchased with your own money (fill in percentage)? ________%

Estimate how much of your own money you spend each school year on materials (books, supplies) to support your reading and language arts program (write dollar amount)? $______.
Teacher survey (continued)

Organizing for instruction

34. Which of the following structures comes closest to describing your classroom teaching situation (circle one number)?
   1. I teach in a totally self-contained classroom; that is, I teach all subjects and the same students all day long (with the possible exception of sending your students to "special teachers" for art, music, PE).
   2. I teach primarily in a self-contained environment, but I do team teaching with one or more other teachers for reading or language classes; that is, we group for reading instruction across several classrooms on the basis of reading ability or interest.
   3. I teach in a departmentalized environment; that is, I teach one or two specialized subjects all day long (e.g., reading, math, science, social studies), teaching students from other teachers' classrooms at my grade level. List specific subject area(s) you teach ——————————————————————————————————
   4. I teach in another environment (specify) ——————————————————

35. The following statements describe various ways to organize classroom reading instruction. Circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that describe organizational plans you employ regularly in your classroom (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).
   1. I use ability groupings to teach reading; for example, placing all the "highest" readers in one group, all the "middle" readers in a second group, and all the "lowest" readers in a third group.
   2. I use flexible reading groups in my classroom; that is, students might be grouped according to interest, genre, or skill need, but these groupings are not fixed and change regularly (select this category if you use structures such as Book Clubs, cooperative-learning groups, and mixed-ability groups).
   3. I teach reading as an individualized activity, designing special programs for each of my students; therefore, I do not formally group children for instruction.
   4. I teach reading as a whole-class activity; that is, I do not generally group students for reading instruction.
   5. I use another organizational plan (specify) ———————————————————

36. Which of the organizational structures described in item 35 do you use as the primary or most frequent structure in your classroom reading program (circle one number)?
   1. ability groupings
   2. flexible groupings
   3. individualized instruction
   4. whole-class instruction
   5. other organizational plan (specify) ————————————————————

Accommodating gifted and struggling readers

37. The following statements describe various ways to accommodate the needs of children in your classroom who may be gifted, talented, or accelerated readers. Circle the numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to your teaching situation (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).
   1. There is a pull-out program for my gifted readers, which is taught by a special teacher for gifted and talented students.
   2. A special teacher for gifted and talented students comes to my classroom and works with me to accommodate my most capable readers.
   3. I adapt my classroom curriculum and my instruction to accommodate the special needs of my gifted and talented readers.
Teacher survey (continued)

38.* If you indicated in item 37 that there are special support personnel who work with your gifted readers either in the classroom or in a pull-out program (i.e., you selected either of the first two options), how do you rate the effectiveness of these support services (check one number)?

1. exceptional  2. very good  3. adequate  4. poor  5. totally inadequate

39. The following statements describe various ways to accommodate the needs of children in your classroom who may be struggling readers or experiencing reading difficulties. Circle the numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to your teaching situation (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. There is a pull-out program for my struggling readers, which is taught by a special teacher for students experiencing difficulty in learning to read.
2. A special teacher trained to work with children who experience reading difficulties comes to my classroom and works with me to accommodate my struggling readers.
3. I adapt my classroom curriculum and my instruction to accommodate the special needs of my students who experience problems in learning to read.

40.* If you indicated in item 39 that there are special support personnel who work with your struggling readers either in the classroom or in a pull-out program (i.e., you selected either of the first two options), how do you rate the effectiveness of these support services (circle one number)?

1. exceptional  2. very good  3. adequate  4. poor  5. totally inadequate

Assessing reading development

41. Select the following statement that best characterizes your overall approach to classroom reading assessment (circle one number):

1. I rely primarily on conventional assessment measures, for example, basal reader tests and district-administered standardized reading tests.
2. I use a mix of conventional assessment measures (e.g., basal and standardized tests) and some informal assessments (e.g., Informal Reading Inventory).
3. I am moving toward adopting various forms of alternative reading assessments (e.g., running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories) and/or a portfolio approach to assessment in my classroom.
4. I rely extensively on alternative reading assessments (e.g., running records, anecdotal records, observational checklists, informal inventories), and/or I am using a portfolio approach to assessment in my classroom.
5. I basically don’t engage in any conventional or alternative reading assessments.
Teacher survey (continued)

