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ABSTRACT

This dissertation reports findings from a reading motivation study conducted in an elementary school serving students, all of whom were American Indian, in the southwestern United States. The school claimed to have more than fifty percent of its students scoring proficient or advanced on the state’s high-stakes reading assessment and to value the students’ cultural and linguistic diversity. Yearlong observations and data analysis called these claims into question.

The study was designed to explore what first through fifth-grade students—identified as having high or low reading motivation on the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS: 1st & 2nd) or the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ: 3rd-5th)—would say about reading and their motivations for reading or not reading. Additionally, the study asked how the American Indian students in this study compared to students from other ethnic groups on the MRS/MRQ and what the relationship was between their reading achievement and reading motivation.

The study found that for students in this setting, reading motivation was multidimensional and could thus be influenced by parents, teachers and other educational leaders, and community members. Students in classrooms where teachers had high expectations for learning, flexible curriculum pacing, and clear academic standards reported greater reading motivation. Some elements of reading motivation were strongly related to reading achievement.

Learning to speak the students’ first, Native language proficiently was found to be connected with individual, family, and community goals, while reading English was connected more closely with individual goals.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When developing approaches to early (K-5) reading instruction, educational leaders and policymakers often rely on two research streams. One has to do with instructional methods and the cognitive aspects of learning to read (e.g., Adams, 1990; National Reading Panel, 2000; Shanahan, 2004; Torgesen, 2002). This is basically the nuts and bolts of “how to” teach children to read. The other is concerned with inequitable social structures, which affect variables such as school readiness and response to instruction or interventions (e.g., Apple, 2002; Bernstein, 1996; Hart & Risley, 1995; Ogbu, 2004). This tradition points to structural differences, how they affect the ways students approach school, as well as the linguistic, cultural, social, and material resources available to students as they negotiate the schooling process. Structural differences may also affect the quality and amount of resources available to certain students in particular schools. Both perspectives are necessary. But while teaching methods focus on teachers and administrators, and structural approaches emphasize the socio-cultural environment surrounding students and schools, the way individual students react to both can determine the result of schooling for a specific student from a particular culture in a certain school system.

Statement of the Problem

Individuals from American Indian or Alaska Native cultures are often overlooked in school research. Sometimes students who are American Indian or Alaskan Native are too few in numbers to allow disaggregation of their achievement data. While these students represent an important percentage of the overall U.S. school population, information on how they are faring
academically in the nation’s schools is limited, even though they represent fairly large
percentages of the student population in some states. For instance, 27% of the school population
in Alaska identifies as American Indian or Alaska Native; 6% in Arizona; 11% in Montana; 11%
in New Mexico; 9% in North Dakota; 19% in Oklahoma; and 10% in South Dakota (NCES,
2005). The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicates that many students
who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native are not achieving what is considered by NAEP
to be proficient levels of reading. In a sample of seven states, with American Indian/Alaska
Native student populations representing at least 5% of the entire student population, NAEP results
showed only 10 to 32% of American Indian/Alaska Native students performing at a “proficient”
or “above proficient” level on the 2009 fourth grade reading assessment and only 11 to 30%
performing at a “proficient” or “above proficient” level on the 2007 eighth grade reading
assessment (see Tables 1-1 and 1-2 below.)
Table 1-1

2007/2009 Percentage of American Indian Alaska Native Students at or above proficient levels in
4th grade reading on the NAEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Alaska</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
<th>North Dakota</th>
<th>Oklahoma</th>
<th>South Dakota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss=2</td>
<td>Gain=4</td>
<td>Loss=1</td>
<td>Loss=4</td>
<td>Gain=3</td>
<td>Gain=2</td>
<td>Gain=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss=3</td>
<td>Gain=1</td>
<td>Loss=5</td>
<td>Loss=5</td>
<td>Gain=0</td>
<td>Gain=1</td>
<td>Loss=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first number is the 2009 score. The second number in italics is the 2007 score. The number after the = sign is the 2007 to 2009 percentage gain or loss.

Table 1-2

2007/2009 Percentage of American Indian Alaska Native Students at or above proficient levels in
8th grade reading on the NAEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Alaska</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
<th>North Dakota</th>
<th>Oklahoma</th>
<th>South Dakota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain=1</td>
<td>Gain=5</td>
<td>Loss=1</td>
<td>Gain=5</td>
<td>Gain=9</td>
<td>Gain=1</td>
<td>Loss=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain=0</td>
<td>Gain=4</td>
<td>Loss=1</td>
<td>Gain=5</td>
<td>Gain=2</td>
<td>Gain=0</td>
<td>Gain=0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first number is the 2009 score. The second number in italics is the 2007 score. The number after the = sign is the 2007 to 2009 percentage gain/loss.
While performance for all students in these states showed less than half achieving reading proficiency on the NAEP assessments in either 2007 or 2009, the American Indian/Alaska Native students’ scores were considerably lower. In fact, the percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students achieving proficiency was about half that of all students, except in Oklahoma, where American Indian/Alaska Native groups compared more favorably with other students. While this is essential information in the aggregate, it more importantly represents individual students who are or are not responding to certain pedagogical or policy initiatives. This study seeks information about and from those students. It examines what is motivating or not motivating individual students to read.

Many policies and pedagogical plans view students as an undifferentiated mass with certain common characteristics. In the same way that a whole may be more than the sum of its parts, a part may be very different from the whole. An interesting take on this notion of individual agency was offered by Harré in 1984. Harré proposed a “unity” of personal being in which he distinguished the “socially defined fact of personal identity . . . from the personal sense of identity through which a person conceives of him or herself as a singular being with a continuous and unique history” (p. 27). A “person,” said Harré, is a social being who takes on the “properties of the primary structure of a social world” and creates a secondary structure “modified to a greater or lesser degree by intrinsic personal processes” (p. 76). “Persons,” stated Harré, are social in nature and “so are identifiable by public criteria. . . . Selves are psychological individuals, manifested in the unified organization of perceptions, feelings and beliefs of each human being who is organized in that fashion in their own regard” (p. 76). According to Harré, “self-consciousness as a theory forms part of the cognitive equipment with which a person works in the social world” (p. 161) and is a “cognitive achievement facilitated by the possession of a theory of oneself as a unified being” (p. 165). As Harré summarized: “I mark my thoughts, feelings, actions
and so on as mine according to culturally distinctive conventions” (p. 172). Defined simply, culture is “a normative system, integral to which are norms, rules, and other indicators of how people should ‘behave’ in particular roles and particular places” (Moghaddam, Walker, & Harré, 2003, p. 114). Thus, the culture surrounding a student (including peer, family, and school culture) is vital, but the way a particular student organizes a response to that culture is also crucial and may vary from one individual to another within the same culture. These individual differences can be overlooked by teachers and other school leaders trying to understand student performance and achievement through aggregated means.

Though Vygotsky has clearly contributed to Harré’s view of the self, and has also contributed to current thinking on the role of culture and language in individual development, I want to focus here on those who have enlarged our understanding of what might be called, following Harré’s lead, a self-response to cultural and social structures. This includes social cognitive theorists, such as Bandura (1977, 1989, 1993, 2007) and others (Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 2000), as well as motivational researchers (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Chapman & Tunmer, 1995; Eccles, 1983; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). What Harré identified as the self’s response to, or organization of, its social world is generally referred to by these researchers as self-beliefs—a broad term for a number of other concepts including self-efficacy, self-concept, and motivation.

Bandura and the social cognitive theorists have provided an important framework for understanding the effects of self-concept and self-efficacy on student motivation and achievement. However, there is little in the literature to explain how Bandura’s social cognitive theory may operate differently for various ethnic groups in the U.S., particularly from understudied groups such as American Indians. Likewise, although motivational theorists have engaged in international cross-cultural work that shows differences in how motivation to learn
operates for individuals in different countries (e.g., Artelt, 2005; Wang, 2001), less has been done to understand how specific theories—for instance, Eccles’ (1983) expectancy value framework—operates for some U.S. ethnic groups. Again, American Indian students seem particularly underrepresented in these studies. In fact, several of the instruments commonly used to measure reading motivation have only been field-tested with students in the eastern United States, primarily with African American and European American students (see, for example, Graham’s 1994 synthesis).

Young children depend, in part, on others to help them form perceptions of their progress (Pressley, 1998). As Bandura (1993) noted, “…it is difficult for children to remain prosocially oriented and retain their emotional well-being in the face of repeated scholastic failures” (p. 138). Bandura (1993) and others (e.g., Ali & Saunders, 2006; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 2000) have also theorized that self-efficacy determines “the goals people set for themselves, how much effort they expend, how long they persevere in the face of difficulties, and their resilience to failures” (Bandura, 1993, p. 131).

Social cognitive theory addresses not only self-efficacy but also self-concept, a slightly different construct. Self-concept is generally considered a more global measure of an individual’s self-beliefs. Chapman and Tunmer (1995) suggested the more general “self-concept” should be broken into academic, social, physical, or musical self-concept. Academic self-concept can then be thought of in relation to math, reading, spelling, or writing. Reading self-concept, as discussed in Chapman and Tunmer (1995), can be considered in terms of its “subcomponents” including competence, difficulty, and attitude (p. 154). This is especially important for reading, since studies (e.g., Stahl, 2004; Taylor, et al., 1990) show reading progress is strongly associated with the amount of reading in which children engage. It is also possible that self-beliefs and motivation
account for some share of what Stanovich (1986) described as Matthew Effects of reading, wherein “rich” or skilled readers become increasingly skilled.

Engagement in reading activities and motivation to read has been conceived in different ways. Saracho and Dayton (1989) used a reading attitude scale (Preschool Reading Attitudes Scale) with students as young as three and four and were able to distinguish certain factors that predicted whether the child’s teacher would identify her/him as having a positive or negative attitude toward reading. Baker and Wigfield (1999) said “much of the work relevant to readers’ motivation has been framed in terms of attitudes toward reading” (p. 452). Baker and Wigfield took a more multi-dimensional view, adapting the Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ) by Wigfield and Guthrie (1997). Baker’s and Wigfield’s categories included one that considered self-efficacy and competence (similar to work by Bandura, Pajares, Schunk, Zimmerman and others); one that looked at the purposes, or why children read (Deci and Ryan have important work on this topic); and a third category, designed to better understand the social purposes of reading, including students’ expectations of reading and the value they place on reading (based on work by Eccles, Wentzel, and others).

The MRQ explores more dimensions of reading motivation than the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP) by Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzoni (1996), even though the MRP is shorter and might also be used with younger students. Another appealing instrument, particularly for American Indian students might be McInerney’s Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) since it was designed to “measure motivational goal orientations and to be appropriate for both Western and non-Western students” (Ali & McInerney, 2005). Unfortunately, the instrument has only been used thus far with older students. Another instrument, used successfully with younger students, was the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS). Like the MRQ, the MRS was designed to assess students’ competence and efficacy beliefs, as well as their personal reasons for reading,
and perceptions of the social aspects of reading (Baker & Scher, 2002). Both the MRQ and the MRS are grounded in expectancy value theory as conceptualized by Eccles (1983) and others (e.g., Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). However, the MRS is more appropriate for younger students. Discussed further in Chapter 3, the present study is based, in part, on Eccles’ model of reading motivation, which includes students’ expectations of success and the value they place on reading. Eccles’ framework also takes the child’s “cultural milieu” into account as well as the beliefs and behaviors of the child’s “socializers.”

American Indian students, grades 3-5, have not been assessed using the MRQ or the MRS. Knowing how American Indian students respond to these instruments would be a valuable addition to the literature. Also, there were no reports found where American Indian students were asked how they felt about reading and what motivates them to read or not. It would be helpful if educators and researchers knew more about reading motivation and possible links between reading motivation and reading achievement among students from American Indian groups.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to take the first steps in a long journey toward answering questions about how the individual reading motivations of students from understudied groups, such as American Indians, develop; to begin to understand how such motivations are or are not connected to reading achievement; and to learn more about why students from a particular American Indian tribe read or do not read, and what they believe about themselves as readers.

An explanatory mixed methods design was used as described by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007). The MRQ/MRS was used to assess students’ motivation for reading based on Eccles’ expectancy value theory. The MRQ/MRS measured motivational levels for students of
different grade levels and genders, within the targeted population, and compared them to the levels of students previously assessed on the MRQ/MRS. Correlation studies compared motivational levels to students’ reading achievement. Semi-structured interviews were then conducted to explore the students’ own ideas about reading and what motivates them to read or not, independent of what researchers have theorized. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to see what the similarities or differences might be between student responses to a theory-based questionnaire and the more generative responses that might arise from interviews to elicit students’ own ideas about reading motivation.

I wanted to find a school that viewed linguistic and cultural diversity as a resource rather than a “problem.” Although I was not entirely successful in this attempt, the site did prove informative. Generations of American Indians have suffered from hegemonic schooling practices designed to assimilate groups through their children and often creating what some have called a “lack of self-confidence” (Tharp, Lewis, Hilberg, Bird, Epaloose, Dalton, Youpa, Rivera, Riding In-Feathers, & Eriacho, 1999). Commenting on this situation, Tharp, et al. said, “the long history of subjugation common to all Native Americans,” and manifested in the community where Tharp, et al. were working, seemed to “sap young people’s confidence in their capacity to become leaders themselves” (p. 14).

Some American Indian communities have begun to demand greater involvement in local educational decisions and practices. Studying reading motivation in such a community provides the greatest opportunity to witness Harré’s view of “self” emerging from “culturally distinctive conventions” indigenous to the local culture rather than adopted from dominant discourses. Saint Theresa School, in the Torreon School District1, located in the southwestern United States, has maintained its cultural distinctiveness and thus seemed suited to providing evidence of indigenous

1 School and district names are pseudonyms to preserve participant anonymity.
conventions over dominant discourses. Although these indicators proved misleading, the site still provided important information about students’ reading motivation and also showed how a school that appears to be one thing, may in fact be something else entirely when some of the outer trappings are lifted and the site is examined more closely.

Saint Theresa had a strong native language program, has had American Indian administrative leadership, including school board members from the local community, and touts its commitment to respecting the cultural and language assets of its American Indian students (A. Torres, personal communication, August, 2008; S. Neddeau, personal communication, July, 2008). In 2006, the school was recognized by the governor and the state’s public education department for improved student performance on the state’s high stakes assessments. The school moved from probationary status to “meets standards” during the 2004-2005 academic year, and maintained that status during subsequent assessment cycles (Briseo, 2006). Unfortunately, this performance dropped sharply in 2007-2008, and again in 2008-2009. What began as a study of reading motivation in a site where students who were American Indian were achieving on par with other students in the state became a study where these students were not achieving typically.

Generally, school leaders emphasize reading, partly because early English reading success has been related to later school success and eventual wage-earning ability for the individual (e.g., Farkas, 1996; Torgesen, 2004); and also because many believe reading may be linked to increased cultural and civic participation (National Endowment of the Arts, 2007), although that assumption has not been adequately tested for possible differences when income, ethnicity, or region of the country is varied. But what happens to students who do not progress as expected in early reading development? Do they only fall behind academically or do they fall behind and develop self-beliefs that work against them later in life? What were those beliefs when the children entered school? Does early failure in reading achievement affect reading
motivation and does motivation affect early reading success or failure? Is reading motivation different for students from American Indian and other understudied groups? What inter-group differences are present? Is reading motivation connected to reading achievement for students from understudied groups? Does this help explain why many students from American Indian groups underperform as compared to peers on national reading assessments? How might students from schools organized to see ethnic heritage as a resource differ from students in more traditional schools? How would schools explain possible differences between individual students in their school, and between their students and students from other schools on measures of reading motivation? Do American Indian students whose families have been historically subjected to hegemonic schooling practices, including devaluation of their culture (e.g., Whiten & McIver, 2001), participate at school with different beliefs about themselves as “learners” or “students” or with different ideas about the value of reading?

Goals

The questions posed above are interesting and complicated. Gaining a better understanding of reading motivation in students from an understudied group is only the first step in answering these questions, but it is an important one. An educator’s desire to help every child reach high levels of learning is laudable, but it requires understanding and planning. If we have students in our classrooms from groups about which there is little empirical information, we may draw on knowledge of learning and motivation that is entirely inappropriate. Also, there have been mixed results from studies examining the link between reading motivation and achievement in students from different ethnic groups and at different ages (Denissen, Zarrett, & Eccles, 2007; Graham, 1994; McInerney & Swisher, 1995; Radda, Iwamoto, & Patrick, 1998). Educators need
more information about the role of reading motivation for students from understudied ethnic
groups in order to understand what teachers might do in the classroom to serve all students better.

American Indian groups are currently underrepresented in the literature. Therefore, this
study aims to gather information about students from the Saint Theresa School in the
southwestern U.S. regarding how much they say they read, what they say about why they read,
and their beliefs and attitudes related to reading motivation. The study also compares answers
from these American Indian students on a commonly used reading motivation instrument (MRQ),
and the less well-known MRS, to those of students from other ethnic groups and looks for
possible relationships between the students’ perspectives on reading and actual reading
achievement. The study provides a process other schools could use to learn more about their
students’ reading motivation, and this cross-cultural view expands our understanding of reading
motivation in this population.

Research Questions

In an elementary school where all students are American Indian:

1. What do students identified as having high or low reading motivation on the MRQ/MRS
say about reading and their motivations for reading or not reading? Are there differences
in their responses based on grade level or gender?

2. How do the American Indian students in this study compare to students from other ethnic
groups on the MRS/MRQ?

3. What is the relationship between reading achievement and reading motivation for these
students? Are there differences in those relationships based on grade level or gender?
Definition of Terms

Agency—individuals are active agents in their own learning and construction of self identity (Murphy & Alexander, 2000).

Culture—“a normative system, integral to which are norms, rules, and other indicators of how people should ‘behave’ in particular roles and particular places” (Moghaddam, Walker, & Harré, 2003, p. 114).

Expectancy—conceptualized by some researchers as efficacy expectancy or outcome expectancy (Eccles & Wigfield, 1991), wherein an efficacy expectancy is the individual’s belief (s)he can do the task, and an outcome expectancy is the individual’s belief that if (s)he does X, Y will happen. Others (Eccles, Wigfield, Harold & Blumenfeld, 1993) have found some children do not distinguish between the two constructs.

Expectancy value theory—that motivation is strongly influenced by one’s expectation of success or failure at a task as well as the “value” or relative attractiveness the individual places on the task (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996).

Extrinsic motivation—performing a task for a reward or consequence outside the activity itself (Murphy & Alexander, 2000).

Future Time Perspective (FTP)—motivates students by giving them a sense of purpose in school and other activities. This sense of purpose is thwarted if students have no FTP and believe the activities they are asked to complete are irrelevant to their present goals. This lack of purpose can affect motivation (McInerney, 2004).

Intrinsic motivation—performing a task because the task itself is rewarding, rather than for an extrinsic reward or consequence (Murphy & Alexander, 2000).
Instrumentality—the value of the perceived connection between a current task and a future goal (Husman, Derryberry, Crowson, & Lomax, 2003).

Person—social in nature and identifiable by public criteria (Harré, 1984).

Reading attitude—reader’s affect toward reading. (Baker & Wigfield, 1999).

Reading motivation—(1) activation to action [in this case to read]. Level of motivation is reflected in choice of courses of action, and in the intensity and persistence of effort. (From definition of motivation by Bandura, 1994, Encyclopedia of Mental Health); (2) a person’s choice to read or not and the vigor and persistence with which that person pursues [reading] behavior (Murphy & Alexander, 2000, p. 28).

Reading self-concept—can be considered in terms of “subcomponents” including competence, difficulty, and attitude (Chapman & Tunmer, 1995, p. 154).

SCAs—or domain specific self-concepts of ability are “representations” about “level of skill in the attainment of education goals” developed from “generalized notions” in young children to “increasingly domain-specific self-views” (Denissen, Zarrett, & Eccles, 2007, p. 430). According to Bong and Clark (1999), SCA is positively related to academic achievement and more closely related to self-efficacy.

Self—the psychological individual, manifested in a unified organization of perceptions, feelings and beliefs (Harré, 1984, p. 76).

Self-beliefs—an overarching term for different beliefs about and by the self, including self-concept, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-confidence.

Self-concept—a more general construct than self-efficacy that incorporates many forms of self-knowledge and self-evaluative feelings (Zimmerman, 2000, citing Marsh & Shavelson, 1985). Self-concept may be broken into academic, social, physical, or musical self-
concept. Academic self-concept can then be thought of in relation to math, reading, spelling, or writing (Chapman & Tunmer, 1995).

Self-efficacy—(1) people’s beliefs about their capabilities to produce effects. (Bandura, 1994, Encyclopedia of mental health); (2) people’s assessment of their ability to organize and successfully carry out certain types of performances in specified situations. (Bandura, 1989). According to Murphy and Alexander (2000), the “organize and execute” portion of the second definition reflects the domain- and task-specific nature of self-efficacy.

Self-determination—“the capacity to determine one’s actions as they emerge from an internally locus ed and volitional causality, rather than from an externally locus ed causality (e.g., reinforcement contingencies) or from an internally locus ed but nonvolitional causality (e.g., drives, intrapsychic pressures)” (Murphy & Alexander, 2000 p. 388).

Self-response—used here to designate Harré’s description of the move from “person” to “self.”

Self-schema—self-knowledge that allows individuals to perceive and respond to situations and events consistently. Self-schema is similar to self-concept but is more fluid and situational, having more to do with patterns of behavior than level of belief (Murphy & Alexander, 2000).