42.* To what degree do you use results from the following types of assessments to make instructional decisions in your classroom? Circle 1 if they are used to a Considerable degree, 2 to a Moderate degree, 3 to Little degree, and 4 if Not at all (circle one number for each row).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual standardized reading tests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal reader program unit/level skills tests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Reading Inventories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running records</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/writing portfolios</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interviews or conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading miscue analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational checklists/anecdotal records</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent literacy surveys/assessments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal phonics/decoding assessments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. The following statements describe various standardized or formal assessments. Circle numbers in front of all of the following types of assessments that you are required to administer to your students each school year (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. District-required standardized tests (e.g., Iowa Test of Basic Skills) that include one or more reading subtests
2. State-mandated competency tests in reading and/or writing
3. District-required informal reading (e.g., informal reading inventories) and/or writing (e.g., essay) assessments
4. Additional required or mandated assessment (specify) ________________________

44. About how many total hours do you and your students spend each year preparing to take (e.g., test-taking exercises or lessons) and actually taking the required assessments you checked in item 43?

__ hours (write total hours per year)

45.* Some teachers report that they feel so pressured by the required assessments (i.e., those listed in item 43) that they end up modifying their curriculum or instruction to conform to the mandatory assessments. To what degree do you modify your teaching to conform to mandatory assessments (circle one number)?

1. very much 2. somewhat 3. not at all
Teacher survey (continued)

Home-school connections

46. The following statements describe activities or programs some teachers have initiated to involve parents and caregivers in their children's literacy learning. Circle numbers in front of all the statements below that describe home-school literacy initiatives you have established (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. I encourage parents/caregivers to read to their children at home regularly.
2. I encourage parents/caregivers to listen to their children read at home regularly.
3. I encourage parents/caregivers to provide opportunities for their children to write in meaningful ways (e.g., write grocery lists, write down chores, write letters to relatives).
4. I send home notes to parents/caregivers that explain our classroom reading/literacy program and how they can support it at home.
5. I invite parents/caregivers or other relatives (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) to come to school and help out in the classroom (e.g., listening to children read, reading to children).
6. I regularly send home books from my classroom library for my students to practice reading with their parents/caregivers.
7. I invite parents/caregivers to school for special workshops I conduct on how they can support literacy at home (e.g., reading aloud at home, writing opportunities at home).
8. Other home-school initiative (specify) ____________________________________________________________

Overall school and classroom reading program

47. How would you rate your overall school reading program on the following criteria, giving your school a grade of A, B, C, D, or F for each (write an A to F letter grade in each blank)?

___ Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension.

___ Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live.

___ Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature.

___ Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures.

___ Additional goal(s) my school has ________________________________

48. How would you rate your overall classroom reading program on the following criteria, giving yourself a grade of A, B, C, D, or F for each (write an A to F letter grade in each blank)?

___ Developing readers who are skillful and strategic in word identification, fluency, and reading comprehension.

___ Developing readers who are critical and thoughtful in using reading and writing to learn about people and ideas, and how they might use literacy to positively affect the world in which they live.

___ Developing readers who are independent in choosing, appreciating, and enjoying literature.

___ Developing readers who are knowledgeable about literary forms or genres and about different text types or structures.

___ Additional goal(s) I have _________________________________________

___
Teacher survey (continued)

Level-specific questions

The following sets of questions are age or grade specific. If you teach:

- Prekindergarten, Kindergarten, Transitional First, First, or Second Grade, please answer items 49 through 52. Then skip to item 54 and complete the rest of the survey.
- Third, Fourth, or Fifth Grade, please skip to item 53 and answer it and all remaining questions in the survey.

Pre-K through second-grade questions

49. What is your personal philosophy or perspective about reading programs for young children? Check the statement below that best matches your personal philosophy (circle one number).

1. I believe in a reading readiness perspective; that is, a child's physical, intellectual and emotional maturity are directly related to success in reading and writing. Therefore, it is a teacher's job to provide students appropriate activities (e.g., visual, auditory, motor skill activities) to support or enhance their readiness for reading.

2. I believe in an emergent literacy perspective; that is, all children can benefit from early, meaningful reading and writing experiences (e.g., invented spelling, environmental print, being read to). Therefore, it is a teacher's job to provide students appropriate activities that will enable them to understand the functions and forms of literacy and to grow into conventional forms of reading and writing.