Task value—originally, task value was comprised of the usefulness of the activity (utility value), its importance (attainment value), the enjoyment/interest shown in the activity (intrinsic value) and cost, or what the student would have to give up to engage in the activity (Eccles, 1983). There is some evidence these distinctions are not useful, especially for young children (Eccles, Wigfield, Harold & Blumenfeld, 1993). More recently, researchers have separated task value conceptually into both close and distant future orientation to explain how students may be motivated by the immediate value of an
activity (close future orientation), or by the activity’s value based on the students’ future goals (distant future orientation) (Husman, Derryberry, Crowson & Lomax, 2003).

**Understudied groups**—for this study, primarily students from American Indian groups, but for the concept of reading motivation generally, understudied groups would include students identified as Hispanic, Chicana/o, Latina/o, Pacific Islanders, students who are disabled or economically disadvantaged, or others who are not often included in studies of reading motivation.

**Significance of the Study**

As noted earlier, elementary students not only develop academic skills in school, but also attitudes and beliefs that can influence their entire lives, including possibly the ways they will eventually participate in the civic and cultural life of their community. Through early reading pedagogy, and systemic interventions to address structural inequality (e.g., programs such as Head Start, free school lunch, Title I reading, etc.), educational leaders attempt to assure students develop proficient early reading skills. School leaders emphasize reading partly because early reading success is related to later in- and out-of-school successes (e.g., Farkas, 1996; Rindone, 1988; Torgesen, 2004).

Students, however, are not just subjects to be acted upon; they are also agents who play a major role in their own learning. Inter-psychological processes, including cultural mediation of reading motivation, may influence a student’s attitudes and beliefs about reading. Also, the ways in which those inter-psychological processes are transformed into intra-psychological processes can cause particular students to think and believe certain things about reading and to approach the act of reading in unique ways, which are important to understand. Teachers and other educational
leaders need more information about what motivates children to read, particularly in light of findings that “young [U.S.] adults are reading fewer books in general; [that] reading is declining as an activity among teenagers” when compared with past generations; and that reading can have civic and cultural consequences (National Endowment for the Arts, p.7; Cox & Guthrie, 2001).

This study addresses two problems in the current literature on reading motivation. First, it compares reading motivation quantitatively for students from an understudied group to what is known about reading motivation from other U.S. ethnic groups using the MRQ/MRS. It explores relationships between these quantitative findings on reading motivation and students’ reading achievement. Second, it draws on qualitative evidence to understand what and how individual students think about reading and how that may contradict, provide new insights, or raise new questions about the quantitative findings. Though the results cannot be generalized to students from other American Indian groups, the process used to gather the information could be used with other students and the information should prove useful to parents, community members, and the school’s teachers and administrators. Alexander and Murphy (2000), in an overview of understandings in motivation research asked if there might be different conceptions of various aspects of motivation in “non-Western” traditions and suggested answers might be found in “programs of cross-cultural motivation studies” (p. 45).

The study was designed using mixed methods to improve its usefulness to educators. The quantitative portion of the study provides information that can be compared to that gained from other studies of students the same age but from different ethnic backgrounds. This could be used by teachers and other education leaders as they interact with teacher training organizations, since it could show “outsiders” ways in which the community’s children may be similar to, or different from children in other groups. It could also be valuable for local leaders looking to current research on reading motivation to understand how other groups may differ from local
students. It could help local educational leaders develop more appropriate pedagogy and curriculum. Though the information should not be generalized to other American Indian groups, the process and insights might still be valuable for expanding the thinking of regional education leaders. Finally, since the proposed instruments fit students into established thinking about motivation, and since the students in this school may think differently about reading than students from other ethnic groups, the interviews were designed to probe student thinking directly so new theories or hypotheses may emerge.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature review, I outline what we know about what it means to read, including the importance reading for participation in society. The effects of deficit views on students learning to read are discussed, as well as how school organization may affect students’ self-beliefs. I examine portions of the vast motivation literature, including what is known about motivation among diverse student groups, and modern expectancy value theory.

Introduction

Effective reading instruction and intervention aims to develop a student’s ability to read and understand written material. Learning to read effectively is a lifelong process. According to the RAND Reading Study Group (RRSG, 1999), “the proficient adult reader can read a variety of materials with ease and interest, can read for varying purposes, and can read with comprehension even when the material is neither easy to understand nor intrinsically interesting” (Executive Summary, p. xiii). The RRSG described how readers bring not only personal cognitive abilities, but also motivation for reading to each reading situation. Reading comprehension, as conceptualized by the RRSG, involves interactions between the reader, the text, and the learning activity. These interactions are situated within a context that becomes critically important in the process of reading and understanding. The RRSG explained, “the learning process for reading takes place within a context that extends far beyond the classroom. In fact, differences among readers can, to some extent, be traced to the varying sociocultural environments in which children
live and learn to read” (Executive Summary, p. xvi). The group of reading experts who contributed to the RRSG viewed learning and literacy as “cultural” and “historical” activities.

With this understanding of reading, even a study focused on the individual reader must take into account that reader’s socio-cultural background. The present study was situated in a school that claimed to acknowledge student’s culture and language and engender pride in students’ socio-cultural heritage. Students heard and spoke their native language daily and local leaders influenced the day-to-day workings of the school. Just as reading is a situated experience, this study was situated in a specific socio-cultural context and was designed to learn what individual students had integrated from their surroundings into their own ideas about reading. This information came from the students themselves.

Before centering on students though, I want to look at the larger context for the study. First, I will briefly discuss methods of reading instruction and the role of structural supports, two research topics educational leaders and reformers often turn to when thinking about improving students’ reading skills. In that section, I will also discuss stratification and social mobility to explain why reading is such an important topic for education leaders. Next, I will provide evidence regarding a group of students who seem particularly underserved\(^2\) by current U.S. reading policy and how this has led some educators to develop deficit views of this group. The next section discusses how schools can combat deficit thinking. Then, with a clear picture of this larger context, I discuss reading motivation in detail.

\(^2\) Underserved is used instead of at-risk, minority, or low SES to underscore society’s failure to uphold its responsibility to these students.
Why Reading is Important

Saying someone is “educated” in the U.S. assumes certain levels of literacy since reading and writing are taken to be among the primary purposes of schooling. Brandt (2001) has even suggested literacy has become a U.S. commodity “as literacy has gotten implicated in almost all of the ways that money is now made in America” (p. 2). (Brandt is referring primarily to print literacy.) Thus, how children do or do not learn to read becomes critically important to their future success in this country. Literacy has become a “channel” for social mobility in a country that continues to believe every child has a chance to succeed. Unfortunately, as Sorokin noted in 1927:

In theory, in the United States of America, every citizen may become the President of the United States. In fact, 99.9 per cent of the citizens have as little chance of doing it as 99.9 percent of the subjects of a monarchy have of becoming a monarch. One kind of obstacle removed, others have been established. (pp. 153-154)

Ours, according to Sorokin, might not be as constricted as, for instance, a caste-society, and the channels of mobility may have changed so that the church or military no longer serve as the main conduits to ascent, but a vertical structure was and is still firmly in place, with less upward movement than many seem willing to believe (Sorokin, 1959). Education and print literacy have become increasingly important, even primary, channels for social mobility in the U.S. (Brandt, 2001).

Channels and structures of mobility tend to be so stable that, in 1960, Turner described an ideal type (folk norm, organizing principle, ideal pattern) at work in the U.S, which he called “contest mobility,” meaning most Americans believe the country does its best to level the playing field (think No Child Left Behind) and make it a fair academic, social, and economic competition
in which the best man (and recently maybe woman too) could and would win higher social status. Taken with Clark’s description that same year (1960) of the “cooling-out” function (lowering of expectations) of U.S. community colleges, a recent report in *Class Matters* (The New York Times Correspondents, 2005) that U. S. “mobility … has lately flattened out or possibly even declined” (p. 2), and the conclusions by McDonough (1997) that students’ views of “college opportunity structures” are often either “enlarged” by high SES parents or “constrained” by low SES parents (p. 146), and there is every reason to believe effective obstacles to vertical mobility are still in place in the U.S.

However, there is also a belief that education, particularly literacy, can serve as a channel—an “elevator” as some have called it—allowing those in the lower classes to rise ever higher in the social network. This “elevator” though is not necessarily available to all. High-stakes assessments and college admissions policies serve as gate-keeping devices, opening only for those who can perform effectively on “the tests.” In the U.S., a country supposedly founded on revolt against elite rulers, this is tolerated because our espousal of “contest mobility” allows us to believe that “the tests” are available to everyone and that, therefore, everyone has an equal opportunity to prepare for them. Not everyone agrees, and critics have claimed otherwise for most of the last century.

In the early 1900s, at about the same time Sorokin was explaining how vertical mobility seemed to be a historical fact, Apple (2002) said education leaders such as George Counts began asking if education might finally be the channel that could flatten that vertical structure. According to Apple, Counts “electrified an audience of progressive [U.S.] educators with a stirring call . . . [claiming] a dominant class had gained control of schooling and the economy, and this must be fought so that schools could lead the way toward a more democratic society” (p. 3).

---

3 Such as SAT, ACT, GRE, MAT, MCAT, LSAT, and now state accountability tests and graduate exit exams.
Apple said Counts’ question: *Dare the Schools Create a New Social Order?* was “premature” and before posing it we first needed “to more fully understand the ways in which …the curricular, pedagogic, and evaluative principles and practices that go on within [schools] are ‘determined’” (p. 608). Counts’ question was not premature; it was, and is, essential. However, in order to answer it, Apple is right, we need to understand what happens currently in classrooms, and one of the most important “curricular, pedagogic, and evaluative” practices occurring in classrooms is literacy instruction.

Almost everyone in America has an opinion about the quality of literacy instruction in American schools, often based on how they or their own children fared or are faring in learning to read and write. Many parents intuitively understand, as Brandt (2001) has emphasized, that “the ability to read and, more recently, to write often helps to catapult individuals into higher economic brackets and social privilege” (p. 2). As Brandt sees it, however, “the very broadening of these abilities among greater numbers of people has enabled economic and technological changes that now destabilize and devalue once serviceable levels of literate skills. Unending cycles of competition and change keep raising the stakes for literacy achievement” (p. 2). As these “stakes” are raised, Brandt believes the role of “sponsorship” in individual lives becomes particularly important. Brandt’s book, *Literacy in American Lives* chronicled the way literacy skills have become linked to economic conditions in the U.S. Using life-story research, she traced “memories of learning” to read and write, including the “people, institutions, materials, and motivations” associated with those memories, and the “uses and value” of the literacy learned for 80 participants in south central Wisconsin, ranging in age from 10 to 98 years old.

Brandt defined literacy “sponsors” as “any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, and model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold, literacy – and gain advantage by it in some way” (p. 19). In her research, “sponsors” were “the figures
who turned up most typically in people’s memories of literacy learning: older relatives, teachers, religious leaders, supervisors, military officers, librarians, friends, editors, influential authors” (p. 19). Brandt preferred the term “sponsors” because of its economic associations. She asserted:

the more that economics play a hand in sponsoring literacy development, the more that racial discrimination in that system hurts literacy development. And in the most vicious of vicious circles, injured literacy development in turn hurts chances for economic improvement. Under practices of segregation, people of color were on the whole bypassed when subsidies started flowing in the early and midtwentieth century into the foundation of what would become the information economy – public and private subsidies to schools, corporations, the military, libraries, technology. As these investments helped to raise the economic value of literacy skills, further injury befell those without these skills…. (pp. 203-204)

Reading and sponsors have been identified as critical in other studies as well. Using survey techniques, Rindone (1988) studied factors that contributed to the successful completion of a college degree among adults from the Navajo reservation near Window Rock, Arizona. Over 85% of respondents reported a “desire to achieve academically” while in school, and 85% also said that they “read in [their] free time” during their school days. The last question on the survey asked respondents to list the one factor that contributed most to their achievement. Rindone reported, “thirty-four percent responded that it was their own motivation, and 45% reported that it was the encouragement from parents and other family members” (Results section, para. 6). Some of the questions on the survey instrument used in the present study tapped into the role of “sponsors,” who are often parents; and this was an area that was probed in the interviews as well.
Reading is not only important for academic and economic success, at least one report also linked it to increased cultural and civic participation. In a 2007 study, the National Endowment for the Arts claimed, literary readers [those who read poetry, drama, fiction] are more than three times as likely as non-readers to visit museums, attend plays or concerts, and create artworks of their own. . . [; and] literary readers are more than twice as likely as non-readers to volunteer or do charity work. (p. 18)

Although the report is value-laden and possible differences in people of varied income, ethnicity, or region of the country were not taken into account, it bolsters a commonly held view that literacy is not only good for the individual but also good for society. Cox and Guthrie (2001) concurred, citing studies that showed, “the most active readers are also among the most socially interactive community members” (p. 117).

Understanding the importance of reading makes the differences seen in reading achievement among students from different ethnic and socioeconomic groups particularly disturbing. In a 2008 NCES report on status and trends in American Indian/Alaska Native education, the report’s summary reported that “on the 2007 4th and 8th grade National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading and mathematics assessments, American Indian/Alaska Native students generally scored lower than White and Asian/Pacific Islander students but not measurably different from Hispanic students” (NCES, 2008).4 Hispanic students were still considerably below White students on these reading assessments. In the latest assessments, “the reading score gaps between White and Black students at all three ages showed no significant

4 It is important to note that when ethnic groups are compared on curriculum-based measures, minority students often achieve the same levels as non-minority students of comparable socioeconomic status (e.g., Stevenson, Chen, & Uttal, 1990, p. 521).
change from 2004 to 2008, [but] the gaps did narrow in 2008 compared to 1971. White-Hispanic gaps in reading scores also showed no significant change from 2004 to 2008” (NAEP, 2009).

Note that American Indian/Alaska Native students are not even mentioned in the NAEP summary. Often students from American Indian/Alaska Native groups are also unrecognized in calls for reforms or in rationales for new research initiatives. For instance, in a special issue of Educational Psychologist, entitled “Promoting Motivation at School,” Wigfield and Wentzel (2007) devote half a column to “the persistent achievement gap between children from some minority groups and their White and Asian American peers” (p. 192), but fail to mention American Indians or Alaska Natives.

**Instruction or Social Structures?**

If reading is important to individuals, important for society, and if certain groups are not achieving adequate literacy levels, there is obviously a problem. Unfortunately, there is still considerable disagreement over how to address this problem. Some reading researchers believe many students “remain illiterate because the [look and say reading method] advocated 150 years ago is still embedded in our schools” (Sweet, 2004, p. 16). These researchers call for a more phonologically-based instructional method, particularly for beginning reading instruction often in conjunction with explicit oral language development. Though the emphasis on more direct early phonological instruction has its critics (see, for instance, Allington, 2001), the bulk of evidence seems currently to weigh in favor of the importance of directly teaching sound to symbol correspondences and developing phonemic awareness, particularly for beginning readers (Adams, 1990; Ehri, 2004; National Reading Panel, 2002; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). However, teaching the code is just one portion of good reading instruction. Students also need to read
interesting, challenging and enjoyable text, and write for authentic purposes. Motivating students to enjoy reading and writing is also critical. There is, however, a consensus that both code and meaning are critical components of good reading instruction (IRA, 1997).

But if we know how to teach beginning readers, why are large portions of minority ethnic and low socioeconomic groups continuing to score well below their peers? Some believe the most recent research has not been adequately disseminated to teachers. In a study Moats (2004) conducted with Barbara Foorman, in which they trained teachers from Washington D. C. and Texas to understand and use the latest research on reading, Moats claimed teachers were unprepared to deliver phonologically adequate instruction. Moats believed, as the teachers themselves reported, “they [teachers] had been directed away from explicit sound-based instruction by district policy of the previous decade” (p. 276). However, Moats also noted that “the principals whose schools outperformed the other schools in the [Moats] study visited classrooms regularly, reminded teachers of the value of specific instructional practices, promoted literacy throughout the school, read with children, supported family literacy programs and outside reading programs, created a businesslike atmosphere in the school, and expected improvement at all levels” (p. 273).

This is important information because what happens in classrooms undoubtedly affects students’ reading development. In addition, the social context is also important. Pajares (1996) has suggested in his illustration of Bandura’s “triadic reciprocality” that social structures contribute to environmental factors that may in turn influence self-beliefs. Ogbu (2004) also discussed social structures he called status problems, which, according to Ogbu, are “external forces that mark a group of people as a distinct segment from the rest of the population” (p. 4). Status problems, Ogbu said, include: “involuntary incorporation into society [e.g. Black Americans, American Indians]; instrumental discrimination [denial of equal access]; social
Underserved student groups may struggle to achieve in school as a result of, or in addition to, the problems Ogbu listed. This, in turn, may negatively impact self-beliefs. Some groups, such as African Americans and American Indians, have experienced all of the status problems Ogbu outlined. In the post civil rights era, Ogbu claimed African Americans have responded to status problems with one of “five culturally patterned strategies… [including]: assimilation, accommodation without assimilation, ambivalence, resistance of opposition, and encapsulation” (p. 18). These are reactions against hegemonic subjugation, and become part of students’ behavioral repertoire in school settings as well. Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) have noted in the career development literature that “over the course of childhood and adolescence, people’s environments expose them to a wide array of activities of potential career relevance. They also observe or hear about others performing various occupational tasks” (pp. 88-89). However, if students are victims of instrumental discrimination, they may not see or hear about certain occupational tasks. Thus, reasons for attending school may differ, with corresponding differences in achievement motivation.

Response to status problems most likely vary both between and within groups and may also have varied affects on self-beliefs. While African Americans and other minority ethnic groups may suffer status problems as a result of white hegemony, students from lower socioeconomic groups must respond to the hegemony of wealth, and students who have special needs may be forced to react to a world that sees them as disabled. In addition, many students may be represented in all three groups, and some students may suffer from placement in one group but benefit from also being in another. For instance, Ali and Saunders (2006) found that, in spite of “generalized local poverty,” high school students in a primarily white Appalachian school maintained hope of attending and succeeding in college and their “vocational/educational self-
efficacy beliefs and perceptions of parental support play[ed] a key role in [the students’]
expectations to attend college more so than their parents’ education or occupational status”
(Discussion section, para. 1).

Is this because white students who are poor still see opportunity in the larger social context? If so, then what explains Graham’s (1994) findings that “African Americans maintain high expectance in the face of failure, have high self-regard, and that perceived uncontrollability does not lead to maladaptive consequences” (p. 108)? In her review of studies through 1990 on achievement motivation in normally functioning children and young adults who were African American, Graham identified five main research topics: locus of control, need for achievement, causal attributions, ability self-concept, and expectancy. Summarizing the research on locus of control, Graham found that African Americans may have a more external locus of control, but that this greater externality is not necessarily “maladaptive” (p. 85). In particular, some studies showed Blacks with a more external locus of control engaged in greater social activism and showed greater congruence between ideal and perceived self (p. 79). The evidence comparing African Americans to European Americans in terms of need for achievement was mixed, with some showing advantage and some showing a disadvantage for Blacks. Graham said, “Blacks and Whites are about equally likely to display what is thought to be an adaptive (internal) attributional pattern—that is, attributing success to one’s ability and effort, and one’s failure to lack of effort” (p. 93). African Americans appeared to have self-concepts as positive as, or more positive than whites, and, in terms of expectancy, “Black subjects maintain[ed] undaunted optimism and positive self-regard in the face of achievement failure” (p. 103). As Graham noted, some of the findings were counterintuitive and require further research. Her review pointed to the importance of context in interpreting findings, and she recommended including socioeconomic
variables in studies. Graham also suggested a need for “race homogenous” research, something which was possible in the present study.

Similar to Graham’s summary of optimism in African American students, Phalet, Andriessen, and Lens (2004) noted that “typically, minority families and youth show higher academic aspirations and future expectations than working-class native [non-immigrant] youth” (p. 82). However, Phalet, et al. also noted there could be limits on how far these high aspirations and future expectations can carry students who also experience cultural dissonance between home and school, or students who are limited in future expectations by a lack of relevant role models or a belief their striving will eventually be blocked by discrimination or other structural impediments. Likewise, McInerney and Swisher (1995), in a study of Navajo student motivation, concluded:

If children receive messages from the cultural community that it is good to do well at school, and that one’s life chances are enhanced by success in school, they will succeed. Conversely, if the community’s messages indicate that success at schooling is at best irrelevant, and at worst inimical to one’s cultural identity, children will not look to the school as the arena in which to demonstrate their successes. (Sense of self section, para. 2)

These findings are particularly important since Bandura (1977) noted in his discussion of learned helplessness that “people can give up trying because they lack a sense of efficacy in achieving the required behavior, or they may be assured of their capabilities but give up trying because they expect their behavior to have no effect on an unresponsive environment . . . .” (p. 205). Students not exposed to positive mentors, sponsors, or other highly literate and successful individuals in their environment may become unresponsive, not because of low self-efficacy, but because they have been “socially subordinated” and see no point in further effort. In Learning to
Labor, Willis (1977) provided an ethnographic account of “how [according to Willis] working class kids [got] working class jobs” in Great Britain and suggested:

the ‘transition’ from school to work… of working class kids who had really absorbed the rubric of self-development, satisfaction and interest in work, would be a terrifying battle. Armies of kids equipped with their ‘self-concepts’ would be fighting to enter the few meaningful jobs available, and masses of employers would be struggling to press them into meaningless work” (p. 177).

No doubt, things have changed in the U.K. since 1977, but low-paying jobs requiring minimal education still abound there and in the U.S. and often students who are poor or from ethnic minorities fill those positions. Their children may see fewer examples of economic success to emulate, with possible consequences for the children’s expectations and motivation.