50. What is your opinion about the importance of teaching young children the following word reading strategies? Circle 1 if you believe instruction in the strategy is Essential, 2 if you believe it is Important, and 3 if you believe it is Not important (circle one number in each row).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teaching phonic analysis skills/strategies (decoding)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching structural or morphemic analysis skills/strategies (meaningful parts of words)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching contextual analysis skills/strategies (what word makes sense in a selection)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching words by sight (whole words)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching meaning vocabulary (word meanings)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. If you believe that instruction in phonic analysis is "essential" or "important" (i.e., you circled either 1 or 2 in the first line of item 50), please circle numbers in front of all the statements below that describe how you teach phonics to your students (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. synthetic phonics (systematic instruction in which students are taught letter/sound correspondences first and then are taught how to decode words)
2. analytic phonics (systematic instruction in which students are taught some sight words first and then are taught phonics generalizations from these words)
3. instruction in phonics by way of word families or phonograms (e.g., -all, -ain, -ake words)
4. only as needed (not systematic instruction; rather, students are taught phonic analysis skills as the need arises)
5. in the context of literature (phonics skills are presented and taught through trade books or literature anthologies)
6. in the context of writing and spelling (phonics skills are presented and taught through children's writing)
Teacher survey (continued)

52. Which of the following materials, techniques, or activities are likely to be found in your Prekindergarten to Grade 2 classroom regularly (define "regularly" as three or more times per week)? Circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to you personally (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. Big Books used instructionally
2. trade books used instructionally
3. basal readers used instructionally
4. children writing and conventional spelling is expected
5. children writing and invented spelling is accepted or encouraged
6. book handling demonstrations or activities
7. phonics and word identification lessons
8. reading aloud to children
9. oral language activities (e.g., songs, chant, poems, rhymes)
10. Reading Workshop time
11. Writing Workshop time
12. Reading response activities (e.g., oral, written, or artistic responses following a reading/listening activity)
13. Free reading periods (e.g., Drop Everything and Read, or Uninterrupted Sustained Silent Reading time)
14. journal writing time
15. Working with word cards (e.g., word banks, sentence strips, word sorts, flash cards, pocket charts)

Note: If you are a prekindergarten, kindergarten, transitional first, first- or second-grade teacher, now skip to item 54.

Third- through fifth-grade questions

53. Which of the following materials, techniques, or activities are likely to be found in your Grade 3-5 classroom regularly (define "regularly" as three or more times per week)? Circle numbers in front of all of the following statements that apply to you personally (i.e., you may mark multiple responses).

1. comprehension strategy instruction (e.g., making inferences, drawing conclusions)
2. instruction in comprehension monitoring (e.g., self-questioning, applying "fix-up" strategies such as rereading)
3. instruction in literary elements (e.g., characterization, mood, setting, narrative structure)
4. word identification instruction lessons (phonics, structural, or contextual analysis)
5. vocabulary lessons or activities to develop students' knowledge of word meanings
6. literature response activities (e.g., discussion, written responses to literature)
7. literature discussion groups (e.g., book clubs)
8. trade books used instructionally
9. basal readers used instructionally
10. reading nonfiction trade books in order to learn about expository genres
11. teaching reading strategies along with content subjects (e.g., teaching chronological text structure in the context of a social studies textbook lesson)

12. Reading Workshop time
13. Writing Workshop time
14. critical reading lessons or activities
Teacher survey (continued)

Open-ended questions

54. Have you made any major changes or innovations in your reading instructional program over the past several years (circle one number)?
   1. yes  2. no

If you marked "yes" to the preceding, please respond to the following questions by telling about the most important or significant changes you have made:

What was the nature of the change or innovation?

Who initiated the change and what was the reason for the change or innovation?

Evaluate the success of the change or innovation. How is the change process proceeding?
55. As you work toward improving the quality of reading instruction in your classroom, what are the greatest challenges you face?
APPENDIX B

PERMISSION AND CONSENT LETTERS

Superintendent Permission Letter

Dear Dr. Daria and Dr. Davie,

My name is Jesse Sartain and I am a graduate student at the University of Alabama pursuing a doctorate in Elementary Education in the College of Education. Currently, I am on a one-year leave of absence from teaching kindergarten at Northport Elementary in order to spend time with my first child as well as to collect data for the dissertation phase of my doctoral studies. Given my interests in both teaching reading to young children as well as working with pre-service and practicing teachers across the elementary grades, I decided to pursue a doctorate in Education with an emphasis in literacy. An essential component to consider when teaching children to read is their interest and motivation to actively engage in reading activities. Unfortunately, most of the research on motivation targets older children in the upper elementary grades and above. As such, my proposed dissertation study seeks to investigate primary-grade teachers and their literacy practices that support children’s reading motivation. To answer my research question, *What instructional practices do primary grade teachers use to motivate their children to read?*, it is necessary to utilize both survey research and case study methods.

Accordingly, my proposed study will unfold in two, simultaneous phases. The first phase consists of administering a survey to primary grade teachers (K-2) across the state of Alabama. The second phase of the study consists of conducting interviews with willing primary-grade, Alabama Teacher of the Year nominees from the past two years.

The proposed study does not require me to gather any identifying information from the participants such as personal information, standardized test data or confidential student data. Further, the use of pseudonyms will protect the anonymity and confidentiality of all the participants involved in the study.

I am seeking your permission to do the following:

- Search out primary-grade teacher of the year nominees from your records and contact those nominees requesting an interview.

I request your assistance with the following:

- Forwarding my “Email Survey Consent” letter to your elementary principals and ask that they forward to their kindergarten-second grade general education teachers.

Please know that I respect and value the process of seeking approval for conducting research in the schools. I would be grateful for your support in this endeavor as I hope to use my
expertise and knowledge on the topic of motivation in the future. Please do not hesitate to contact me or request further information about my proposed study as I am happy to meet with you in person at your convenience.
Study title: Dissertation research exploring the question: How do primary-grade teachers motivate students to read?

Jesse Sartain, Ed.D candidate in Elementary Education

You are being asked to give permission for your child to take part in a research study. This is a dissertation research study exploring what primary-grade teachers do to motivate students to read. The study is being done by Jesse Sartain, who is a graduate student at the University of Alabama. Mrs. Sartain is being supervised by Dr. Julianne Coleman, who is a professor of literacy education at the University of Alabama. Jesse, the investigator/researcher, is not being paid for this research.

Jesse is employed by the Tuscaloosa County School System, which could create a conflict of interest. The conflict has been reviewed by the IRB and the University of Alabama Conflict of Interest Review Board. A Conflict of Interest Management Plan has been put in place to ensure that the interest of the researcher does not have any adverse impact on this study.

The information gained from this study is important because we currently know very little about what teachers in the early grades are doing to motivate students to read. The results of this study will help our local school system to understand what exactly is being done in the classrooms to motivate students to read, which could help promote these good practices and create a consensus among other local schools and teachers.

If you give permission, your child will be asked to be in this study because the investigator wishes to interview his or her teacher and observe in his or her classroom. This study will only involve the investigator observing in the classroom.

This study will not cost you or your child anything, and there will be no penalty or consequence at all for choosing not to participate. Your participation will not be compensated. There are absolutely no risks involved with participation in this study. There are also no direct, personal benefits for participating. Participation in this study, though, may make you feel good about knowing that you have helped our school system learn more about reading motivational practices going on in the classrooms.

In order to protect your child’s privacy, pseudonyms will be used to identify all data, and the data will be kept in a locked safe at the investigator’s home. All data will be destroyed up to one month after this study is complete.

The alternative to being in this study is not to participate. Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can choose to allow your child to participate, and you can also choose to end their participation in the study at any time.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (“the IRB”) is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The IRB may review study records from time to
time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study later on, please call the investigator, Jesse Sartain, at 205-344-3824. Jesse is being supervised by Dr. Julianne Coleman, and her number is 205-348-3248. If you have questions about your rights as a person in a research study, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html or email the Research Compliance office at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I give my child permission to be asked to participate. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

_________________________________________________________________ _______________
Signature of Research Participant’s PARENT or LEGAL GUARDIAN       Date
_________________________________________________________________  _______________
Signature of Investigator                                               Date
Dear Teacher,

You are being asked to be in a research study. This is a dissertation case study being conducted in partial fulfillment of a Doctor of Education degree at The University of Alabama. This study is being done by Jesse Sartain, and the question being explored is, “How do primary grade teachers motivate students to read?”

The study is supported by Jesse’s doctoral dissertation committee, and she is not receiving any salary or compensation for this work.