In order to fill low-paying, low status jobs in the U.S., some believe (e.g., see Schwebel, 2003) Americans with prestige and power may be entirely satisfied with substandard urban and rural schools, which prevent “working class kids” from acquiring what Farkas (1996) described as the “skills, habits, and styles” that might enable them to prepare for higher-paying, higher status jobs. Berliner (2006) concurred, adding that even “small reductions in family poverty lead to increases in positive school behavior and better academic performance. . . [and] poverty places severe limits on what can be accomplished through school reform efforts, particularly those associated with the federal No Child Left Behind law” (p. 949).

American Indian students may face additional hardships. In a report on early childhood education among American Indian and Alaska Native children, Faircloth (2006) discussed findings that these students may be “disproportionately affected by health problems” that increase their risk “of developing or acquiring a disability which may result in eligibility for special education programs and services” (p. 26). Increased income helps mitigate negative health effects
and Berliner (2006) provided empirical support for the positive effects of even small to moderate income increases on schooling outcomes.

Politically, programs such as Roosevelt’s Great Society or Johnson’s War on Poverty were attempts to address structural inequalities in the U.S. In the early 1960s, educational reformers also attempted structural changes. The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) stressed equity through social interventions, and programs such as Title I and, later Head Start, were designed to offset the educational effects of poverty. Rather than continue to push for equity, however, there has been a shift to excellence in the name of equity. The latest authorization of ESEA, the No Child Left behind Act, was designed to lay bare discrepancies in achievement between students in various groups including different ethnic and socioeconomic groups. However, the focus is on excellence, which is to be gained through assessment and accountability rather than structural supports.

Often, both equity and excellence initiatives focus on school organization. This can mean attention to classrooms and teachers, but it can also mean less attention to students and what they think and believe. School organization is important to understand since it affects the way schools respond to reforms such as the latest accountability measures. However, as Prestine (2005) noted in an investigation of state systemic reform, “student achievement gains must be the ultimate test of policy strength/impact” (p. 212). The bottom line, as Prestine explained, is the effect of reforms on students. School organization is important because it helps determine teachers’ responses to policies and situations at hand. Equally important however may be the ways teachers and policymakers view students.
Reading Achievement, Deficit Views, and American Indian Students

When teachers, other educational leaders, and policymakers believe the obstacles to equity or excellence lie within the students, their families, or their cultures, it can lead to what Shields, Bishop and Mazawi (2005) called “pathologizing practices.” A number of authors have noted such practices among educators dealing with the children of indigenous groups (Barman, Hebert, & McCaskill, 1986; Curwen Doige, 2001) including American Indians in the U.S. (e.g., Carney, 1999; Carroll, 2000; Caskey, 2002). Shields, et al. explained that, “pathologizing” practices result when educators see children’s differences “as deficits that locate the responsibility in the lived experiences of children . . . rather than locating responsibility within classroom interactions and relationships, or indeed, within the education system itself” (p. xx). I would argue responsibility should also extend to political and economic systems, which play such important roles in how educational structures are organized.

There was evidence of such deficit thinking at a national level as early as the colonial and federal periods in the U.S., when Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, among others, showed only a limited “interest [or willingness to invest] in Native American higher education,” yet claimed they were discouraged by the “lack of results” for Native American students (Carney, 1999, p. 137). This discouragement came in spite of the fact that the aim for American Indians was never greater than vocational training and never took into account indigenous knowledge, culture, or language (Carney, 1999). In what was clearly a “pathologizing” view, students’ cultures and languages were not only disregarded, they were blamed for students’ failure to thrive in a hegemonic schooling discourse, and this practice continues today (Caskey, 2002). Shields, et al. (2005) said in the U.S., as elsewhere, “fundamental to the project of colonization was the promotion of the ideologically determined understanding that the new power differentials were in
fact part of the natural order of things due to the cultural and racial superiority of the colonizers” (p. 7). Thus, native peoples and their knowledge systems were considered inferior and unworthy of any real consideration or inclusion. This has been the case in spite of the fact that historical research notes the effectiveness of Native American pedagogy for informal socialization and for teaching and learning basic literacy (Tharp, 2006).

Shields, et al. drew upon the work of Foucault and others to support their view that this process becomes “pathologizing.” Schools sanction certain knowledge and behavior and label other knowledge and behavior as “deviant” (pp. 8, 9). As Foucault has said:

‘truth’ is linked in a curricular relation with systems of power that produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it—a ‘regime’ of truth. . . .

The problem is not changing people’s consciousnesses—or what’s in their heads—but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. (Faubion, 1994, p. 133)

Since, historically, U.S. schools devalued native students’ culture and language, knowledge and behaviors, students were forced to try to learn in ways they did not understand and in places where they often seemed unwelcome. As an example, boarding school abuses have been well documented. (The National Indian Education Association (n.d.) provides an important overview and specific practices are discussed further below). Although Carroll (2000) presented evidence from four U.S. Catholic boarding schools in the Dakotas where conditions seemed less harsh and more of the students’ language and culture was incorporated in classrooms, even in these schools, students ran away and parents would often hide children to prevent them from being taken to the school. The policies in the Dakota schools were slightly more positive because the nuns who served as teachers were recently arrived immigrants themselves with some understanding of the cultural divide their charges were asked to navigate. “Unlike teachers who
worked at government and Protestant schools, these women faced the dual task of adjusting to a foreign culture as well as implementing a program of Americanization at their schools” (p. 171). As a result, the Benedictine and Grey Nuns wove “American,” European and Native traditions into their curriculum and pedagogy. However, such schools were rare and deficit views of American Indian students continued to dominate the thinking of most boarding school educators. This legacy has left an indelible mark on contemporary American Indians and comes up often even in informal conversations about their educational experiences.

**School Organization’s Potential Influence on Self-beliefs**

Although deficit thinking was extreme and pervasive in early U.S. boarding schools, it is, unfortunately, not only a thing of the past. It is one of the “equity traps” that Bell McKenzie and Scheurich (2004) claimed prevents educators from creating schools where all students can enjoy academic success. After describing how deficit thinking continues to affect American Indian students in the southwestern U.S., Shields, et al. (2005) suggested educators must acknowledge and overcome such patterns of thinking because “when we understand and overcome pathologizing discourses and practices, we can quickly dispel the myth that equal academic achievement is unattainable by indigenous children” (p. 141). Shields, et al. believe educators do this by “repositioning” themselves so that students’ socio-cultural realities are recognized and valued in school. “Repositioning through consideration of the current lived experiences of minoritized students, by multiple means of allowing marginalized students’ voices to be heard, helps teachers to experience classroom interactions and relationships in completely different ways” (p. 148).

Gonzalez, Moll, and Armanti (2005) set forth a similar proposal. In their book, *Funds of Knowledge*, they described how teacher volunteers were trained in ethnographic methods by
university researchers. As trained observers, the teachers then visited their students’ homes to learn how to connect the classroom to students’ families and communities. Gonzalez, et al. specifically addressed the notion of agency, and in a review of how the concept of “culture” has changed and evolved and is still viewed differently by different groups, Gonzalez, et al. discussed Ogbu’s identification of voluntary and involuntary minorities and Willis’ work in England that proposed children were not just passive culture-bearers. Gonzalez, et al. contended that Ogbu, to some extent, and certainly Willis have expanded the notion of culture “into realism that posited individuals not as ‘cultural dopes’ doomed to endlessly reproduce a static and unyielding culture, but as manipulating and tinkering with cultural elements, although not always to their educational benefit” (p. 36).

As evidence increases describing how schools can organize to connect with students’ lives and culture (Tharp, 2006; Tharp, et al., 1999), more schools are beginning to recognize how these “repositionings” might positively affect student learning, particularly for students from groups outside the white, middle class mainstream (Reeves, 2004). The leadership in the school targeted in this study claimed the school worked against such deficit views but prolonged contact revealed pathologizing practices were still apparent and working to students’ detriment.

In a different but similar school, one that seems further along in the process of “repositioning” its curriculum and pedagogy but located in the same region of the country and in a Pueblo tribal community similar to the one described in this study, years of research have been conducted and published. This other school, whose reading scores on the state’s high-stakes reading assessments were also similar to Saint Theresa’s, when Saint Theresa was experiencing academic success, is located in a community where generations had also been subjected to hegemonic schooling practices. Tharp, et al. (1999), researchers who spent many years in the
community, provided the following brief history of Native American contact with U.S. schooling as background for their own work in the schools there:

To promote assimilation [at the turn of the century], Native American children between the ages of 6 and 16 were forced to attend boarding schools (Huff, 1997). Although many Native children continued to be educated in missionary schools, others were sent to Indian Service (later known as BIA) schools, funded by the sale of reservation land under the Allotment Act. Due to the poor conditions, harsh treatment, and forced attendance, these schools were like prisons. Overcrowding promoted the spread of tuberculosis and trachoma. Inadequate supplies resulted in chronic malnutrition and chronic disease (Ellis, 1994). There is also reason to suspect countless cases of physical and sexual abuse (Stewart, 1998). Generations of youth were captured, shipped hundreds of miles distant, and subjected to schooling designed to integrate them into the dominant culture. Food rations were withheld from families that hid their children (Ryan, as cited in Huff, 1997) and children who ran away from boarding schools were retrieved by the Army or Indian Service. Native American children, unaccustomed to punishment, were flogged with ropes; some schools even had jails (Huff, 1997; Spring, 1994). Twice in 1891, the Tenth Calvary was sent in search of Hopi children. Uncooperative leaders were arrested, and some Hopi fathers who resisted the abduction of their children were sent to Alcatraz Island for a year. (Reyhner & Eder, 1989, p. 9)

Tharp, et al. (1999) said “a lack of self-confidence in Native American leaders is a consequence of the long history of subjugation common to all Native Americans and it is evident in [the community where they worked]” (p. 14). A former superintendent (and co-writer with Tharp, et al.) summed the worked up in this way:
When we accept the American common tradition as the model for education for our people, and settle for gaining our little piece of Indian control over that model, we severely limit ourselves. We ourselves must design education for our children, from the center up, from where we come as Indian people. We must build on the whole young person—physical, psychological, social, educational, cultural-spiritual, familial—and create on the basis of all of the strengths. I think of a seven directional model, where we will look to the strengths of the six directions that we have as Indian people, but also look to the seventh, which is ourselves. We must create our own. That’s risky. It means real change. And it can save our children…. (p. 23)

This study is an attempt to look at individuals within a similar community—to better understand students’ self-beliefs, particularly what motivates them to read, with all that entails for their own futures and the futures of their communities.

**Reading Motivation**

With this context for the study in mind, reading motivation can now be considered in depth. Reading motivation is complex and can be conceptualized in various ways. Two definitions of motivation, adapted to the reading domain, may be helpful: (1) activation to action [in this case to read]. Level of motivation is reflected in choice of courses of action, and in the intensity and persistence of effort. (From definition of motivation by Bandura, 1994); and (2) a person’s choice to read or not and the vigor and persistence with which that person pursues [reading] behavior. (Murphy & Alexander, 2000, p. 28). Essentially, reading motivation research is an attempt to understand why some students choose to read actively over a range of topics for sustained lengths and periods of time, while others do not.
Two measures of reading motivation were critical to this study: the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS) and the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ). Using the MRS, Baker and Scher (2002) studied 65 first graders from six schools in Baltimore, Maryland and interviewed the students’ mothers to understand the similarities and differences in the children’s home and school literacy environments and how they influenced the children’s reading motivation. Baker had conducted earlier research with Wigfield using the MRQ. The MRS, which Baker and Scher developed for the first grade study, though considerably shorter, has dimensions in common with the MRQ (i.e., Value, and Perceived Competence). Baker and Scher found the first graders they studied generally valued and felt competent in reading. However, these young students responded less positively about their enjoyment of reading. The researchers reported no differences between boys and girls and little difference based on ethnicity or socioeconomic status. The children of parents who reported their children read for pleasure and were interested and actively involved in learning to read also showed greater motivation for reading on the MRS.

Earlier, Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) developed and revised a multi-dimensional questionnaire (MRQ) to assess children’s reading motivation. An empirical test of the MRQ was conducted and reported by Baker and Wigfield (1999). The authors found strong relationships between reading motivation and reading activity. In other words, “children who believe[d] they [we]re capable of reading well and [we]re intrinsically motivated to read report[ed] that they read more frequently” (p. 470). However, there was a weaker correlation between reading motivation and reading achievement, which varied based on gender and ethnicity. Baker and Wigfield (1999) concluded that “children should not be characterized as either motivated or not motivated to read. Instead, they are motivated to read for different reasons or purposes, and it is important to distinguish among them” (p. 474).
In terms of measurement, Watkins and Coffey (2004) investigated the validity of the MRQ using 328 grade 3-5 students from schools in the mid-Atlantic U.S. and 735 students, grades 3-5, from southwestern U.S. elementary schools. In this larger and more diverse sample, eight rather than 11 dimensions emerged from factor analysis. The authors criticized the MRQ because within these eight dimensions, several were identified with only three or four items rather than the recommended five (recommended by Comrey & Lee, 1992; Fabrigar et al., 1999, and cited in Watkins & Coffey, 2004). Watkins and Coffey also believed the Work Avoidance category was distorted because of the negatively-phrased questions. They concluded the MRQ required further development and should not be used as a dependent variable “or as a measure of affective change in high-stakes educational evaluations” (p. 117). Since no intervention is planned for this study, the MRQ is suited to the present purpose because it provides a multi-dimensional view of reading motivation and offers an opportunity for cross-cultural comparison related to the research questions.

According to Baker and Wigfield (1999), the MRQ relies on two prominent theories of reading motivation: engagement and achievement motivation. Engagement theory suggests readers “are motivated to read for different purposes, utilize knowledge gained from previous experience to generate new understandings, and participate in meaningful social interactions around reading” (Baker & Wigfield, p. 452). Achievement motivation theory draws upon self-efficacy and competence beliefs, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and the purposes for achievement.

Achievement motivation theories, in general, are connected to what individuals believe about themselves and what they can accomplish, whereas engagement theorists ask why the individuals would want to undertake certain tasks in the first place. In many ways, modern expectancy-value theory seeks to integrate these approaches (see, for instance, Wigfield &
Eccles, 2000). Therefore, in the following sections, I will discuss competence and efficacy beliefs, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and purposes for achievement in separate sections since these are the specific constructs targeted in the MRQ. I will conclude the section by summarizing modern expectancy-value theory and discussing findings directly related to motivation in students from indigenous groups, as well as gender effects.

**Competence and Efficacy**

The first category measured by the MRQ in the Baker and Wigfield (1999) study was based on competence and efficacy belief constructs and this is a category that is also explored with questions on the MRS. Social cognitive theory, as introduced and expanded by Bandura (1977, 1989, 1993, 2007) and others (Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 2000; Zimmerman, Bandura, and Martinez-Pons, 1992) provides an important framework for understanding the effects of self-efficacy and competence on student motivation and achievement. Children tend to believe what others tell them about their performance and, over time, become aware of how they are progressing in comparison to others (Pressley, 1998). When they fail or struggle with important academic skills, such as reading, it is difficult for them to continue to believe in their own ability (Bandura, 1993). Bandura (1993) and others (e.g., Ali & Saunders, 2006; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 2000) suggest these early successes or failures help explain why students choose certain goals, and activities, and the effort, persistence, and resilience they demonstrate in connection with those goals and activities. This may be especially important for reading, since studies (e.g., Stahl, 2004; Taylor, Frye & Maruyama, 1990) show reading progress is strongly associated with the amount of reading in which children engage. It is also possible that reading self-concept accounts for some share of what Stanovich (1986) described as *Matthew Effects* of reading, wherein “rich” or skilled readers
become increasingly skilled, in part, because their attitudes toward reading are conducive to continued engagement in reading activities, and continued engagement contributes to better reading, in what may be a reciprocal process.

In fact, Chapman and Tunmer (1995), in a series of four experiments with very young students in New Zealand, suggested such Matthew Effects could be at work and attempted to learn more about these relationships. They conducted four experiments as a follow up to work by Marsh (1988), who had introduced a “self-description questionnaire” for young readers. Chapman and Tunmer concluded that “the increasingly negative perception of difficulty and competence observed in [Chapman’s and Tunmer’s] research may be precursors of negative Matthew effects,” and that “as initial, uncorrected problems in reading become established patterns of difficulty and poor performance, children’s perceptions of competence come into line with actual achievement” (p. 165).

Chapman and Tunmer also developed an instrument they called the Reading Self-concept Scale (RSCS)-30, a 30-question oral assessment of students’ perceptions of competence in, perceptions of difficulty with, and attitudes toward reading that they tested with five-, six- and seven-year old students in New Zealand. Unlike Marsh, who believed negative items should not be included in surveys for younger students, Chapman and Tunmer found negative items (e.g., I am dumb at reading) could be successfully included in a measure for young children as long as “the wording was changed from declarative statements to questions, in conjunction with the referential pronoun you” (e.g. Are you dumb at reading?) (p. 164).
Differences in Self-belief Constructs

Before proceeding further with specific instruments and studies, however, the research on self-concept should be distinguished from what Chapman (n.d.) has called “other self-system factors” (on-line lecture, accessed February 7, 2008), including self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-confidence, causal attributions, and achievement expectations. Bong and Clark (1999), comparing self-concept to self-efficacy research, found self-efficacy to be a more well-defined concept, comprised of cognitive perceptions of ability on particular tasks, based on prior performances, and more often studied under experimental conditions. Self-concept, according to Bong and Clark, has both cognitive and affective components, connected to domains rather than tasks, includes social comparison, and is more often studied using correlational methods. Bong and Clark also reported that studies up to 1999 generally showed “younger children [because they attend to specific outcomes] may not differentiate as much between their self-concept and self-efficacy” (p.150). Zimmerman (2000) discussed the differences in self-concept and self-efficacy, noting that “self-efficacy items focus exclusively on task-specific performance expectations” (Self-efficacy and related beliefs, para. 1). Citing Marsh and Shavelson (1985), Zimmerman added that others have described self-concept as “a more general self-descriptive construct that incorporates many forms of self-knowledge and self-evaluative feelings” (Self-efficacy and related beliefs, para. 1). Indeed, it was Marsh and Shavelson (1985) who showed that self-concept might be thought of as an overarching or hierarchical term including what would later be divided by Chapman into specific sorts of self-concept. To understand self-concept in greater detail, Chapman suggested the “general self-concept” should be broken into academic, social, physical, or musical self-concept. Academic self-concept can then be thought of in relation to math, reading, spelling, or writing (slide 12). Finally, reading self-concept, as discussed in
Chapman and Tunmer (1995) can be considered in terms of its “subcomponents” including competence, difficulty, and attitude (p. 154).

Before the notion of self-concept became more refined, many researchers were using instruments that may have been limited due to the lack of a strong conceptual frame. Most of the research also seems to have been conducted with white students. One study that did investigate motivation among minority students was a 1969 study by Heaps and Morrill who examined differences in self-concept between two ethnic groups. They essentially found little difference in Navajo and white students on many measures using an early self-concept scale (Tennesse Self-Concept Scale). In a similar study comparing native and non-native students in Labrador using the same scale, Bognar (1980) found several subscale differences between the two groups but questioned the validity of the scale and how reading ability might influence results. So, what little research there has been on self-concept and indigenous students seems to have been conducted some time ago and may have suffered from conceptual and measurement problems.

Rider and Colmar (2005) explored the relationship between reading achievement and reading self-concept in underperforming schools in Australia with diverse ethnic representation including schools where “47% of the students in the school reported they spoke a language other than English at home (Vietnamese, Khmer, Mandarin, Cantonese, Samoan, and Arabic)” (Method section, para. 1). The authors were looking specifically for gender effects and found little difference in terms of gender but did note that “reading rate made the most significant contribution to reading self-concept” (Contributions section, para. 1). Especially important for educational leaders was the following:

The findings in this study were consistent with the work of Chapman and Tunmer (1995)....Only the Attitude subscale differed, as a significant correlation with reading comprehension was not reached in Chapman and Tunmer’s study until the 5th year of
schooling. It appears that for the New Zealand children in Chapman and Tunmer’s sample, poorer readers did not develop corresponding negative attitudes toward reading until they were older. These results may be attributed to differences in the support provided to poorer readers in the two systems. (Integrity section, para. 1)

This is particularly interesting for those who want to examine how school organization may contribute to the relationships between reading achievement and reading self-concepts. The Rider and Colmar study suggested that in schools without significant supports and interventions for struggling readers, students may develop negative attitudes much earlier. Their study also suggested students from different ethnic groups may hold different self-beliefs.

**Self-efficacy for Underserved Students**

Having looked at the construct of self-concept, it is important to return to self-efficacy. In terms of self-efficacy in underserved populations, there is still little in the literature to explain how Bandura’s social cognitive theory may operate differently for various ethnic and socioeconomic groups in the U.S., particularly from typically understudied groups such as American Indians. Studies conducted with students from American Indian groups have typically used assessments that are no longer considered viable (e.g., Martig and DeBlassie, 1973, using Muller and Leonetti’s *Primary Self-Concept Scale*) or were designed primarily for older students (e.g., Martin, 1978, working with 4th, 8th and 12th grade students using the *Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory* and the *Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale*).

What does seem clear from social cognitive theory is that self-efficacy is domain specific and responds to changes in environment or context. Self-efficacy does not have the stable, trait-like characteristics of self-beliefs, such as self-concept or self-esteem (Zimmerman, 2000).
“Self-efficacy and other expectancy beliefs [discussed below in the expectancy-value section] have in common that they are beliefs about one’s perceived capability; they differ in that self-efficacy is defined in terms of individuals’ perceived capabilities to attain designated types of performances and achieve specific results” (Pajares, 1996, p. 546). There is also a difference between efficacy and outcome expectancies. An efficacy expectancy is the individual’s belief (s)he can do the task, whereas an outcome expectancy is the individual’s belief that if (s)he does X, Y will happen.