**What is this study about?**
This study is seeking to explore how primary-grade teachers motivate students to read. Specifically, the investigator would like to explore what practices and initiatives are taking place inside the classrooms and schools to support students’ reading motivation. You will be interviewed about what literacy practices you are implementing in your classroom as well as what you consider to be motivational strategies for your young students.

**Why is this study important—What good will the results do?**
The findings from this study will not only serve to fill an existing gap in the research literature pertaining to primary grade reading motivation, but will also serve to give insight to teachers and leaders in our system about what exactly primary grade teachers are doing to motivate students to read. This could help teachers with ideas and schools with reading initiatives that will motivate students to be lifelong readers.

**Why have I been asked to take part in this study?**
You responded to the investigator stating that you would be willing to participate in interviews and observations of your classroom literacy practices.

**How many other people will be in this study?**
The investigator hopes to include one other teacher in the observation and interview phase of this study.

**What will I be asked to do in this study?**
If you agree to be in this study, the investigator will conduct an interview with you as well as scheduled, regular classroom observations for a week.

**How much time will I spend being in this study?**
The interview will be semi-structured and should last about 15-30 minutes, depending on how much information about your experiences and practices you choose to share. The observation time will not require you to do anything outside of your regular classroom schedule.

**Will being in this study cost me anything?**
The only cost to you from this study is your time.

**Will I be compensated for being in this study?**
For participating in the case study, you will receive a small monetary appreciation gift.

**What are the risks (problems or dangers) from being this study?**
There are no dangers or problems posed by this study.

**What are the benefits of being in this study?**
There are no direct benefits to you unless you find it pleasant or helpful to describe your literacy practices and reading motivational strategies. You may also feel good about knowing that you have helped this local researcher learn more about how to motivate young students to read.

**How will my privacy be protected?**
You are free to decide where the investigator will interview you, so we can talk without being overheard. There will also be a pseudonym used in place of your name.

**How will my confidentiality be protected?**
The only place where your name appears in connection with this study is on this informed consent. The consent forms will be kept in a locked safe in the investigator’s home, and no person besides the investigator will receive this information. When we record the interview, we will not use your name, so no one will know who you are on the recording. When the interviews have been typed, the recordings will be destroyed. This should occur within one month of the interview. You may also refuse to be recorded, in which case the interviewer will take handwritten notes.

**What are the alternatives to being in this study?**
The only alternative is not to participate.

**What are my rights as a participant?**
Being in this study is totally voluntary. It is your free choice. You may choose not to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. Not participating or stopping participation will have no effect on your relationships with the University of Alabama.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board is a committee that looks out for the ethical treatment of people in research studies. They may review the study records if they wish. This is to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

**Who do I call if I have questions or problems?**
If you have questions about this study right now, please ask them. If you have questions later on, please call Jesse Sartain at 205-344-3824. You may also choose to call Dr. Julianne Coleman, Jesse’s doctoral committee chairperson, at 205-348-3248. If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.
You may also ask questions, make a suggestion, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online there, or you may ask Dr. Johann for a copy of it. You may also e-mail us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions.

______________________________
Signature of Research Participant

______________________________
Signature of Investigator

Date
Email Research Invitation

Jesse Sartain, Principal Investigator from the University of Alabama, is conducting a study called “How do Primary Teachers Support Reading Motivation for Young Children?” She wishes to explore classroom practices for motivating students to read.

Taking part in this study involves completing a web survey that will take about 20 minutes. This survey contains questions about classroom literacy practices.

We will protect your confidentiality by keeping this survey anonymous. Only Jesse, the Principal Investigator, will have access to the data. Only summarized data will be discussed in this study.

There will be no direct benefits to you for completing this survey. The findings, however, will be useful to local educators for conducting professional development for motivating students to read.

There are no foreseeable risks involved in completing this survey, but you may skip any questions you do not want to answer.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Jesse Sartain at 205-344-3824 or by email at jlfuller1@crimson.ua.edu. You may also contact Dr. Julianne Coleman with any questions or concerns at jucoleman@ua.edu or 205-887-0509. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a research participant, contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. If you have complaints or concerns about this study, file them through the UA IRB outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. Also, if you participate, you are encouraged to complete the short Survey for Research Participants online at this website. This helps UA improve its protection of human research participants.

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY. You are free not to participate or stop participating any time before you submit your answers.