Pajares also explained an important difference between self-efficacy for performance and self-efficacy for learning. He said, “When students are unfamiliar with the specific tasks that confront them, judgments of competence cannot be based on perceived skill related to the tasks, for students are not clear on which skill was required” (p. 562). This seems particularly true of reading. Young children rely greatly on others’ perceptions of their progress as well as how they see peers progressing, and attributions others encourage them to make. As Pressley (1998) explained, “6- and 7-year-olds typically believe that they can succeed by trying hard . . . [but with] increasing age during the elementary years, children differentiate effort and ability” (p. 232). Children, according to Pressley, learn to attribute successes to ability rather than effort in most U.S. schools, so that by children’s sixth or seventh year of school, “successes are considered to be indications of high ability and failures to be indications of low ability” (p. 232).

Bandura (1993) also explained that “the adverse social and emotional effects of a low sense of cognitive efficacy are understandable. It is difficult for children to . . . retain their emotional well-being in the face of repeated scholastic failures and snubbing by peers that erode their sense of intellectual efficacy” (p. 138). Bandura and Locke (2003) reported a study in which Bouffard-Bouchard “instilled high- or low-efficacy beliefs in students by suggesting that they were of higher or lower standing compared with bogus peer norms, irrespective of their actual
performance” and found those students who thought they ranked higher “set higher goals for themselves, used more efficient problem-solving strategies, and achieved higher intellectual performances” than students who were just as bright but were convinced they were lower-performing (p. 89).

Such comparisons are often made by students as they interact together in groups, and you would be hard-pressed today to find a teacher training program that did not emphasize practices that engage students in group activities, or cooperative learning. In terms of oral language development, research suggests this is a useful practice (e.g., Echevarria & Graves, 1998). Unfortunately, when teachers are trained for organizing and engaging students in group work, the training often neglects specific cooperative learning strategies that would promote students’ sense of efficacy such as making sure students can perform the necessary tasks to participate effectively in the group, and making sure groups are friendly and internally noncompetitive (Margolis & McCabe, 2003). Without these considerations, cooperative learning may not provide optimal opportunities for building students’ self-efficacy. When students are grouped for early reading instruction, they are often placed in ability groups that remain static. Flexible ability grouping is supposed to give teachers the opportunity to target instruction to students’ needs, but when these groups remain stable, and deficient skills are not remediated quickly, students begin to evaluate the relative performance of “their group” in relation to other groups and make judgments about their own ability as a result.

The judgments students make of themselves matter because researchers repeatedly report findings supporting Bandura’s claim that self-efficacy determines the effort, persistence, and resilience to failure students will exhibit when engaged in a task such as reading. Children who believe they are “good readers”—which for different students in different classrooms might entail very different criteria—will continue trying to read ever more difficult books, will work to
decode and understand text, and will exert the effort needed to become the wide-ranging readers who show the greatest gains in “known” words, vocabulary, and comprehension. As Bandura (1977) pointed out early on: “after strong efficacy expectations are developed through repeated success, the negative impact of occasional failures is likely to be reduced” (p. 195). In fact, the phenomena may have a snowball effect, in that those with higher self-efficacy may work harder and longer and become better readers. These same students later on may consider more career options and, Bandura (1993) claimed, “the more career options they consider possible, the greater the interest they show in them, the better they prepare themselves educationally for different occupations, and the greater their staying power and success in difficult occupational pursuits” (p. 135). Again, the rich get richer.

There may also be important effects of self-efficacy on memory. Bandura (1989) linked efficacy and its association with increased effort to a greater ability to “convert experiences into recallable symbolic forms” (p. 733; also suggested in Pajares, 1996 citing Berry, 1987). This is important not only for its possible effects on comprehension, but also because the work by Ehri, Deffner and Wilce (1998), along with several imaging studies (reviewed in Papanicola, Pugh, Simos, & Menci, 2004) suggest memory is critical for developing a store of known words that are recognized instantly when seen in text. Any mechanism that could aid in memory facility could be important in this process. Likewise, an impairment of these processes could impede fluency with cascading consequences for gaining automaticity and corresponding effects on vocabulary and comprehension.

Specific links between self-efficacy and reading and writing were investigated by Shell, Murphy, and Bruning (1989). Reviewing literature connecting literacy skills to self-efficacy and outcome expectancies, these authors found relationships between self perceptions of reading ability, grade, and reading achievement. They also found an internal locus of control seemed to
be connected to students’ perceptions of reading ability and achievement; and that good and poor readers attribute successes and failures differently. Shell, et al. found that, just as the literature suggested, reading self-efficacy and achievement became ever more tightly linked through schooling levels up to and including the college level. Again, self-efficacy predicted achievement better than outcome expectancies. In other words, a student might believe she is a good reader but also believe she might not do well on a particular reading assessment. Perhaps the most interesting finding was that “reading and writing [we]re characterized by a single dimensional interrelation that [wa]s primarily influenced by reading” (Discussion section, para. 5).

**Resiliency and Self-efficacy**

Another important factor in self-efficacy and competence beliefs is resiliency. Highly efficacious students seem able to resist effects of failure that might cause others to lower self-beliefs and exert less effort as a result. Researchers believe academic success, particularly for traditionally underserved students, is often associated with interpersonal relationships. Borman and Overman (2004) reported “resilient students tend to develop much stronger and more supportive relationships with their teachers than do nonresilient students” (School model of resilience section, para. 3). Howard (2006) suggested relationships, such as mentoring, activate “positive emotional attractors” that “assists the development and maintenance of resonant relationships by activating the [mentored] individual’s upbeat socio-relational interest and energy” (Discovery #5 section, para. 1).

Ashcroft (2004) provided another example from the resiliency literature that seemed particularly relevant. Ashcroft conducted a case study of a child who was part of a larger study on the effects of using decodable text for reading practice but whose scores were not included in the
larger study because his pretest scores had been too low. At the beginning of the study, the author noted that the student would not engage during sustained reading and that he exhibited “challenging” off-task behaviors. At the end of the study, the child was asking for more time in sustained reading. The author believed this was a result of: using decodable text, which allowed the student to experience success and competence; the child’s “bonding” with the interventionist when given the chance to “use existing skills;” and of the “rapport” that was established between the interventionist and the child as the “child learn[ed] to associate the adult with many positive experiences, [i.e., the success he experienced while working with the interventionist]” (Discussion section, para. 3).

Relationships affect children’s lives. Southwick, Morgan, Vythilingam and Charney (2006) asserted that the resiliency of “at-risk children and adolescents,” can be increased by a “nonparental kin mentor.” The notion that resiliency and academic performance might be enhanced by mentors echoes Brandt’s (2001) discussion of the importance of sponsors for developing literacy skills (see also Howard, Dryden & Johnson, 1999). Borman and Overman (2004) posited that “developing into a successful student may, in itself, shield children from adversity by enhancing self-esteem, efficacy, and a sense of belonging within the school” (para. 2). The relationships between mentorship or sponsorship, resiliency, and academic performance appear to operate, as Bandura has described, as a version of “reciprocal determinism.” Also called “triadic reciprocality,” Pajares (2006) posited these relationships as interactions between behavior, personal factors, and the environment. The notion of contextuality, or how the people and situations surrounding students affect self-beliefs is a theme that runs through each of the various conceptualizations of reading motivation.
Motivation may also be linked to the individual purposes students have for reading, especially intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to read. One thing that seems immediately different about conceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is the lack of domain specificity. There is, for instance, no general discussion of intrinsic/extrinsic reading motivation or intrinsic/extrinsic math motivation although studies of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation may center on academic tasks. Lepper, Henderlong Corpus and Iyengar (2005) noted that Harter’s scales viewing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as opposites along a single dimension, continue to “provide an important complement to other measures of intrinsic motivation that assess students’ attitudes toward particular activities or content domains” (e.g., Gottfried, 1985, 1990, p.191). However, Lepper, et al. also suggested Harter’s subscales, including challenge, curiosity/interest, and independent mastery could be subscales at opposite ends of a single dimension or they could be orthogonal and related to specific activities. For instance, a third grade student could enjoy the challenge of reading a book written for middle school students, and enjoy sounding out difficult words up to a certain point, at which she might request help. Her curiosity about the book might also be enhanced by a desire to impress her peers as well as a genuine interest in the book’s content.

Another general trend, noted by Murphy and Alexander (2000) is that studies based on engagement theory (including intrinsic/extrinsic motivation) seem concentrated on elementary and middle schools students. The authors believed this may be because some motivation researchers have noted a shift from intrinsic to extrinsic motivation occurs around the middle school years and researchers are trying to “understand the motivational conditions that underlie this transitional period” (p. 32). This interest in a specific age and grade range contrasts with that of achievement motivation theory, in which studies appear “linked to the specialized domains of learning that the researchers chose” (p. 32).
In the Deci and Ryan (1985) model of intrinsic motivation, the individual is conceptualized as progressing along a continuum from lack of attention (amotivation) to ever-more-intrinsic forms of extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation. Therefore, studies that test models of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation often look for goodness-of-fit by comparing correlations between measures of the different “steps” in this progression. Murphy and Alexander (2000) have observed that, unfortunately, this polarization between self-initiated learning versus learning for rewards or external conditions has narrowed the theorizing. They suggested this has, in turn, ‘reified’ and dichotomized the construct (p. 39).

Part of a larger theory of motivation called self-determination theory (SDT), intrinsic and extrinsic motives may also be referred to as autonomous or controlled (Vansteenkist, Lens & Deci, 2006). SDT is based on the notion that individuals have an innate desire for stimulation and learning (leading to intrinsic motivation) and a basic need for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. According to Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier and Ryan (1991), “competence involves understanding how to attain various external and internal outcomes and being efficacious in performing the requisite actions; relatedness involves developing secure and satisfying connections with others in one’s social milieu; and autonomy refers to being self-initiating. . .” (p. 327). A person who satisfies any of these needs for competence, relatedness, or autonomy is motivated, but only those who acquire autonomy are self-determined rather than controlled.

According to Deci and Ryan (1985), intrinsic motivation requires no rewards or contingencies, while extrinsic motivation is related to contingencies. Extrinsic motivation has also been divided by Deci and Ryan into four types: external, introjected, identified, and integrated. Through a process of “internalization,” individuals can move along a continuum from amotivation to extrinsic motivation and eventually become intrinsically motivated (Deci, et al., 1991). Extrinsic motivators may serve to shape behavior that eventually becomes intrinsically
motivated. The extrinsic motivator furthest from intrinsic motivation is “external regulation” and is the “least self-determined form.” External regulation “refers to behavior for which the locus of initiation is external to the person, for example, the offer of a reward or the threat of a punishment” (Deci, et al., p. 329). The next extrinsic motivator, moving along the continuum from amotivation to intrinsic motivation, is introjected motivation, which “involves internalized rules or demands that pressure one to behave and are buttressed with threatened sanctions (e.g., guilt) or promised rewards (e.g., self-aggrandizement)” (p. 329). Identified regulation “occurs when the person has come to value the behavior and has identified with and accepted the regulatory process” (p. 329). There is a greater degree of willingness in identified regulation, and the individual acts for her/his own reasons without external inducements. Integrated regulation “is fully integrated with the individual’s coherent sense of self; that is, the identifications are reciprocally assimilated with the individual’s other values, needs, and identities” (p. 330). Integrated regulation is self-determined, although often not autonomous (p. 330). It is important to note though that in later conceptions, “SDT does not imply that people must invariantly move through each type of regulation for a particular behavior. . .[but can] at any time, fully internalize a regulation that had been only partially internalized” (Vansteenkist, Lens & Deci, 2006, p. 21).

Obviously, the effects of external events are essential to this notion of extrinsic motivation and there are some interesting connections between sociological studies of pedagogy for underserved students and early findings on this process of internalization. Deci, et al. (1991) reported that some early researchers (Zuckerman, Proac, Lathin, Smith, & Deci, 1978) found college students given choices about what to do and how much time to spend were more intrinsically motivated. Deci, et al. said similar findings had been reported for children and their own work showed “that highlighting choice rather than using a controlling style contributed to subjects’ internalizing the regulation of an uninteresting activity” (p. 336).
Former students of Basil Bernstein\(^5\) have reported something similar from inside classrooms. Bernstein was a sociologist and linguist. Sadovnik (1995), in his introduction to *Knowledge and Pedagogy: The Sociology of Basil Bernstein*, explained several important terms that will help develop this connection. Citing Bernstein (1971, 1973), Sadovnik said pedagogy ‘defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of the knowledge on the part of the taught’ (p. 9). Pedagogic practice entails “rules of hierarchy, rules of sequencing and pacing, and rules of criteria” (p. 12), whereas “code has to do with the way messages in curriculum and pedagogy are regulated” (p. 9). “The primary emphasis of his [Bernstein’s] analysis is on how the rules of pedagogical practice define th[e] relationship [between transmitters and acquirers] and how these interactional processes reflect essential social-class assumptions….” (p. 12).

Bernstein’s former graduate students, particularly Morais and Neves (2001), now of Portugal, found that many underserved students achieved better academically with what the researchers called a “weak frame” or more student control over pacing and sequencing, along with a “strong frame” for evaluation—in other words criteria that are clear and explicit. The studies on internalization suggest this could be related to a process that helps students acquire

---

\(^5\) Bernstein is often discounted as a *deficit theorist* (see for example, Dittmar, 1977). Bernstein (1996) himself said “the theory…[in the 1970s] was considered, in [Bernstein’s] opinion wrongly, as wholly a deficit theory and codes were trivialized and confused with dialect” (p. 92). This, according to Bernstein, was the result of misunderstandings between disciplines, and on the part of some who knew only the accounts given in individual papers rather than the overall work that was being attempted at the Sociological Research Unit and the shape that Bernstein’s developing theory was taking. The theory, evolving as it did from empirical research, included ongoing work concerning codes, which was “transformed into a more general account of the social structuring of pedagogic discourse and the shaping of its various practices as relays of a society’s distribution of power and principles of control” (p. 92). Arnold Danzig explained that Bernstein was not trying to compare social classes but to uncover the ways class might be transmitted through language. Brian Davies (2001) reported that in the seventies “there was a scary persistence to the criticism from a Right that accused Bernstein of romanticizing ‘the working class’ and its language and a Left that saw him as confirming its deficit and underplaying class in power relations” (p. 3).
greater intrinsic motivation.\footnote{Another possibility is, as Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons (1992) found, that students with high self-efficacy for academic achievement and high self-regulatory efficacy also expected success and would set, then meet, higher goals. It does seem reasonable that students exposed to more control over pacing and sequencing would have more opportunity to develop self-regulatory efficacy, and with clear evaluation standards, might be better able to set and attain higher academic goals.} It also corresponds with an explanation by Vansteenkiste, et al. (2006) of “autonomy-supportive versus controlling social environments.” The authors explained that “according to SDT, the more autonomy-supportive the social context the more it maintains or enhances intrinsic motivation” (p. 22). When teachers make all the decisions about pacing and sequencing, they create a more controlling environment and, according to Vansteenkiste, et al., students in such environments will “tend to show impoverished and fragmented forms of internalization and . . . [will] fail to find interest in [activities]” (p. 22).

Student control over pacing and sequencing may be different though than giving students choices over task assignments or choices about whether or not to do a task. Interestingly enough, Reeve, Nix, and Hamm (2003) found that “perceived choice” was not indicative of self-determination and did not promote greater intrinsic motivation. Reeve, et al. tested models that included three qualities of self-determination: locus of causality, volition—“how free versus forced people feel while doing what they want to do”—(p. 376), and perceived choice. Causality could be located either in the individual or in the environment. They wanted to know whether people “experience these qualities as overlapping, or as independent, or even as epiphenomenal” (p. 377). What they found was that when teachers provided “teacher-determined options” (p. 388), study participants did undergo increased perceptions of choice, but this did not translate into increased intrinsic motivation. Reeve, et al. believed past studies have confounded volition, locus of control, and perceptions of choice and they concluded that “in practice, the provision for choice is best considered as one contributing element within a larger autonomy-supportive
manipulation, relationship, motivating style, or classroom climate (e.g., Reeve et al., 1999)” (p. 389).

Reeve, et al. (2003) also conceived self-determination as a state rather than a trait, meaning intrinsic motivation might change in different situations. Harter and Jackson (1992), targeting math, social studies, English, and science, concluded that some students showed intrinsic motivation in some subjects but extrinsic motivation in others; other students were either intrinsically or extrinsically motivated in all school subjects. So, for some, motivational orientation was a variable state and for others it was more trait-like. A remaining question was whether there were age differences in intrinsic/extrinsic motivational orientations.

Lepper, Henderlong Corpus and Iyengar (2005) used a large (797) sample of third-through eighth-grade students from primarily Asian American and European American groups to explore differences in intrinsic motivation among students in different grades. Lepper, et al. wondered if “Harter’s (1991) finding of decreasing intrinsic motivation across grade levels [would] still emerge when intrinsic motivation was measured independently of, rather than in opposition to extrinsic motivation” (p. 189). They found that intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation “can and do coexist,” and in their study “these two orientations proved only moderately correlated, suggesting that they represent two somewhat orthogonal dimensions of motivation rather than simply opposite ends of a single dimension” (p. 190). Also, intrinsic motivation correlated positively with GPA and standardized test scores in all six grades and extrinsic motivation negatively with GPA and standardized test scores in all but the third grade with no differences by ethnicity or sex. Lepper, et al. concurred with Harter’s finding of a “continuous developmental decrease in intrinsic motivation from third through ninth grades” but also found that “extrinsic motivation changed very little across the grade levels” (p. 192). They also found older students became more “work avoidant.” Lepper, et al. pointed out another
important consideration. While grades are generally considered extrinsic motivators, they may also “provide useful information about competence and mastery, and desiring this sort of feedback may reflect an intrinsic interest in the material or activity rather than an extrinsic motivation” (p. 191).

Extrinsic motivation may also involve rewards, particularly the externally regulated type, which, according to the original Deci and Ryan conception, was just one step above amotivation on the continuum moving toward intrinsic motivation. This means rewards should be non-intrinsically motivating. Generally, according to cognitive evaluation theory, rewards negatively affect intrinsic motivation. “Rewards that are closely tied to performance standards are said to be perceived as controlling... [and] will undermine perceptions of self-determination (autonomy), leading to a reduction in intrinsic motivation” (Cameron, Pierce, Banko and Geer, 2005, p. 642). This is unless the rewards are perceived as indications of competence instead of control. In a Canadian study by Cameron, et al., achievement-based rewards increased intrinsic motivation as measured by free time spent on the task and higher interest levels for the task, with the mediators being perceptions of competence and internal attributions.

Overall, self-determination theory is concerned with students’ need for competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Deci, et al., 1991). I discussed earlier the importance of a significant adult in the lives of children who show resiliency in the face of difficult environments. It was important in the present study to see how a school that claims to value students’ culture and language might contribute to students’ sense of autonomy, relatedness, and competence and how those qualities might affect self-reported reading motivation. Also, Lepper, et al. (2005) found Asian American and European American students view pressure from parents and teachers differently. Asian American students do not view pressure from parents and teachers as a loss of
autonomy. These cross-cultural differences are important to understand, especially in places with large numbers of ethnically diverse students.

**Social Purposes of Reading**

Ethnic diversity means the context for learning and motivation may be different for different students. Sometimes, motivation researchers focus on “person-process” interactions (e.g., Bandura, 1989; Reeve, Nix & Hamm, 2003), but many add the student’s social context (e.g., Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Fontaine, 1991; Wentzel, 1989). Drawing again on the Baker and Wigfield study (1999) and looking at the categories used to construct the MRQ, the third category seeks information about the social purposes of reading, or what Fontaine (1991) called the “person-process-context” paradigm (p. 465).

Wentzel (1989, 1991) made a strong case for the connection between students’ social environments (home and school) and their academic motivation and achievement. Wentzel (1989) conducted two studies with high school students exploring relationships between GPAs and SAT scores to the students’ reports of social responsibility goals and found that “motivation to achieve socially prescribed as well as cognitive outcomes is potentially relevant for explaining academic performance in the classroom” (p. 139). Students with high GPAs reported being dependable and responsible while those with average and low GPAs were dedicated to having friends and fun. Surprisingly, the high SAT achievers were less likely to report a desire for social approval and said they did not always try to do their best in school. Wentzel offered the explanation that the SAT may draw on “task-intrinsic” factors, whereas GPAs are more affected by “classroom motivational factors” (p. 140). This study was also important because it showed girls and boys pursuing “social and academic goals with equal frequency” (p. 140).
In 1991, Wentzel studied middle school students and found socially responsive behavior led to social competence and helped predict achievement. Socially responsive behavior included sharing, cooperating, helping others, not starting fights or breaking rules, and doing other things schools say students are supposed to do. The relationships were complicated but there was a positive correlation between social responsibility and achievement, even after controlling for differences in IQ. Wentzel suggested this could mean social responsibility is valued and rewarded in classrooms, that classrooms influence levels of social responsibility, or that students who experience repeated failures reject class norms and become socially irresponsible. A similar process could occur for reading development. Students may interact in home or school environments where reading is valued and rewarded, in environments where reading is valued in one place but not the other, or their own lack of reading skills could cause them to reject reading no matter the value placed on it by others. Students could also be good at reading, know it is valued, but just not enjoy it or reject it in favor of other options.

In an excellent overview, Wentzel (1999) provided a summary of research showing links between socialization and achievement, and some of this work coincides with the work on resiliency. In short, Wentzel said students’ interactions at home with parents and other community members, and at school with teachers and peers, influenced their motivation and achievement. Wentzel added, and this is important to the present study, that “noncompliance with the majority culture’s institutional norms and standards for achievement can lead to acceptance within the minority community but social rejection and academic failure at school” (p. 91). As I noted above in the section on Ogbo’s work, students from involuntary minorities may be conflicted about accepting school values and goals that may be incongruent with those in their home or community. They may also view the racism and discrimination they see in the larger
community as a signal their efforts in school will not be rewarded and adjust their school efforts accordingly.

Returning now to the person-process-context paradigm, Fontaine’s (1991) study noted that different students may have different social purposes for reading but for the Portuguese sixth-graders she studied, social contexts changed the relationships between anxiety, conformity, success expectations and general achievement motivation. Specifically, the value of school achievement and social stereotyping was different for students from urban versus rural areas and for students from low socioeconomic groups (SES) as compared to higher SES students. In urban areas, students were more anxious but this higher anxiety did not diminish performance. As important as social pressures may be, however, students still exhibited personal agency and many rejected social values leading to instances where inclusion in the group did not predict motivation. For instance, Fontaine reported, “when the social group does not place a high value on school success, the high achievement motivation at school corresponds to a personal option clearly separated from social values” (p. 465). A student in this environment who chooses to achieve will show low conformity. Low SES rural students who did well in school fit this pattern. In this case, “the low conformity of highly motivated individuals results in active involvement in a field that is undervalued [achieving in school]” (p. 465). In this study low conformity was also associated with high achievement in the high SES urban students, but for entirely different reasons. In that group success could be achieved without school achievement, so doing well in school was not required and expending the effort placed students outside the norm. The study is an excellent reminder of the personal and contextual nature of motivation. The study’s results show social context is influential but does not necessarily determine individual motivation. The results also demonstrate why educational leaders and policymakers need to remember that
individual students matter even when considering social/structural or instructional changes that appear appropriate for whole groups.

As Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, and Mazzoni (1996) explained, “highly motivated readers are self-determining and generate their own reading opportunities. They want to read and choose to read for a wide range of personal reasons, such as curiosity, involvement, social interchange, and emotional satisfaction” (p. 518). Guthrie (1996) also discussed how individually engaged students read for their own purposes (which may vary), read often, and are involved and curious rather than simply compliant in the classroom. However, even though it is important for educational leaders and policymakers to take individuals into account, it would be a mistake to think that every reader is an island unto herself. Guthrie’s discussion of classroom environments that promote reading engagement makes it clear that the social processes that surround students can have an important impact on why students read. Guthrie and Cox (2001) have developed an instructional strategy called Concept–Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) that is organized around “culturally significant, generative concepts” (Guthrie, 1996, p. 437). Obviously, these researchers understand how pedagogy and what happens in classrooms can affect the way individuals orient to reading activities, which can then affect individual reading motivation.

Educators and policymakers understand that what teachers do in classrooms is important. However, as noted earlier, where reading is concerned the focus is often on reading instruction itself rather than how it affects students’ motivation to read. Often unacknowledged, reading instruction practices may also have important effects on motivation. The very act of learning to read has been shown to affect reading motivation. Mazzoni, Gambrell and Korkeamaki (1999) found that among first and second grade students in the U.S. and Finland, reading motivation increased in first grade (even though U.S. children generally begin first grade at age six and in Finland at age seven) but there was no increase in motivation for second graders. The authors
suggested that “learning to read during the first year of school, in itself, may be a powerful
motivator” (p. 247). The correlation to this finding may be that not learning to read in that first
year can also be quite de-motivating. Again though, social contexts and purposes for reading
would need to be considered. Students in the Mazzoni, et al. study were from moderately to
highly affluent families, which may have placed a very high value on learning to read.

Oldfather (1996) reported on two participant observation studies she did in 1991 and
1993 that showed an interesting interaction between the classroom environment and student’s
social purposes for reading. Studying fifth and sixth grade students, Oldfather was interested in
classroom practices that encouraged what she called a “continuing impulse to learn” (CIL) or
what others might call intrinsic motivation. She found CIL “was linked most often to [student
activities] involving self-expression”. . .[and] “when students were engaged in self-expression as
part of their literacy activities, they experienced an emancipatory and direct connection between
literacy learning and their own lives, identities, values, and ways of thinking” (p. 97). Oldfather
called this a “deeply responsive classroom” and suggested it provided an important social context
that connected classroom activities with students’ personal responses and interpretations and,
therefore, increased student motivation.

Some students may be motivated by self-expression, but Gambrell and Morrow (1996)
also stressed the role of collaboration in reading motivation. They said, “many reading studies…
have found that collaboration promotes achievement, higher level cognition, and intrinsic
motivation” (p. 118). Gambrell and Morrow drew on Vygotsky’s ideas of culturally-mediated
learning to explain why the studies they reported indicated that “challenge,” “choice,” and “social
collaboration” increased reader motivation in elementary school children.

Social purposes for reading are fluid, derived from individual interests and needs but also
affected by the social and cultural context that surrounds the student. Expectancy-value theory
attempts to tie many of these elements, including competence and efficacy beliefs, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and purposes for reading together into a coherent whole. The next section discusses this theory explicitly.

**Modern Expectancy-Value Theory**

Weiner (1980) identified Kurt Lewin, the famous Gestalt theorist, as a leader in the transition from mechanistic, drive theories of motivation, such as those advocated by Freud and Hull, to the “cognitive, expectancy-value framework advocated by Kurt Lewin, John Atkinson, and Julian Rotter” (p. 141). Atkinson is most often cited by modern expectancy-value theorists (e.g., Eccles & Wigfield, 2002) as the link from past to present expectancy-value theory. Working primarily in the ‘50s, ‘60s, and ‘70s, Atkinson focused on motives, incentives, emotional anticipation, expectations, and tendencies.

Atkinson’s model was rather straightforward: expectancy x value = motivation. Beginning in the ‘80s, and drawing on Atkinson and others, Eccles (1983) presented a model of motivation that serves as the foundation for what is now known as the modern expectancy-value theory. Linking performance, persistence and choice, Eccles hypothesized expectancy as both ability beliefs (I am a good reader/football player; I am the best reader/football player, etc.) and expectancy beliefs (I think I will make the team this year; I think I could read that book). The task difficulty, personal goals, and self-beliefs were accounted for in the expectancy construct. Value was comprised of the usefulness of the activity (utility value), its importance (attainment value), the enjoyment/interest shown in the activity (intrinsic value), and cost. Attainment value was how important the person believed it was to her/him to do well on the task and utility value was related to current and future goals. Cost was the negative consequences of engaging in the task, the amount of effort to do the task and what the person would not be able to do if (s)he
chose that task over others. Eccles and Wigfield (2002) also explained that “choices are assumed to be influenced by both negative and positive task characteristics, and all choices are assumed to have costs associated with them . . . . Consequently, the relative value and probability of success of various options are key determinants of choice” (Modern expectancy-value theory section, para. 2).

Originally, ability beliefs and expectancies were distinct (Eccles, 1983). However, empirical studies showed young children did not necessarily make that distinction. In a study of 865 first-, second-, and fourth-grade, lower-middle to middle-class students in a longitudinal project in Michigan, Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, and Blumenfeld (1993) concluded the children in the study did not distinguish between ability and expectancy. In this study, the authors also concluded that “in contrast to findings with older children (Eccles and Wigfield, 1991), . . . young children do not make the distinctions among the different components of subjective task value hypothesized by Eccles et al. (1983)” (p. 839). Expectancy and value remained distinguishable, even for young students, but the fine distinctions within each construct may not be as helpful for understanding motivation as originally expected, especially in young children.

To better understand the value component, some researchers have separated task value conceptually into both close and distant future orientations. As Husman, Derryberry, Crowson, and Lomax (2003) explained, each choice a student makes may consist of two values: “the immediate value a step may have, and the value of the long-term goal. Raynor described the value that resulted from the perceived connection between a current task and a future goal as instrumentality” (p. 64).

This may seem like an unnecessary distinction. However, it has important implications for the present study since there is evidence that different cultures may perceive time and future orientations differently (Flowerday & Shaughnessy, 2005; Macduff, 2006; McInerney, 2004;
Instrumentality, according to Husman, Derryberry, Crowson, and Lomax (2003), can be further divided into endogenous and exogenous forms. Exogenous instrumentality refers to a certain task that may have utility for a future goal but is not necessarily important for that future task. Husman, et al. used the example of passing a math course for someone who wants to go to veterinary school. The class may not help the student succeed as a veterinarian but getting through the class is something that must be done on the way.

Endogenous instrumentality is when the task is directly related to the future goal. Using Husman’s example, “the same math course might have endogenous instrumentality for an engineering student” (p. 66). In a study of undergraduates in a human development course in a southeastern university, Husman, et al. found important relationships and distinctions between intrinsic orientation, endogenous instrumentality, and task value. Specifically, “endogenous instrumentality and intrinsic motivation were separate but supportive constructs. Intrinsic orientation and task value were also supportive. As [Husman, et al.] expected, task value and instrumentality were separate constructs and only weakly related” (p. 74).

Also, as mentioned earlier in the section on self-efficacy, there is a difference between efficacy expectancies and outcome expectancies. Generally, outcome expectancies are the belief that if an individual performs certain actions, certain outcomes will result. In the view of Wigfield and Eccles (1999), their model of expectancy-value is more closely aligned to Bandura’s view of expectancies, “wherein the individual is expressing a belief in what (s)he can actually accomplish” (pp. 70, 71). Also, though self-efficacy has moved in the direction of task-specificity, expectancy-value, like self-concept, appears to be more domain-specific.

Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, and Blumenfeld (1993) outlined findings on competency beliefs (expectancies) and subjective task value beliefs (value). The authors discussed how “Harter (1983) [had] proposed that children’s ability self-concepts are rather global initially, and
gradually become more differentiated” (p. 832). In other research, very young students (preschool to around second grade) have expressed general ideas about their competence whereas students beginning about the second grade view themselves as competent, or not, in specific domains. However, work by Marsh, Chapman and others (see above in section on self-concept) has demonstrated children as young as kindergarten may have domain-differentiated views of competence, particularly if researchers pay careful attention to how they phrase survey questions (as advised by Chapman and Tunmer, 1995). Eccles, et al. believed their study of first-, second-, and fourth-graders in Michigan “suggested this [domain] differentiation occurs quite early... [and more specifically, that] children’s math and reading ability self-concepts [expectancy beliefs] and subjective task value beliefs are differentiated... by the end of first grade” (p. 838). Another important finding from the Eccles, et al. (1993) study was that children’s expectancies decreased as grade increased and subjective task values declined as grade increased in some domains (reading and music) but increased at the upper grades for the sports domain. One way to maintain self-concept is to lower the value attached to a domain or activity where limited competence is perceived. It is also possible that individuals will eventually attach more value to the tasks they do well because success is a more positive experience. There were also gender differences by domain.

Recently, Eccles and Wigfield (2002) have presented an updated version of their expectancy-value model (see Chapter 3, Figure 3-2). In this model, they propose expectancies are influenced by the student’s perception of other people’s attitudes and expectations for the student, by the students’ past achievement, and by affective memories of past or expectations for future tasks. Additional influences include the students’ socializers’ behavior and beliefs, stable child characteristics, and the student’s own history of successes or failures—all situated in a cultural milieu unique to particular students. In this new conception, the authors also suggest a
further modification: that value may exert a direct influence on performance, and expectancy, controlled for past performance, may directly influence choice.

Motivation among Students from Ethnically-diverse Groups

Although there is little in the literature that pertains directly to motivation among students from American Indian groups, some work has been done. In 1995, McInerney and Swisher published results of a study they conducted with Navajo students at the Window Rock High School in Arizona. The authors surveyed 529 students, grades nine through 12, using the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) developed primarily by McInerney and based on Maehr’s Personal Investment model of motivation. Like the MRQ, the ISM posits different constructs related to motivation. In the ISM, these constructs are: Striving for Excellence, Sense of Competence, Recognition, Social Concern, Affiliation, Group Leadership, Sense of Purpose (future/school), Competition, and Task Involvement. Criterion variables were: school confidence, affect to school, intention to complete school, perceived value of school (based on a separate survey), desired occupation after leaving school (also elicited in the additional survey and then grouped by prestige of occupation), grade point average, and days absent for the enrollment period during which the survey was conducted, (Results section, para. 3). The authors concluded affiliation and competition did not predict motivation or achievement (Discussion section, para. 5). This was in spite of reports by others that cooperation and group affiliation is critical for American Indian and Alaska Native students (see for instance, Pewewardy, 2002). Likewise, and again in spite of contradictory reports, “competitiveness [wa]s not significantly related to any of the criterion variables” (Discussion section, para. 5). Interesting, too, was the finding that children who reported intending to finish school did not have a strong need for recognition. On
the other hand, McInerney and Swisher also reported findings that align with much that has been reported on the learning styles and preferences of American Indian students or on motivation generally, including:

(1) Navajo children who strive for excellence in their schoolwork are more confident, like school more, and spend less days absent from school;

(2) group leadership is significantly related to school confidence and desired occupation;

(3) social concern … related to intention to complete schooling, with those expressing strong social concern being more likely to have the intention to complete schooling;

(4) strong evidence that sense of competence is a major determinant of the Navajo student’s school confidence, affect to school, desired occupation after leaving school and absenteeism;”

(5) sense of purpose for the future was significantly related to perceived value of school and the intention to complete schooling (Discussion section, paras. 8-12).

In a discussion of future time perspective (FTP), McInerney (2004) summarized the work reported above as well as additional studies in which he was involved that explored the motivation and achievement of Anglo American and Indigenous students in the U.S. and Australia. McInerney said, in general,

Anglo American students more clearly articulated their future goals than did students from Native American backgrounds. Native American students indicated that the reason they were at school was that ‘they had to or they would be punished’ or ‘they had to, to get their per capita.’ Native American students, in particular, needed help in clarifying their ‘world view.’ Although many Native American students gave an initial impression of not caring about education and the future, that impression was really the result of weak
verbal fluency. Through careful probing of ideas, I was able to uncover in many individuals a wealth of beliefs and values about the present and future that were not being articulated. (p. 148)

Future time perspective is important since it can motivate students by giving them a sense of purpose in school. This sense of purpose may be articulated by students as “I want a good job,” “I want to go to college,” etc. As discussed earlier, FTP may also be “undermined by the belief that schooling is, in reality, irrelevant to improving present and future life chances because of entrenched sociopolitical forces” (McInerney, p. 149). In a 2005 interview with Flowerday and Shaughnessy, McInerney was asked to summarize his research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning (p. 91). He said recent literature posits that Anglos are “competitive, individualistic, and future goal-oriented, whereas the Navajo and the Aboriginal . . . are collectivistic, socially oriented, and nonfuture oriented” (p. 91). However, said McInerney, “I found that children across cultures value the same things. Mastery, effort, sense of purpose, and future orientation are highly salient cross-culturally, whereas competition, social power, and extrinsic rewards are not endorsed by any of the groups” (p. 92). McInerney concluded that what many consider to be “indigenous values” are actually “basic human values” (p. 92). This may be true; however, McInerney was comparing indigenous students to non-indigenous students within the same schools or areas of the U.S. and Australia. He might not be considering the possibility that the non-indigenous students may have been influenced by indigenous values in these areas and thus may not accurately represent the larger non-indigenous population.

Also, as Phalet, Andriessen, and Lens (2004) explained, many “minority children start their school career with an initial disadvantage and hence must work harder and persist more to catch up with their native [non-immigrant] classmates” (p. 62). This means a future orientation might be particularly important to students from minority groups. Phalet, et al. also found
parents’ aspirations for their children had a powerful effect on achievement. Phalet, et al. explained FTP as consisting of both cognitive and dynamic aspects. The cognitive aspect is comprised of instrumentality, or the value of a present task goal for achieving future goals. The dynamic aspect included the incentive value of future goals. For students who are positive about their futures and have long FTP, instrumentality can play an important role in motivation. In particular, Phalet, et al. asserted “future goals may help students to overcome momentary failures. . . . [and] in minority students’ school careers, a focus on future goals seems all the more important as a powerful protective factor against more frequent school failure and dropout” (p. 82).

In a study of American Indian students from a reservation near Phoenix, Arizona, who attended school in a nearby border town with a predominantly white and Hispanic student population, Radda, Iwamoto, and Patrick (1998) used the methodology from the McInerney and Swisher (1995) study reported above to survey over a thousand students, grades five through twelve and reported specific findings from the 81 American Indian students within that larger population. As in the McInerney and Swisher study, striving for excellence (task effort) positively predicted achievement. Sense of purpose and sense of competence were also, as in the earlier study, strong predictors of achievement; and also like the earlier study, social concern was linked to intent to complete high school. However, unlike the earlier study, Radda et al. reported group leadership (power) was not related to any of the predictor variables. Also, while students in the Radda, et al. study responded positively to the affiliation statements, affiliation was not a strong achievement predictor. Additionally, recognition negatively predicted academic achievement, whereas in the earlier study the only link was with children who reported intending to finish school and who also seemed to have little need for recognition. In the Radda, et al. study, “token rewards did predict GPA but not intent to graduate high school” (Discussion section,
paras. 3-13). The differences in these findings in studies conducted in a generally similar part of the country, suggest American Indian student motivation is situational and may vary significantly from one school site to another, particularly when American Indian students are a minority within the larger school setting. It also suggests that the context or “milieu” as Eccles termed it is important to understand when studying student motivation among American Indian students.

**Motivation and Gender**

Baker and Wigfield (1999) found there were significant differences between boys and girls on all the subscales except *Work Avoidance* and *Competition*, with girls posting the higher means. Other researchers have also noted gender differences. Like Baker and Wigfield, Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) found gender differences favoring girls on *Self-efficacy* and *Importance* subscales. Differences in reading interests by gender have been noted as early as 1916 (Bell & Sweet) and again in 1941 (Thorndike), with a recent study by Marinak and Gambrell (2010) showing third grade girls of average reading ability from low to middle class Caucasian, African American, and Asian backgrounds were more motivated to read than their male peers and valued reading more with no real differences between girls and boys in terms of reading self-concepts. This mirrored Durik’s, Vida’s, and Eccles’ (2006) finding that 4th and 10th grade girls valued reading more than boys and also followed an earlier longitudinal finding by Wigfield, Eccles, Kwang Suk Yoon, Harold, Arbreton, Freedman-Doan, and Blumenfeld (1997) showing white, lower to middle class girls in 3rd, 4th, and 6th grades found reading more useful than male counterparts. Wigfield, et.al, however, differed from the Marinak and Gambrell study in that girls in the Wigfield study felt more competent as readers than male peers. Likewise, Kaminski, Shafer, Neumann, and Ramos (2005) found that 6th grade Mexican American girls had a higher
reading self-concept than boys. Earlier, Lummis and Stevenson (1990), in a cross-cultural study of Taiwan, Japan, and the U.S, found that among 1st and 5th grade students, those who believed there were gender differences in reading ability were more likely to say girls were the better readers. Others (Kush & Watkins, 1996; McKenna, 2001) have reported girls generally have more positive attitudes about reading than boys.

Conclusion

Reading is important to students’ future success. Although educational leaders and policymakers often think first of school organization and reading instruction methods or improved social structures to support positive reading outcomes, students’ motivation to read may also contribute to reading achievement. Deficit views that link low achievement to students’ personal characteristics or to “problems” with students’ parents, or their culture and language can lead to pathologizing practices. Such practices exacerbate low performance for students from groups suffering historically from hegemonic social policies and school policies and practices. On the other hand, schools organized to elicit pride in students’ heritage may view students and their families and communities differently and this may counteract the effects of past discrimination and deficit views. Students in such schools may have different conceptions of their competence and their reasons for reading. In other words, these students may be motivated to read or not in ways that we do not yet understand.

There are a number of ways to conceptualize reading motivation. One that incorporates multiple dimensions is expectancy-value theory. In Chapter 3, I outline a study based on expectancy-value theory and a conception of persons and selves that will provide the foundation for asking students directly why they are, or are not, motivated to read.
The study was designed using mixed methods to compare quantitative results to results from other studies and correlate those results with reading achievement. The qualitative findings were intended to provide further information from students’ viewpoints, so that more useful insights might emerge.

Overview

The primary aim of this study was to explore the reading motivation of students from an underserved group—specifically, American Indians. The study was designed to discover directly from students why they chose to read and what motivated them to exert effort and show persistence in reading activities, or, conversely, why they resisted reading and failed to exert effort or persist in reading. Secondary aims were to compare these students to students in other studies using the same reading motivation instruments, and to examine possible relationships between students’ reading motivation and reading achievement.

A pragmatic, mixed methods approach was employed for several reasons. First, quantitative methods provide a general view of phenomena. Such a view is useful for broad generalizations, but qualitative methods can help explain why these general patterns exist and may be more appropriate for lower levels of abstraction and for creating “more concrete and realistic explanatory models” (Moghaddam, Walker, & Harré, 2003, p. 124). Common instruments for measuring motivation at what Moghaddam, Walker, and Harré called “higher levels of abstraction” are often insensitive to cultural difference. In some cases, instruments may
even be irrelevant when applied to diverse populations (Tashakkori, Barefoot, & Mahryar, 1989). In any case, such instruments are designed for an etic view; are often developed by cultural outsiders; and may or may not capture dimensions of phenomena that might be uncovered using a more emic or insider’s view. Since the primary aim of this study was to gain an inside view of reading motivation from the students themselves, the quantitative methods were used to compare students to those from other studies, to explore possible achievement and motivation connections, and to support the qualitative case study methods.

An explanatory mixed methods design was used as described by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007). As Greene, Caracelli and Graham (1989) noted, mixing methods “may yield ‘stories that converge’ or discrepancies that invoke fresh perspectives and new, more illuminating explanations” (p. 257). Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) presented a typology in which explanatory design was separated into either a “participant selection model” or a “follow-up explanations model.” For this study, the participant selection model was modified so that the quantitative phase not only led to participant selection but also addressed two other research questions, i.e., the relationship between reading motivation and achievement and a comparison of study results to results from previous studies. Figure 3-1, below, illustrates the study’s design, showing how the initial quantitative phase of the study led to the qualitative phase, which was the study’s emphasis.
The study was situated in a school serving American Indian students only, whose leadership claimed they viewed students’ language and culture as a resource. In the first and quantitative phase of the study, the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) was administered to 78 students in grades 3-5. Students in grades 1 and 2 (also 78) were assessed using the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS). The MRS is more appropriate for younger students as it contains only 16 items as compared to 54 on the MRQ. Students’ scores on the MRQ/MRS were then compared to their reading achievement scores and to students’ scores from previous studies using the same measures. The second, qualitative phase was conducted to explore the reading motivation of students showing high motivation and those showing low motivation on the MRQ/MRS (See sampling matrix, Table 3-3). This approach, called

7 Source. Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007, p. 73
extreme/deviant case sampling (Kemper, Stringfield, & Teddlie, 2003), seeks information from students at each end of the sampling spectrum in order to learn as much as possible from students who appear exceptional in their motivation, or lack of motivation, for reading.

**Research Questions**

School leadership practices were closely linked to the research questions for this study. Because of a tendency toward deficit thinking among many who educate American Indian students (Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005; Tharp, Lewis, Hilberg, Bird, Epaloose, et al., 1999; Valencia, 1997), a school was selected whose leaders professed a commitment to culturally relevant pedagogy and curriculum. The Saint Theresa School principal and staff, under the direction of the Torreon 8 School Board (whose members included two Pueblo community leaders) had instituted practices designed to foster student pride in their heritage language and culture. Students received daily lessons in their home language, Keres, from local native speakers hired as educational assistants, and these lessons were reinforced by strong local use of the language in the community and at the school. The curriculum for this instruction was developed and approved by a tribal language committee, which school administrators said they depended on to provide leadership for language instruction at the school. School administrators also allowed tribal leaders’ input regarding some discipline issues and said they were open to suggestions from local residents and tribal leaders about other school decisions. For instance, local veterans asked for and were given a ceremony honoring their service to country at the school on Veteran’s Day; tribal officials vetoed the idea of allowing students to attend school in costumes on Halloween; and the date for the winter school performance was changed to accommodate holiday events.

---

8 School and district names are pseudonyms to protect student identity.
scheduled in the local community. In February, the Pueblo Governor called the school principal to ask that students be dismissed early the next day to participate in a tribal event and though this was unplanned and unscheduled, the principal agreed. In addition to the Keres language program, a project developed by tribal government and staffed and led by local teachers and educational assistants, school administrators appeared anxious to cooperate with tribal leaders and community representatives.

Like other public schools in the U.S., Saint Theresa School wanted its children to become successful adults who could get and hold the jobs they wanted. However, as Tharp, Lewis, Hilberg, Bird, and Epaloose, et al. (1999) explained, “in Native American education, these goals [should be] supplemented with specific requirements that schools educate within the context of the history, values, goals, and culture of the local tribal community” (p. 6). Because Saint Theresa claimed a commitment to culturally relevant pedagogy and curriculum, students in this district would be expected to experience less exposure to the “pathologizing practices” described by Shields, Bishop, and Mazawi (2005). Pathologizing practices, also known as “deficit thinking,” result when teachers, administrators, and other school personnel blame students’ academic underperformance on the students themselves and their parents, rather than looking for explanations in the curriculum and pedagogy to which students have been subjected or the social structures which also affect students’ success in school (McLaren, 1995; Shields, et al., 2005; Valencia, 1997).

The site for the study was also chosen because the student population at this school was 100% American Indian and because 81% of 3rd graders, 50% of 4th graders and 56% of 5th graders scored “proficient” or above on the state’s high stakes reading assessment in 2007. This was important because it meant these research questions were to be asked in an environment where
American Indian students were said to be achieving at or above the rates of other students in the state.

Unfortunately, both the proficient reading scores and the commitment to cultural and linguistic diversity were misleading. Students’ scores dropped precipitously in 2008, and again in 2009. Thus, rather than a study of the reading motivation of students who were achieving well on the state’s high-stakes reading test, it became a study of students who appeared to be struggling with reading. Additionally, when I more carefully examined the school’s commitment to cultural and linguistic diversity, I found there was also an undercurrent of deficit views and practices.

This, then, was the observed context (as opposed to what the school had projected as the context) for the research questions, which, again, were:

1. What do students identified as having high or low reading motivation on the MRQ/MRS say about reading and their motivations for reading or not reading? Are there differences in their responses based on grade level or gender?
2. How do the American Indian students in this study compare to students from other ethnic groups on the MRS/MRQ? Are there differences based on grade level or gender?
3. What is the relationship between reading achievement and reading motivation for these students? Are there differences in those relationships based on grade level or gender?

Study Design

The study’s design was linked to quantitative work on reading motivation by other researchers as well as the unique insights of individuals within the community of study. Two
conceptual frameworks, one tied to quantitative dimensions, and the other to qualitative elements were used to design the study.

**Conceptual Framework**

As recommended by Maxwell (2005), in this section I provide information on how my own teaching experiences have influenced my understanding and development of the conceptual model, and discuss the framework and theory upon which the model was based.

**Personal Interest**

I am certified to teach students in kindergarten through fifth grade, all subjects, and sixth through twelfth grade in English and social studies. However, I believed I would work with middle school and high school students in English or Language Arts classes. My first teaching assignment was in a high school project for students whom administrators and teachers had labeled “at-risk” for gang involvement and academic difficulties in a large, urban comprehensive high school. One of the things I realized immediately was that many of the students in my classes were struggling because of limited decoding skills, academic English vocabulary, and reading comprehension skills. I began working to learn more about decoding, vocabulary, and comprehension instruction in order to address these students’ needs. I learned enough to eventually create a reading program for students eight to eighteen years old in the same school district for a public school in the county’s juvenile detention facility. Unfortunately, some of my students in the comprehensive high school also became my students in the detention facility. They assured me I was getting better at teaching reading, but they also taught me that motivation played a large role in how individual students reacted to various reading interventions. What I found very difficult from a personal, emotional standpoint was working with older students who
often expressed their sense of defeat where reading was concerned. I could show them ways to overcome unhelpful attitudes, but I continued to feel that subjecting students to years of reading failure is cruel and unjust and that we have a duty to do better for every child. That is much of what motivates my interest in this study.

My own culture has also contributed to my choice of design. Invited into this southwestern state over a hundred years ago by powerful white men who had grabbed land from other groups and were willing to share some in order to consolidate their power base, white homesteaders streamed into the state from other states to the north and east. My great-great grandparents came from adjoining states and settled on less than ideal parcels of land. That life required pragmatism and that trait, still valued in my culture, is reflected in this study’s design. (For a review of the pragmatic roots of mixed methods research, see Maxcy, 2003.) This historical fact is also one that may affect my relations with people of other cultures in the state and I tried to remain cognizant of this in my work and writing.

Framework for the MRQ/MRS

In the 2002 Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, Eccles and Wigfield shared the latest iteration of Eccles’ expectancy-value model of achievement (see Figure 3-2). The authors noted that, based on new evidence, the model might need to be revised slightly to “reconsider the paths from the expectancies to choice once prior achievement level is controlled, and from values to performance” (p. 120) instead of how it now stands with expectancies and values linking to both choice and performance. I share their conceptualization here because it grounds the MRQ, developed by Wigfield and Guthrie (1997), and the MRS, developed by Baker and Scher (2002) with an understanding by a leading thinker in expectancy value theory, the theory from which both measures are derived.
Figure 3-2. Eccles’ expectancy value model.⁹

One reason I particularly liked this model was Eccles’ inclusion of a “cultural milieu.” This is important because it takes into account Harré’s (1984) conception of person and self. It also includes the student’s perceptions of “socializer’s beliefs and behaviors,” a point I explored and found essential in understanding the qualitative interviews. Although empirical tests of the MRQ and MRS had not been reported for American Indian students, the measures had been field-tested and information on the reliability and validity of the instruments are included below.

As the study progressed and as I listened to students talk about why reading was important, how it was useful, who reads or does not read and why, how one becomes a good reader, and what others tell them about reading, I was struck by the number of possible influences, and also by

how singular the process was for each student. Some students integrated most of their information from their community, some from parents or grandparents, while others valued what their peers’ said and a few believed the teachers at the school knew best. This exchange moved in both directions, which is why the conceptual model presented below shows broken lines and gaps, even though, generally, the school operated within a distinct culture, surrounded by societal pressures from outside the community. Originally, I conceived this model as a series of flat fields. However, as the study continued, I realized the integration from “person” to “self” was more fluid and dynamic, as an opinion gleaned from a friend today may be replaced by a word or two from the Governor visiting a classroom tomorrow, or a grandparent next week, and so forth. Through multiple cases within a single case study, individual perceptions and multiple accounts provided patterns and anomalies that resulted in a multi-dimensional model rather than flat, linked blocks (See Figure 3-3 below). In this model, Harré’s (1984) conception of “person” is found in the circles surrounding the “self.” The self arises from what Eccles and Wigfield (2002) called the “cultural milieu” and “socializer’s beliefs” but here are simply termed the experiences and influences of society and culture, including family, peers, and school with a few variations and additions based on what I learned in the interviews. Most of the Eccles and Wigfield model is subsumed in this model within the self. The process, essentially, is this: the self considers his/her past and previous achievements and, using his/her knowledge of outcome expectancies, determines possible goals. These goals are linked to future time perspectives. The self, or student, then considers efficacy expectancies (Can I achieve this goal?) and subjective task value (Is it worth doing?). If the answer to both questions is yes, then the student makes the choice to go for it. When the going gets tough, the student must decide whether to persist and how much effort to expend. At this point, subjective task value comes into play again, along with the social
Figure 3-3. Reading motivation model.
cognitive view of efficacy. In other words, the student continues to work hard and persist if (s)he believes (s)he’s good at the task (high efficacy), that the task has high value, and is interest-sustaining.

Studying local sites is important since “case studies illustrate how students may develop a perspective on schoolwork which depends on struggles, practices, and identities ‘imported’ from other sites of cultural production” (Levinson & Holland, 1996, p. 26). Schools can “draw students into dominant projects of nationalism and capitalist labor formations, or bind them even more tightly to systems of class, gender, and race inequality” (Levinson & Holland, p. 1); but they can also be places where students develop their own ideas about how to move from “persons” to “selves,” as conceptualized and discussed above. Inequalities can become fixed and stable, and schools then reproduce the power/identity/texts that perpetuate those inequalities. Bourdieu (1984) believed this happened via the stabilization and reproduction of cultural capital. It was interesting that Levinson and Holland also discussed Ogbu, who has expressed powerful ideas about the way persistent inequalities can operate on the identities of “involuntary” minorities. However, Levinson and Holland concluded their introduction by “emphasizing the creative agency of social actors within and against schooling. Such agency demonstrates again that, despite the commonalities of mass schooling, everywhere we find local struggles around the cultural production of the educated person” (p. 30).

This brings us to the notion of culture. The simple definition of culture, provided earlier, is “a normative system, integral to which are norms, rules, and other indicators of how people should ‘behave’ in particular roles and particular places” (Moghaddam, Walker, & Harré, 2003, p. 114). Hoffman (1999) explained that “while comparative education has…been increasingly receptive to ideas of culture in the framing of its theory and research…[it] might [also] benefit from deeper engagement with ideas of culture, and [that] a more productive use of the concept
requires its de-centering from positions of reification and determinism in which it places limits on human understanding and agency” (p. 464).

The conceptual model employed in this study served also as a reminder that I bring a “context,” “culture,” and a “self” to this work, as does the reader, as did the students who participated, as well as the adults with whom they interacted at home, in school, and elsewhere.

Method

This section includes a thorough discussion of the site and study context. It also discusses data collection, including: sampling, access, consent, assent, procedures, and instruments.

The Site

Before a site was chosen, several criteria were set. First, more than 25% of students were to be American Indian. At the site chosen, all students were American Indian, from a particular southwestern tribal community. Next, at least 50% of the third through fifth grade American Indian students were to be achieving at or above “proficient” levels in reading on the state’s high stakes assessment. The final criterion was that the school showed evidence of valuing Native American culture and heritage. The site was thought to meet these criteria as well, as I have discussed above.

An elementary school was targeted because there is evidence early experiences in reading may have a profound impact on later opportunities for success (e.g., Farkas, 1996; Stanovich, 1986; Torgesen, 2004). Saint Theresa School is located only a few miles from the tribal community from which students are drawn. Most students are bused to school, but some parents
drop their children at school on the way to jobs in one of two large urban centers located north and south of the village.

Though it was not mentioned directly, I learned from spending time in the school office that there was a certain amount of transfer from this school to other public schools in the area serving other nearby tribal communities and to an all-Native American school in a nearby urban center. The principal would not say exactly how many students transferred from school to school each year, but I saw students dis-enrolling and students re-enrolling, particularly after the winter break.

With not quite 8,000 residents (U.S. Census, 2000, p. 24), Pueblo Village\textsuperscript{10} has nonetheless expanded outside its traditional boundaries. There is now a new housing district closer to the school, which is about five miles from the original Pueblo, but there is status in living at the original Pueblo. Of the population over 25 years of age, 70% have a high school degree, and 3% have a bachelor’s degree or higher (U.S. Census social, economic, and housing summary, 2000, p. 36). Only 40% of those over 16 are employed, compared to 63% in the closest non-reservation town and 65% in a nearby urban area (U.S. Census, p. 51). Per capita income in 2000 was $9,045 compared to $21,000 in the closest non-reservation town (p. 61). Median income in 2000 was $30,500, almost $20,000 less than the median income for the closest non-reservation town, which was $47,077 (p. 79). The school does not keep family income records to qualify students to receive free school lunches because the school has school-wide Title I designation, qualifying all students for free breakfasts and lunches. Because of this, and

\textsuperscript{10} Pueblo Village is used instead of the village name to preserve identity and because the community is one of a group of culturally distinct American Indian villages in the southwestern U.S. called “Pueblos” by Spanish invaders because of an architectural style that included multi-storied stone or adobe structures usually situated around an open public space, or “plaza.” Pueblo people have a unique language and culture.
because the community seemed guarded when I asked questions about socioeconomic status, I dropped my original plan to add this dimension to the analysis.

Pueblo Village is located alongside one of the few major rivers in the state and is next to a historic trade route that has been used for centuries by indigenous peoples and was an important thoroughfare for later colonizers. Pueblo Village became “one of several headquarters of the Spanish colonial mission system in the newly established province of [the state] and a significant location of Pueblo resistance against Spanish hegemony during the Pueblo Revolt and during the Re-conquest” ([state] Office of the State Historian, n. d., para. 2). In fact, historically, resistance to colonizers, Hispanic and Anglo, has been an important characteristic of this community. The Pueblo maintains and guards its traditional dances and ceremonies, some open to the public; others kept secret among Pueblo members. While many other Pueblos seem to be losing native speakers, this community prides itself on the fact that “well over 80 percent of [its] children come to school speaking their native Keresan” ([state] Office of the State Historian, n. d., para. 1). The community has shifted from an agricultural base to one where many members produce and sell jewelry, pottery and other arts and crafts for the tourist trade or work in jobs outside the Pueblo.

Hoping to eventually replace native religious practices, Catholic missionaries who accompanied Spanish conquistador Castaño de Sosa and, later, Oñate, tolerated the Pueblo’s intermixing of the new, Catholic religion, with indigenous beliefs. Pueblo leaders embraced some of the new religious ideas in return for Spanish protection against nomadic indigenous tribes of the area (Sando, 1998). This relationship grew strained however as the Spanish failed to adequately protect Pueblo communities against increased attacks by Apache, Comanche and other raiders and as the Spanish became more demanding of the tribe in terms of extracting labor and suppressing the Pueblo’s traditional religious practices (Sando, 1998). In 1680, as every elementary student in the state is trained to remember, leaders from this Pueblo and 18 others rose
in rebellion against the Spanish in what has been termed the Pueblo Revolt. Three friars were murdered in the Pueblo mission and 21 friars were killed in other Pueblo communities, along with 400 Spanish colonists ([state] Office of the State Historian, n. d.). The Spanish were successfully expelled for more than ten years. When they returned, they took revenge on many of the rebel leaders, a fact that still reverberates in relations between those of Hispanic and American Indian descent.\(^\text{11}\)

In the 1800s, colonization by Anglo entrepreneurs and settlers began. First, speculators and cattle ranchers acquired land and resources, and settlers soon followed. When the railroad arrived in the state in the 1880s, Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad officials discovered its customers were interested in buying arts and crafts from Pueblo artisans (Sando, 1998). By the 1920s, Pueblo Village was a regular stop along the route and was touted as the closest stop to “Indian Country” ([state] Office of the State Historian, n. d.).

Colonization of the territory by both Hispanic and Anglo populations shows some similar patterns. In both cases, the acquisition of land and wealth propelled the first explorers. These speculators took what they could and, then, wishing to consolidate their power by increasing their numbers, they gave some of their vast land acquisitions to settlers who could expand their base and help them counter local resistance.

Members of this Pueblo community accommodated and resisted both groups of colonizers. Though they adopted many Spanish religious customs, the Pueblo still maintains native tribal celebrations and customs and I also noticed continued blending of Spanish and

\(^{11}\) For example, the following is an excerpt from a 2002 newspaper article that discussed the proposal of a statue commemorating Spanish conquistador, Oñate: . . . there are always two sides to history. Indian people throughout [two southwestern states] revile Oñate for an incident in 1599 when, according to most scholars, he terrorized the rebellious [Pueblo] tribe by cutting off the right feet of dozens of young warriors. Though evidence of the account is sketchy, historians generally accept that Oñate ordered the brutal punishment and that his orders were probably carried out. In the wake of growing protests over the Oñate monument, at least two El Paso City Council members have rescinded their support for the project, though one has said he may reconsider (Thompson, 2002).
Native practices. For instance, it is traditional in this state for priests to bless parishioners by rubbing ashes on their foreheads on Ash Wednesday. Students wear the ashes throughout that day. I noticed early on that many of the younger students came to school with a single ash dot on their foreheads. Asking local residents what this meant, I was told it was a blessing by parents and a way to protect their children while they were away at school.

Sitting in the school’s office, I saw parents who came to pick up students, some of whom were wearing traditional hairstyles and clothing and others dressed in the latest, most contemporary styles. While most of the teachers and instructional aides at the school wore more contemporary clothing, skirts were usually longer, attire was modest, and most also maintained traditionally long hair. The school secretaries were as likely to speak Keres as English when conducting school business on the phone or in person.

The secretaries also unabashedly decorated the office with a Christmas tree, gifts, and other seasonal accents. Classrooms were full of Christian holiday decorations, yet the “Christmas program” was also scheduled to accommodate certain activities in the local community, some of which were Christian and some which celebrated more traditional Native beliefs. According to the state historian, “other Pueblos look to the people of [this community] for inspiration and guidance because of their ability to adapt to the outside while still sustaining their traditions” (para. 15).

One tradition I stumbled upon during an interview with an adult from the school was that of the Rivermen. This is one example of how the tribe motivates young children to behave. Like the bogey man in some Anglo cultures or La Llorona for Hispanic children, Rivermen are designed to keep behavior in line with certain cultural expectations. However, unlike the mythical figures in other cultures, Rivermen are real people who threaten in a very real way. During a particular ceremony, Pueblo Village men dress in long black coats, with masks, and
whips. If word comes to village leaders that a particular child has been behaving inappropriately, the Rivermen will target that child during the ceremony and drag him/her towards the river. A relative is required to ransom the child with chips, food, or other tokens to vouchsafe that the child has learned his/her lesson and will behave in the future. It is, apparently, very effective for younger students. Though I had heard about the Rivermen from another source, an Anglo teacher also knew about them and shared her information with me without being asked. I asked a few of the other Anglo teachers who had been at the school for a long time if they had ever heard of Rivermen, without divulging or explaining what I knew, and they appeared unaware. I did not discuss the Rivermen with other teachers from the community because I knew the tribe generally guards such information closely.

Not only does the tribe guard traditions closely, in meeting with the newly elected tribal governor and lieutenant governor to share results from the quantitative measures, I learned the tribe would also like to gain control of the local public school. One possibility would be to establish a charter school. Although the principal in charge during the study tried to accommodate tribal leaders’ requests, community members believed district administrators gave the school short shrift. They expressed frustration over what they perceived as inadequate facilities, and one informant told me during an informal conversation that their school got the “teachers the district wanted to get rid of” (personal communication, educational assistant related to tribal official, February, 2009). This sentiment was repeated by at least one teacher from the local community and by a tribal leader.

In fact, the school gym had to be refurbished when a worker fell partway through the ceiling during summer roof repairs. This required closing the gym for the first three months of school. The community pressured the school board for a new gym, but district officials claimed the district could not afford one. Having been in many schools in the state, and knowing most are
inadequate structures compared to those in other states, the school structures seemed fairly typical to me. I was more concerned about how unclean the school was, particularly the bathrooms. This, I learned, had more to do with management of the custodial staff than with district negligence. It also seemed to me more attention might be paid to landscaping and drainage issues. In essence, there was no landscaping at the school. There was a soccer field with one bleacher, a kindergarten swing set/play area, and another jungle gym, climbing wall and swing set for the older students. When it rained, there were many large mud puddles that had to be avoided, or not, by students, and some playground areas became virtually inaccessible. Fortunately, it did not rain often, but there was also almost no shade for the many days of sunshine.

In terms of teaching staff, my observations and subsequent teacher member checks indicated that there probably was a basis for dissatisfaction with the quality of teachers at the school. This is not to say there were not some excellent teachers. Several were among the best and brightest I have ever encountered. However, of 13 first through fifth grade teachers, three were first-year teachers, two had serious health problems (one of whom discussed retiring), and two others were planning to retire either that year or the next. Not among this list were two teachers whose interactions with students concerned me, only one of whom was being monitored by an administrator.

Another problem was the lack of cultural relevance and opportunities for expanded perspectives provided by the books, including the textbooks, available to students. I spent at least four full days in the library. I helped a parent with the book fair, substituted twice for the librarian, shelved books on several occasions, and spent most of the day in the library while working with a student assigned to me for in-school-suspension. What I observed there was a fairly outdated collection (typical in many of the state’s schools), with large sections rarely
touched by students and not nearly enough books about art, drawing, and humor to satisfy demand. The Native American section seemed to be missing historical works written by Native American authors, as well as examples of contemporary themes of and by Native Americans.

The adopted reading series was Houghton Mifflin. Like other publishers, Houghton Mifflin claims to provide a multicultural selection. Much could and has been said about the appropriateness of those choices, but equally disturbing to me was the lack of stimulating chapter books for older students. Substituting in a fourth grade classroom, I tried to find an interesting book to read aloud after lunch. I wound up telling students a story because there was nothing I thought would interest fourth graders. The social studies lesson for the day involved a reading that could have come from my own fourth grade textbook, one in which the “Pilgrims” were counting on the “Indians” (no tribal identification) for sustenance in the form of corn and fish.

From what I could observe, the cultural relevance of the curriculum depended upon how teachers enacted lessons from materials that generally lacked a Native American perspective.

**Context**

Except for 14 teachers, the counselor, the reading specialist, and the administrators, the entire staff (of approximately 51, including cooks, custodians, and instructional assistants) was comprised of local community members. As a result, most of the informal conversations around the school were conducted in Keres. Thus, students were immersed in Keres—which virtually all considered their first language)—outside their classrooms and received 30 minutes of daily, formal Keres language instruction. All the students I observed understood Keres, though some seemed reluctant to respond to adults in Keres. I was told by a teacher from the local area that some of the younger students were losing their Keres language skills and that they were shy to
speak because they did not speak Keres well. I did, however, note some those same students speaking Keres to each other on the playground and the middle school students seemed to have adequate Keres conversational skills, speaking often and easily to each other, and to teachers and staff members in Keres. Keres was also used frequently by students to carry on conversations with other students that Hispanic and Anglo teachers could not understand. This was done sometimes without thinking, sometimes for improved communication, and other times it appeared designed to exclude others or as a subtle way to show disrespect.

I have been told by friends from other Pueblo communities that this particular Pueblo is one of the most, if not the most, conservative in the state. This common knowledge was corroborated by the state historian. Even knowing this though, I was surprised to learn that people who were not members of the community were not allowed to remain in the pueblo after dark and were monitored closely while on site. I learned this directly from a teacher at the school when I tried to obtain housing for the school year in order to conduct the study. The community was isolated and unique and data from the last three years of standards based assessments suggested students were achieving reading proficiency on the state’s high stakes tests within this unique setting.

Surprisingly however, during and after data for this study was collected, new information became available regarding Saint Theresa’s performance on the state’s standards based assessments. The percentage of proficient readers had dropped precipitously. Had this study been initiated a year later, Saint Theresa would not have met the study criteria, since percentages of students scoring at or above “proficient” levels dropped dramatically in the 2007 to 2008 school year and the next year showed another substantial decrease as seen in Table 3-1 below.
Table 3-1

Percentage of students scoring proficient or above on state’s high-stakes reading assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n/a = only 9 male students were tested and this was considered too few to disaggregate.

Note. There were a number of possible explanations for this decline. The school district’s personnel director told me, in an informal conversation just after the district received their 2008-2009 SBA scores, that he believed this was a direct result of inadequate school leadership. The principal and assistant principal both resigned at the end of the 2008-2009 school-year, before SBA scores were available. Both cited personal reasons for leaving, one moving to a school district closer to her home and the other moving out of state for family reasons. By then, I was working as a reading coach at the district’s high school, so I continued to attend school board meetings and gather information about Saint Theresa. Once the scores were released, local newspapers reported the plummet, and coincidentally, the state’s legislative finance committee randomly chose the district as one of five mid-sized school districts to evaluate regarding “the use of funding and cost-effectiveness of resource allocation decisions and the success of district efforts to improve student academic performance” (Patel, letter to the District School Board, attached to the Report to the Legislative Finance Committee, 2009).

A new principal was hired (Hispanic, female) as well as a new assistant principal (Native American, female). The school also had a new reading specialist (white, female). The new
assistant principal resigned in December and the new principal was removed mid-year as well. The superintendent sent the District’s Director of Secondary Education (Hispanic, male) and the Human Resources Director (white, male) to fill the positions. The district’s school improvement coordinator (white, female) also became very involved at the school and the fifth grade male teacher whose classroom had been so rancorous was terminated and barred from the school premises, leaving a permanent substitute teacher in his place. Two of the first-year teachers from fourth and fifth grade continued at the school. At mid-year, in the year after the study, the school appeared to be in leadership turmoil with some limited improvement in teaching staff resulting from the upheaval. Leadership appeared to improve after the district took over at mid-year.

Although there were many factors that may have contributed to the steep decline in SBA reading scores over the past two years, changes in testing accommodations may have contributed to the drop. A former school employee explained to me how, in earlier years, many students had received testing accommodations, which meant instructional assistants could translate the questions and possible answers into Keres for students. They could not translate the reading passages, but with administrators unable to speak or understand Keres and large numbers of students receiving help, it was a difficult situation to monitor. The principal in charge when the study was conducted aligned accommodation procedures with public education department regulations. Student’s scores dropped dramatically in that testing cycle. Unfortunately, neither the testing administrator at the school nor the state public education department would provide the number of students accommodated in the different years even though I submitted a formal request for public information to the state. A state attorney sent a letter stating the information was not and would not become available.

Looking at Table 3-1, the 2004-2005 third grade cohort suggested a possibly typical, though abnormally steep, fourth-grade decline for girls, but not boys, provoking a number of
interesting questions. Some “fourth-grade slump” would not be a huge surprise as this is when students in this curriculum transitioned to greater expectations for content-based reading comprehension. There appeared to be some changes in their reading motivation at this age too. But why then did the boys remain constant across these two years? The 2005-2006 third-grade male cohort showed a “fourth-grade slump,” but the 2005-2006 third-grade female cohort dropped sharply from third to fourth grade and, again, from fourth to fifth grade, suggesting something else at work. This happened to the 2006-2007 third-grade female cohort too, but there were not enough boys tested in 2008-2009 to check the third-grade male cohort across all three years. So, while overall scores had been holding together in some ways, despite changes in principals, girls’ scores should have attracted the attention of the district’s and state’s educational leaders when the girls who tested as third-graders in 2005-2006 continued to decline in subsequent years. These odd patterns were certainly notable. Unfortunately, neither scores nor unusual patterns were a public topic at the school during the time I was there.

I would suggest the problems were multi-faceted, stemming not just from the lack of attention to data by school leaders at the helm in 2008-2009. The district appeared to be satisfied with scores until the 2008-2009 year scores were reported, or if dissatisfied, had not pressured the principals to establish a culture at the school that took interest in understanding student data and using it to adjust curriculum. In fact, the Report to the Legislative Finance Committee (2009) about the district cited a “lack of attention to data driven decision-making” as contributing to student achievement declines (p. 35).

Third grade girls posted a shockingly low SBA reading performance in 2008-2009, but that problem likely started three or more years earlier. What measures were in place to assess how these girls were faring in kindergarten, first, and second grades? Where was the district leadership earlier? If the district was disaggregating data, how were these peculiar patterns missed? There
were more questions than answers and since it was not the study’s focus, I did not pursue the matter. It was important to acknowledge however that what I thought was a school where third, fourth, and fifth-grade students were proficient readers, proved to be one in which just the opposite was true.

*Keres Language Use*

Speaking Keres marked insiders and outsiders in this community. Testifying before the [state’s] Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Mary Eunice Romero, a nearby university professor of Language, Reading and Culture, and a [nearby] Pueblo tribal member, explained that the Keres language is essential to the inner workings of [state] Pueblo communities. Pueblo governments do not separate church and state, partly, Romero explained, because the Keres language is the basis for a way of thinking and knowing the world that precludes such separation (*SB 575*).

In spite of some continued objections and reservations in the community, current tribal leaders have approved the teaching of Keres in the schools and generally support the daily instruction delivered by educational assistants and some certified teachers to students at the school. I was told teachers who were not community members were not allowed to stay in the room while Keres instruction was taking place, though I noticed that some of the veteran teachers did stay.

There has been a good deal of controversy among Keresan speakers as to whether the language should be learned in written form or if it should continue to be passed to future generations orally. According to Romero (n.d.), a [nearby] Pueblo member and native Keres speaker, the arguments against writing the language include its complexity, which many believe makes it difficult to create an adequate orthography. This group also believes a written language is simply unneeded since oral transmission has been successful in the past, and that, orthographic
mapping makes the language available to anyone and therefore open to exploitation from outsiders. Those in favor of developing written Keres say such a move would provide greater opportunities for transmission to generations of children more comfortable with written and technological forms, would provide formal learning resources for young people without access to native speakers to facilitate language transmission, and would standardize current written forms. Of course, there are also inter-communal issues of power and control in decisions concerning orthographies as factions battle over whose dialect and variations should become “standardized” (Watahomigie, 2004). At this time, students at Saint Theresa see a few simple words written in Keres, but transmission, even in the school program, is primarily oral.

The teacher in charge of Keres instruction at the school was also a member of the tribe’s Keres Language Committee. Planning for the project in the summer, the principal had suggested we contact this committee as soon as I obtained school board approval, discuss my study with them, and solicit their feedback. I was excited about the prospect. The principal approached the lead Keres teacher and Language Committee member during the first few weeks of school to introduce me, explain the study, and begin to plan for further contact. This was while we were waiting for board approval. Unfortunately, the encounter did not go as planned.

We met the woman in the hall and the principal introduced us and briefly explained the study. The principal mentioned that we would like to talk to the Language Committee at some point in the future. The other woman became instantly guarded. She said the study sounded interesting but she doubted the Language Committee would approve it since she and the school’s reading specialist had recently proposed what she said was a similar study for the middle school and it had been rejected by the Language Committee. At that point, the principal tactfully brought the conversation to a close, the three of us exchanged pleasantries and the principal and I continued down the hall. The principal then explained to me that she thought we had better wait
to contact the Language Committee until after we had school board approval. My understanding was that we did not want to alienate the woman we had just talked to and that board and university approval would give the project legitimacy and a better chance for more cooperation from the committee later. I asked again in late November if the timing was right to approach the Language Committee and the principal said that it was not, but did not elaborate. I was never able to access the committee and the woman in charge of the language committee was unfriendly to me for the rest of the year.

*Lack of Commitment to Language and Culture*

By mid-year, I was beginning to realize how essential to the community the Keres language was and how much it was used by adults and children in the school. I was not, however, finding many other indications that the school was integrating or embracing students’ culture. The administration did respond positively to direct requests from Pueblo leaders, but, at the district level, the school calendar was not organized around important Pueblo cultural activities, and there was little in the classroom curriculum that reflected or honored the local heritage. In fact, while subbing in a fourth grade classroom, I was asked to read students a passage from the social studies text about the “thirteen original American colonies” that was outdated and insensitive to Native American culture. This, along with several other encounters with that textbook series, made me wonder why teachers were using it or why they were not at least challenging the text when they did use it. For instance, contacts between Native Americans and early colonists were explained from the colonists’ point of view only, describing their hardships and perseverance but not the impact their arrival had on indigenous peoples. Native Americans in the text had only minor roles, coming to the aid of the colonists and helping them survive. In another classroom, I watched, in surprise, as an Anglo teacher—modeling early
composition skills—ended her glowing paragraph about Columbus with: “Columbus was a great man!” I could only imagine what some parents thought when students proudly showed them their paragraphs at home. The lack of awareness or concern over these well-known tensions was jarring.

In the library, there was a “Native American” section, but many of the selections were dated and did not reflect contemporary Native Americans, and most American Indian leaders, past and present, were missing from the biography section. Also sparse were books by or about American Indians for beginning readers.

No doubt, some teachers worked to include relevant curriculum. There was a contest for the bulletin board that best depicted a map/model of the local community. Some of the local teachers tied information in the curriculum to local happenings. Generally, the Anglo and Hispanic teachers did not do this, probably because they had little information about local events, although as I mentioned earlier, one Anglo teacher did try to find out what was happening and used what she knew of students and their families to make the curriculum more relevant.

In general, considering the school’s claims to take local culture into account in the classroom, the curriculum was disappointing. Keres language use was much more integrated into children’s daily experiences than I had expected, but much of this was unplanned, through informal contacts with community members throughout the school day.

In short, the commitment to students’ language and culture, which the school and district touted, was not substantive. In fact, I found evidence of what Shields, Bishop, and Mazawi (2005) would term “pathologizing” practices. The drop in students’ SBA scores and this deficit discourse changed the context of the study considerably.
Data Collection

In the following sections, I discuss sampling and how students were chosen for the interviews. I also review the consent process, including access and student assent. Next, I explain procedures, and conclude with information about the quantitative instruments used for data collection.

Sampling

In the quantitative phase, the MRS was administered to students in grades one and two and the MRQ was administered to students, grades three through five, whose parents returned consent forms and who assented to participate. By removing two items from the Enjoyment dimension (E2 and E3) of the MRS and two items from the Value dimension (V1 and V2),\textsuperscript{12} Cronbach’s\textsuperscript{13} alpha was increased to .65 (from .59). This improved the reliability of the measure, but still suggested the MRS was much less reliable for this population than for the 65 African American and European American first graders in the Baker and Scher (2002) study.

On the MRS, skew was acceptable, though not ideal (-1.47), and the kurtosis was just above an acceptable level (2.26). This was likely the result of several questions in the Enjoyment dimension, one in the Value dimension, and both questions related to library use showing a high positive bias among students.

Tests to examine the shape and distribution of the MRQ data showed a slight negative skew (-.06); and the kurtosis indicated near normal distributions (-.37). Cronbach’s alphas showed good reliability for the Full scale (.90) and ranged from .42 to .73 on the eleven subscales, suggesting the survey was less reliable on some subscales for this student population.

\textsuperscript{12} Appendix H provides the rationale for removing the four items.
\textsuperscript{13} For explanation of Cronbach’s alpha, see Cronbach, Gleser, Nanda, and Rajaratnam, 1972.
than for the white and African American students in the Baker and Wigfield (1999) study (in which subscale alphas ranged from .55 to .76), and the primarily white, African American, and Hispanic students in the Watkins and Coffey (2004) study (where subscale alphas ranged from .60 to .79 in study 1 and from .54 to .80 in study 2). Table 3-2 below compares reliabilities across the three studies.
Table 3-2

MRQ reliabilities on 11 subscales and total scale compared to Watkins and Coffey (2004) and Baker and Wigfield (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Saint Theresa students</th>
<th>Watkins and Coffey, 2004</th>
<th>Baker and Wigfield, 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Not a subscale</td>
<td>Not a subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>Not a subscale</td>
<td>Not a subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>Combined with compliance=.68</td>
<td>Combined with compliance=.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Combined with grades=.68</td>
<td>Combined with grades=.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum, internal consistency reliabilities showed good reliability for the MRQ used with grades 3, 4, and 5 (.90 Cronbach’s alpha), and questionable reliability for the MRS, for grades 1 and 2, with four questions excluded (.65 Cronbach’s alpha).

First through fifth grade teachers were asked to rank students as showing high, average, or low reading motivation. Students’ overall mean scores on the MRS/MRQ were categorized by quartiles. The correlation between teacher ratings and percentile rankings was very low (.14 for the MRQ and .16 for the MRS). So, to be classified as highly motivated, the student had to have a teacher rating of “average or high” and a mean score in the top quartile on the MRS/MRQ. To be among the students with low motivation required a teacher rating of “low” and a mean score in the bottom quartile on the MRS/MRQ. From this pool of “highly” or “less” motivated students, interview participants were selected randomly for interviews. Because the MRS was substantially less reliable for this population, and because informal conversations with first graders suggested they were questionable informants, only four samples were drawn from the MRS, and all of them from among second grade students. The sample was purposive in that extreme cases (only high or low) were used (Kemper, Stringfield, & Teddlie, 2003). Sixteen students were selected as illustrated in the sampling matrix in 3-3 below.
Table 3-3.

**Sampling matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H is high motivation = student whose teacher rated her/him as having average or high motivation and whose mean score on the MRQ/MRS was in the top quartile. L is low motivation = student whose teacher rated her/him as having low motivation and whose mean score on the MRQ/MRS was in the bottom quartile.

As recommended by Eisenhardt (1999), these sixteen students were chosen as examples of “polar types” (p. 141), or what Kemper, et al. called extreme/deviant types. In other words, these were students at both ends of the motivation continuum. Unlike statistical sampling, these choices were based on theoretical sampling in order to explore the thinking of students who were or were not motivated to read, across gender and grade level.\(^{14}\)

**Access, Consent, and Assent**

To gain access to this particular school site, I approached the principal with the study proposal. We met and discussed the study and also talked about ways I might reciprocate with service to the school. With the principal’s tentative approval, I approached the district

---

\(^{14}\) One additional highly motivated fourth grade boy was included in the interviews because he convinced me it was very important to him to be interviewed for the project. I intended to humor him and discard his information later but he turned out to be an important informant and his interviews were transcribed and included in results.
superintendent and associate superintendent, who then reviewed the proposal. Appendix A contains the letter of introduction and proposal summary that was submitted to the district for review.

The principal suggested I begin the process of attaining district approval by contacting the assistant superintendent for elementary instruction. After several conversations, this woman scheduled me to present the proposal to the school board in August. The school board consisted of two Hispanic male members, one of whom was married to the assistant superintendent for elementary instruction, two Pueblo male members (from two different pueblos) and an Anglo female member. One of the Pueblo men was a member of the community where I would be researching. After two presentations to the School Board, the study was approved, but the interactions I witnessed revealed underlying racial tensions among School Board members, mistrust of a white researcher by the Native American members, and apparent tensions between school officials and some board members.

During the month while I waited for School Board approval, I began spending three days a week on site, meeting the staff and helping out in small ways around the school. I was assigned a variety of tasks. Since I had a valid state teaching license, I substituted for teachers in a number of classrooms. I also answered phones in the front office and helped with a couple of classroom art projects. I substituted for the librarian one day and was asked another time to re-shelve and straighten books. I filled in for educational assistants on lunch and playground duty and supervised lunch detention several times for the middle school. I also spent the day with one student who was assigned to a daylong in-school-suspension. Once The Pennsylvania State Office of Research Protection approval was granted, the principal notified teachers that I would be dropping off informed consent forms for students to take home to parents (Appendix A provides a copy of the consent form). The teachers and staff received very little information
about me or the study. I kept expecting the principal to introduce me at a staff or other school meeting. This did not happen. When I mentioned being willing to share my reading expertise with teachers, the principal was enthusiastic, but she did nothing to facilitate the effort. The principal seemed to strongly support the study and was enthusiastic about the updates I gave her, but after our experience with the school board, she also seemed to believe the best approach for the success of the study was to keep a low profile. Since she had more experience in the community, I respected her judgment. I also wanted to maintain my relationship with her, so I did not push the issue.

Toward the end of the quantitative phase, I was beginning to be questioned by educational assistants from the local community about my research and whether or not I had gained permission from tribal authorities to proceed with the study. I felt as though the principal was keeping my work under wraps and it was beginning to make me uncomfortable. I decided to go directly to the community with my work and talk with the new Pueblo Governor about the next phase of the study. However, I also recognized this was risky. If the governor vetoed the plan, the study would stall. Fortunately, I had collected enough data, including classroom observations and teacher interviews that it was agreed that if I had to stop the project, I could modify and finish the study. This enabled me to offer the qualitative phase to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and other tribal leaders as a project they could embrace or not, rather than something I needed in order to complete the dissertation. It also infused the qualitative phase with a more participatory approach. The Governor welcomed and supported the project, sending personal letters to targeted students’ home to facilitate the consent process. (A copy of this letter is in Appendix B.)

Before I was invited to meet with the governor, I began meeting with the community’s librarian. I saw her in the school office one day and she invited me to visit the village library.
After a long conversation and some follow-up emails, the librarian offered to let me conduct the qualitative interviews at the village library and to accompany me to present the proposal to the governor.

New governors are elected every December in this Pueblo. The recently elected governor was an engineer and educator, who had been instrumental in establishing the Keres language program at Saint Theresa School. Committed to both student success in the mainstream education system and traditional cultural values, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor had many questions and also shared some of their own ideas about education and reading. We had several meetings, and at the last one, the Governor said he was ready to support the project. He had me return that same day with a list of students I had targeted, and their parents’ names and addresses. While we continued to discuss one of the potential questions from the semi-structured interviews, his secretary typed letters of support from the Governor and Lieutenant Governor to each child’s parent (see Appendix B). The next day, those letters were mailed to parents and I also gave a copy of the letter, with the consent form and the principal’s cover letter (see Appendix B) to students at the school to take home to their parents as per the Governor’s request. (Assent forms are located in Appendix A.)

Procedures

Most parents who refused to sign consent forms sent back notes or told me directly that their children were “being tested all the time” and they wanted to resist additional testing. To parents who told me this in person, I explained the surveys were not tests, only questionnaires asking for students’ opinions. The parents essentially responded that if it was not part of the regular school curriculum, they did not want their children “wasting their time.” Of 204 consent
forms disseminated, 33 were not returned (84% return rate), and seven parents refused consent (3%). Results are summarized in Table 3-4 below.

Table 3-4

Consent/assent results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Parent consent forms unreturned</th>
<th># Of forms returned; parents refused consent</th>
<th># Parents consented; students did not assent</th>
<th># Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stuffed animals I used to administer the MRS seemed to increase student enthusiasm for participation among first and second graders. Only eight of 90, or 9%, failed to return consent forms in first and second grade, which was half the rate of unreturned forms for the third through fifth grade students. Of forms returned from first and second grade students, four parents refused consent. Only three parents directly refused to participate in third through fifth grades, although unreturned forms were much higher among this group (25 forms or 22% for grades 3-5).

Also, while all the first and second grade students assented to the study, 14 of the older students did not (eight in 3rd, five in 4th, and one in 5th grade). There were also interesting patterns of participation by classroom. In first grade, the two Anglo teachers had 100% returned forms...
and all parents agreed to participate. The other teacher, a member of the local community, was very gracious in terms of letting me continue to try to get forms from students, but two of her students did not bring back forms and two other parents refused consent. In the second grade, five of the six unreturned forms and the two refusals came from classrooms where the teacher lived in the local community. This was also the case in the third grade where all the unreturned forms were from the classroom where the teacher was American Indian, though this person did not live in the local community. In the fourth and fifth grades, where all the teachers were Anglo or Hispanic, one fifth grade Hispanic teacher had a 100% return rate. The other 5th grade teacher, along with the three 4th grade teachers each had five students who did not return their forms.

In addition to parent consent, students were also given an independent opportunity to participate or not. In the 3rd-5th grades, students generally agreed to participate if their parents had consented. However, in one Anglo teacher’s classroom, seven students declined. This was a classroom where the teacher worked hard to know her students, to engage them in authentic learning experiences and to incorporate community resources into the classroom as much as possible. This teacher encouraged students to think carefully about their choices and it seemed one very popular boy did just that and decided to decline. When he refused, others seemed to reconsider as well. Altogether, 156 students were surveyed: 78 in first and second grades and 78 in grades three, four, and five.

Survey procedures

In the quantitative phase, as I continued to encourage students to bring back consent forms, I also began administering the MRS in one-to-one sessions with first and second grade students whose parents had consented. I obtained student assent using the form in Appendix A. I read the form and then paraphrased each section to make sure students understood what I was
saying. All the first and second graders assented and I gave them copies of their parents’ consent forms with my signature and contact information to return to their parents.

MRS administration required two stuffed animals. I chose two small lions, characters from a Disney film and named them Checkers and Bingo to try to avoid gender bias. For the first question, Checkers would make the positive statement, such as “I like to read,” and Bingo the negative statement, “I don’t like to read.” On the next question, the other character would make the positive statement to assure students were attending to the questions and not simply preferring one lion over the other. MRS administration required that students choose a statement that was “most like” them, and then decide whether it was “a lot” like them, or “a little” like them, creating a 4-point likert scale. So Checkers would say, “I like to read” and Bingo would say “I don’t like to read,” and students would decide if they were more like Checkers or more like Bingo. Once that choice was made, I would ask if they were “a little” like Checkers/Bingo or “a lot” like Checkers/ Bingo. Students seemed to have no trouble with the format, answering readily and listening carefully. Some would respond with the animal’s name and others would simply point to the one they thought was most like them and I would ask the follow-up question. Four students required I ask the question directly. For these four students I would say, “Checkers says, ‘I like to read’.” “Bingo says, ‘I don’t like to read’.” “Are you more like Checkers or more like Bingo” [No response.] “Are you more like this one—‘I like to read,’ or this one—‘I don’t like to read’?” [No response.] “Do you like to read?” [At this, students did respond with yes or no.] “A little or a lot?” [All students also responded to the follow-up]. None of these four ever began answering in the more typical way. Each required that I ask them directly but they would then respond with no hesitation.

Teachers decided whether the first and second grade interviews were conducted in the classroom or just outside the classroom door. First grade teachers all offered me space inside the
room. The second grade teachers had me sit with students in the hall just outside their doors. Administration was completed in less than fifteen minutes. Students were eager to answer the questions and when I entered a room with the stuffed animals it often disrupted whatever the teacher was doing with cries of “Checkers!” “Bingo!” “Can I do it now?” Seeing other students talking with me and seeing the stuffed animals also seemed to increase the participation rate.

For the MRQ, I asked teachers to choose the date and time for administration. I said it would be better if teachers were not present when I read students the questions, however all but two teachers chose to remain in the classroom anyway, and I did not push the issue. I did not believe their presence was affecting students’ answers, since the teachers worked quietly in the back of the room and students understood their answers would remain anonymous. One teacher was absent and an educational assistant remained in the room until she heard the first nine questions and then left. In retrospect, I should have given teachers and instructional aides copies of the questions beforehand, since I think most were staying because they were curious about me and the questions.

The first thing I did for the older students was put the response format on the board and gave students several practice statements to make sure they understood how to mark their answers. Next, I passed back copies of the consent forms their parents had signed with my signature and contact information so they could return them to their parents in case parent or student had questions or wished to withdraw from the study. Next I read the student assent form to the whole group (see Appendix A) and students wishing to participate signed the assent form. Once they signed, they received a copy of the questions with a sticky note attached. I explained that I had to read each question even though I knew they could read it for themselves and they seemed very patient with this process. I clarified any vocabulary I thought might be problematic before reading the question, so, for instance, we discussed what a fiction book was, what an
adventure story might include, the components of a mystery, fantasy, etc. When they finished, I checked each paper to make sure students had marked their answers correctly. I had to support two different students, both in fourth grade, one of whom had trouble keeping up, and the other of whom needed help understanding some of the questions. The rest of the students appeared to have no difficulty responding to the statements.

When I finished collecting the students’ papers, I immediately removed the sticky note with the student’s name and replaced it with a code for that student indicating grade level and classroom; then name and code were placed on the master list. This was also the procedure for first and second grade students to ensure anonymity. Although I had scheduled 50-minute time slots, administration took no more than 40 minutes, including the assent process.

Student scores on the MRQ and MRS were calculated. Students scoring in the 75th percentile or higher were pooled for high motivation, while those at or below the 25th percentile were pooled for low motivation. Students within this range were considered average. Teachers were asked to rank the students in their classroom from the ones with the highest reading motivation to those who were least motivated for reading. To be classified as highly motivated, the student had to have a teacher rating of high and a mean score in the top quartile. To be among the students with low motivation required a teacher rating of low motivation and a mean score in the bottom quartile. Students were then selected randomly from either the high or low motivation groups. Initially, two students from each category (two highly motivated second grade girls, two highly motivated second grade boys, two second grade girls and two second grade boys with low motivation, etc.) were chosen in case consent/assent was not gained for some of the students. However, with the Pueblo Governor’s support and personal letter, all agreed to participate so a second attempt was not needed. Such was the power of the Governor’s endorsement.
Though defined in various ways, case study usually includes the use of interviews, observations, and document analysis for conducting inquiry; produces a product unique to the individual case; and consists of a bounded unit chosen for analysis, i.e., the “case” (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994). The type used here was an interpretive case study. Like other types, the interpretive model requires rich, thick description that can be collected with one or a combination of techniques. It is used to “illustrate, support, or challenge theoretical assumptions held prior to the data gathering” (Merriam, p. 38). These theoretical assumptions have been described in Chapter 2. They are based on current understandings in the reading motivation literature, particularly the expectancy value model of reading motivation. Multiple interviews with seventeen students were conducted to stabilize findings and allow for better precision and validity (see Miles and Huberman, 1994).

The initial framework was loose in order to keep it, as Miles and Huberman (1994) described, “receptive to local idiosyncrasies” (p.17). All of the initial interviews and most of the subsequent interviews were scheduled after school. The Pueblo librarian allowed me to interview students in the village library and allowed her assistant to drive with me to several students’ homes for interviews with students who lived in “new housing.” With instructions and an invitation from the librarian, I was also able to walk to a few homes within the Pueblo to interview students, and I returned many students to their homes in the Pueblo from the library after interviews were completed.

The first interview was designed to build rapport and begin a conversation about reading. I began by asking the student about a book (s)he had recently read and enjoyed. Appendix C provides examples of the introduction and questions that could be asked during the interview. This list of possible questions was refined in consultation with teachers, administrators and community members on site, and after the quantitative analysis was completed. Of particular
interest to the Pueblo Governor and Lieutenant Governor was the question designed to elicit from students how “traditional” they viewed themselves and their families and how they defined “traditional.”

On the advice of an experienced interviewer, I brought along colored pencils, markers and white paper for the students to color and write on during the interview to relieve the pressure of talking with a stranger, although by the time the interviews began I had become much less a stranger to most. The first interview was aimed at building rapport. Subsequent interviews were based on information gained from the student through ongoing transcription, microanalysis (as described by Strauss & Corbin, 1998), and coding of interviews. During the interviewing process, informal summaries were discussed with a local expert for additional views and ideas on follow-up questions or probes that might yield better information.

The next interviews built on what the student said initially. Some of the questions mirrored dimensions found on the MRQ, while others were designed to explore instrumentality and future time perspectives. Several were designed to get students talking about reading on their own, without any prior assumptions and with no leading questions. Generally, this did not happen. Students seemed to believe there was a protocol, which included me asking questions and them responding. My attempts to change this script and have them just talk about anything they wanted regarding reading only worked with a couple of the highly motivated students.

I recorded the interviews using digital recording devices. I ran two tapes in case one failed. One original interview and one follow-up had to be conducted by phone because the students were unavailable otherwise. For transcription, I used the student’s assigned codes. The codes and student names were secured. Tapes were transcribed by the researcher in a closed private room in the researcher’s home. After transcription, the audiotapes were erased and only the codes were attached to the transcriptions.
Instruments

The MRQ was developed by researchers Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) who conceptualized reading motivation to include a “cultural milieu” (see Figure 3-2 above). It has been tested on African American and European American urban students in the eastern U.S. and white and Hispanic suburban students in the mid-Atlantic and southwestern U.S.

The MRQ was designed to measure multiple dimensions of students’ reading motivation including: Competence and efficacy beliefs, with subscales for “self-efficacy,” “challenge,” and “work avoidance;” Goals for reading, with subscales for “curiosity,” “involvement,” “importance,” “recognition,” “grades,” and “competition;” and Social purposes of reading, with subscales “social” and “compliance” (Baker & Wigfield, 1999, pp. 476-477). The MRQ was piloted in a 1997 study by Wigfield and Guthrie with 100 fourth- and fifth-grade students in the eastern U.S. Twenty-eight items were subsequently dropped, resulting in the revised MRQ used by Baker and Wigfield.

Baker and Wigfield (1999) drew fifth and sixth graders from six elementary schools in a large mid-Atlantic U.S. city. The size of the population ranged from 270 for some of the analyses to 371 for others (based on the fact that some student information was not available for all students). A little over half of the students were white, slightly less than half were African American and a little over half received free and reduced-price lunches. Assessing reliability, Baker and Wigfield reported alpha levels ranging from .55 (Work Avoidance) to .76 (Importance).

Watkins and Coffey (2004) also used the MRQ in a study of 328 grade 3-5 students from schools in the mid-Atlantic U.S. and a separate analysis of 735 students, grades 3-5, from southwestern U.S. elementary schools. Validity was assessed using exploratory factor analysis. The multi-dimensionality of reading motivation was affirmed with the MRQ, but across the two
samples only eight factors emerged distinctly: Grades-Compliance, Social, Competition, Involvement, Curiosity, Recognition, Efficacy, and Work Avoidance. In terms of reliability, alphas ranged from .54 (Work Avoidance) and .61 (Curiosity), to .77 (Recognition) and .80 (Grades-Compliance), with the other scales at or approaching acceptable levels (.67 Efficacy, .71 Competition, .71 Involvement, and .73 Social).

The MRS was tested by Baker and Scher (2002) in a study of 65 first grade African American and European American students from low and middle socioeconomic backgrounds in Baltimore, Maryland. Designed for younger students, the MRS is composed of 16 questions comprising four components of reading motivation: Enjoyment, Value, Perceived Competence, and Library-related affect. Reliability was tested for this population using Cronbach’s alphas. For the total instrument, alpha = .86. Validity was checked with principle components factor analysis. The Value subscale replicated well. However, the other subscales were more problematic, although there was some replication for each. The authors concluded there was “some support” for the empirical validity of the theoretical dimensions, but “because of the limited power resulting from the small sample size” the researchers labeled their results “tentative” (p. 250).

**Organization of Remaining Chapters**

The study’s remaining chapters are organized as follows. Chapter 4 covers the secondary quantitative questions, which were:

2. *How do the American Indian students in this study compare to students from other ethnic groups on the MRS/MRQ? Are there differences based on grade or gender?*
3. What is the relationship between reading achievement and reading motivation for these students? Are there differences in those relationships based on grade level or gender?

MRS and MRQ results are reported, then analyzed, comparing Saint Theresa student responses to those of students from studies discussed above and assessing results in relation to reading achievement.

Chapter 5 shares qualitative results and analysis of the primary question, which asked what students identified as having high or low reading motivation on the MRQ/MRS would say about reading and their motivations for reading or not reading. Chapter sections are organized around two concepts that emerged during transcript analysis. One has to do with social influences on students’ reading motivation—or what Harré called the “person.” The other is related to the way individuals organize those social influences into personal responses, or Harré’s view of “self.” Various dimensions are discussed within each concept.

Chapter 6 provides the most important insights from the study. Limitations and issues of inference quality and transferability are discussed. Context and leadership are summarized to reiterate how the school context was different than originally expected. Findings from both the qualitative and quantitative results are synthesized, followed by conclusions and recommendations. Questions that arose from the study and could provide additional insight are reviewed, and some final thoughts conclude the chapter.
Primarily, this study asked what Saint Theresa students, identified as having high or low reading motivation on the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS) or the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ), would say about reading and why they read or avoided reading. There were also two quantitative questions. To answer those questions and create a sample from which to choose students for the qualitative study, student reading motivation was first assessed using the MRQ and MRS instruments. Results were analyzed using SPSS statistical software.

**First and Second Grade MRS Results and Comparisons with other Studies**

First, Saint Theresa students are compared to students in other studies, where the same measures were used. Then the students’ reading motivation scores are compared to their reading achievement scores to determine possible relationships. Results and analysis from the MRS for first and second graders is followed by MRQ results and analysis for third, fourth, and fifth graders, concluding with a chapter summary.

**MRS Scores**

Table 4-1, below, shows the mean scores for first and second grade girls and boys from Saint Theresa School on the Motivations for Reading Scale.
Table 4-1

Mean scores and standard deviations on the revised MRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Grade 1 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 1 Boys</th>
<th>Grade 2 Girls</th>
<th>Grade 2 Boys</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>3.70 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.62 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.82 (0.25)</td>
<td>3.68 (0.35)</td>
<td>3.71 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>3.82 (0.38)</td>
<td>3.43 (0.83)</td>
<td>3.75 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.33)</td>
<td>3.70 (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>3.67 (0.37)</td>
<td>3.48 (0.52)</td>
<td>3.65 (0.35)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.38)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3.84 (0.37)</td>
<td>3.85 (0.37)</td>
<td>3.88 (0.22)</td>
<td>3.81 (0.43)</td>
<td>3.85 (0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale</td>
<td>3.74 (0.31)</td>
<td>3.60 (0.36)</td>
<td>3.77 (0.18)</td>
<td>3.70 (0.26)</td>
<td>3.71 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First grade boys were slightly lower than first grade girls or second grade boys and girls on all measures except the Library subscale. For the revised Enjoyment dimension, first grade boys had a mean of 3.62, SD (0.46), with first grade girls at 3.70, SD (0.42), second grade girls at 3.82, SD (0.25), and second grade boys at 3.68, SD (0.35). First grade boys were also lower than others on the revised Value dimension with a mean of 3.43, SD (0.83). First grade girls showed a mean of 3.82, SD (0.38), second grade girls were 3.75, SD (0.47), and second grade boys at 3.80, SD (0.33). First grade boys also posted lower means on the revised Competency dimension at 3.48, SD (0.52), while first grade girls were at 3.67, SD (0.37), second grade girls at 3.65, SD (0.35), and second grade boys at 3.61, SD (0.38). Revised Library subscales were virtually the same for all groups. First grade girls had a mean of 3.84, SD (0.37), with first grade boys at 3.85, SD.

15 Revised means with the items V1, V2, E2, E3 removed
Second grade girls were at 3.88, $SD$ (0.22), and second grade boys at 3.81, $SD$ (0.43). For the full scale, first grade boys were, again, slightly lower than the full sample and the other groups. First grade boys were at 3.60, $SD$ (0.36), with first grade girls at 3.74, $SD$ (0.31), second grade girls at 3.77, $SD$ (0.18), and second grade boys at 3.70, $SD$ (0.26). The only differences approaching significance were for boys on the *Value* subscale ($\alpha$=0.09) and on the full scale ($\alpha$=0.07), a result of the lower scores for first grade boys.

**Comparison to Baker and Scher (2002) Study**

Comparing this sample to students from Baker and Scher’s 2002 study of 65 African American and European American first graders (see Table 4-2 below) showed students from Saint Theresa School were considerably higher on the Full scale score (3.16 Baker & Scher; 3.71 Saint Theresa). Saint Theresa students also posted higher means on the *Value* (3.32 Baker & Scher; 3.70 Saint Theresa), *Enjoyment* (3.04 Baker & Scher; 3.70 Saint Theresa), *Competence* (3.20 Baker & Scher; 3.61 Saint Theresa), and *Library* (3.19 Baker & Scher; 3.85 Saint Theresa) subscales, with the largest differences on the *Enjoyment* and *Library* subscales. However, besides lacking raw data to compare directly, there were also other problems with this comparison. The MRS did not show adequate reliability with Saint Theresa students; the Saint Theresa scores were much closer to ceiling, suggesting a strong social desirability bias. Nonetheless, scores did range from one to four for every question except *Competence Q3 (I think I will be a good reader)*, which ranged from 2.00-4.00. Mean averages on the subscales ranged from 2.20-4.00 for the revised *Enjoyment*; 1.00-4.00 for the revised *Value*; 2.33-4.00 for *Competence*; 2.50-4.00 for *Library*; and 2.67-4.00 for the Full scale score.
### Table 4-2

**Comparing mean scores and standard deviations on the MRS to 2002 Baker and Scher study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale value</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle Income</th>
<th></th>
<th>Baker and Scher (2002)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample Pueblo study*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Calculated with all sixteen original questions and original dimensions for comparison.

### Relationship between MRS Results and Reading Achievement

Since the younger students did not take the state’s high stakes assessments, and one of the school’s curriculum based measures—DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills)—was not useful in assessing actual reading achievement, DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment) levels were used as a proxy for reading achievement since this was the only other
This was the school’s first time administering the assessment, but for older students there was a strong (0.61, α = 0.01) correlation between DRA levels and skill levels on the state’s Standards Based Assessment (SBA, or high-stakes reading test), so administration appeared adequate and the assessment was considered useful for the purpose.

DRA levels for the first and second grade students showed a weak but significant relationship to the revised Enjoyment (0.27, α = 0.05), Value (0.31, α = 0.01) and Competence (0.24, α = 0.01) subscales, no relationship to the Library subscale, and a moderate, significant relationship to the Full scale score (0.33, α = 0.01) as shown in Table 4-3 below. There were no significant gender or grade level differences in links between reading motivation and achievement.

Table 4-3

Correlations among MRS mean scores and DRA for first and second grade students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

16 The Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) is an informal assessment in which a student reads aloud while the teacher uses an observation guide to record errors, including: substitutions, omissions, insertions, reversals, incorrect words, and words supplied by the teacher. Errors are converted to an accuracy score. From level 14 on, the readings are timed and words-per-minute also recorded. The assessment uses both fiction and expository text. When the student’s fluency score drops to a certain level, the assessment is stopped and lower level text is used. Students can use the text to answer the associated comprehension questions. According to Rathvon (2006), “several aspects of administration for the DRA2, K–3 and 4–8 are problematic and compromise both reliability and validity” (p. 4). Unfortunately it was the only achievement measure available for first and second grade students.
First and second grade Saint Theresa students showed high, positive responses on the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS), but MRS reliability for this population was lower than desirable, so results must be considered with caution. All students at this age were very enthusiastic about the library and generally quite positive regarding all reading activities, but for the Value, Enjoyment, and Competence subscales, first grade boys showed slightly less motivation than first grade girls or first and second grade boys or girls, though the differences did not rise to the level of significance. There were three first grade classrooms. In one, I saw no differences between the girls’ and boys’ enthusiasm for reading. In the second classroom, I was not able to observe students making free reading selections and the instructional reading time was so structured that there was little opportunity to observe students’ individual reactions. In the other classroom, there were four boys who resisted just about anything having to