If you understand the statements above, are at least 18 years old, and freely consent to be in this study, click on the link below to complete the survey

https://universityofalabama.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_eCX0CteAbAiyHL7
APPENDIX C

PROTOCOLS

Teacher Interview Protocol Form

Interviewee Pseudonym:

Grade Level:

Introduction: (Interviewer reads verbatim to interviewee)

You have consented to speak with me today because you are a primary-grade teacher who has a great deal to share about teaching young children. My research study focuses on exploring classroom literacy practices with particular interest in understanding how these practices motivate students to read. This study does not aim to evaluate your teaching in any way. Rather, I am trying to learn more about motivating young students to read, and hopefully learn about classroom practices that help improve reading motivation.

Background Information:

- Tell me a little bit about your personal background.
  - Where are you from?
  - Married? Children?
  - Interests
- Tell me about your professional background.
  - Schooling
  - Degrees earned
  - Experien
More specifically, tell me about your background in this school.

- How long have you taught here?
- What grade level experience here have you had?
- Do you serve on any committees and/or assume certain responsibilities outside of your classroom?

**Institutional Perspective:**

- Tell me about any strategies implemented school-wide to motivate students to read.
  - Are these strategies working? Why or why not? How do you know?
- Are there resources available to teachers for improving students’ motivation to read?
  - (i.e. professional development, monetary support for incentives, etc.)
- How do other faculty and staff outside of the classroom encourage students to read?

**Teacher Philosophical Orientation:**

- Question #22 on the survey asked you to describe your philosophy, beliefs, and values about teaching students to read. Can you expound on this for me?
- Question #23 asked you to also describe your role as it relates to developing readers. Can you expound on this for me?
- Talk to me about what you feel the most important aspects of the school day in terms of both teaching and learning?
- Do you feel that reading motivation is important for your students? Tell me why you feel this way.
- Describe your approach to motivating your students to read.
  - Is there a particular philosophy you have when it comes to motivating students to read?
  - Explain how you think about reading motivation?
    - Is it something you value?
    - Is it necessary?
    - What challenges come with motivating students to read?
  - Describe your role in motivating students to read.

**Classroom and Instruction Perspective:**

- On the survey, you indicated information about the reading achievement levels within your classroom. Can you offer some insight as to why you feel these percentages are representative of the students’ reading abilities in your classroom?
- How would you describe your students in terms of being motivated to read?
- Explain how motivating students to read influences your classroom planning and instruction?
- What do you do in your classroom to motivate your students to read?
- Are there specific rewards or incentives that you implement?
- On the survey questions 34-36, you answered questions pertaining to the organization of your instruction. Will you explain more about how you organize your instruction?
  - Do you differentiate instruction based upon students’ motivation to read? If so, will you describe how?

Open-Ended Discussion:

- Please share anything else you would like to about motivating students to read.
Classroom Observation Protocol

**Teacher Pseudonym:**

**Observer:**

**Date of Observation:**

**Classroom Climate:**

- Routines & Procedures

- Classroom Organization

- Social Interaction

- Displays of Reading Values (i.e. word walls, anchor charts, book suggestions, etc.)

**Reading Instruction:**

- Whole Group
  - Before Reading

  - During Reading

  - After Reading
o Program/Resources/Materials

o Text Types

- Small Group
  o Grouping Strategies/Organization

o Before Reading

o During Reading

o After Reading
Content Area Instruction:

- Program/Resources/Materials

- Integrated Literacy Instruction
  - Strategy Instruction

- Text Types

Other Daily Materials and Tasks:

- Other content areas
- Activities/Art/Music/Freplay

**Teacher Practices:**

- Grouping Strategies

- Behavior Management Practices

- Assessment Practices

- Teacher Feedback Practices

- Planning

- Scaffolding/Engaging Students
APPENDIX D

IRB APPROVAL

June 16, 2016

Jesse Sartain
Curriculum & Instruction
College of Education
The University of Alabama
Box 870232

Re: IRB # 16-OR-171 (Revision) “How do Primary Teachers Support Reading Motivation in Young Children?”

Dear Ms. Sartain:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has reviewed the revision to your previously approved expedited protocol. The board has approved the change in your protocol.

Please remember that your approval period expires one year from the date of your original approval, April 22, 2016, not the date of this revision approval.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the assigned IRB application number. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Carpaneta T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance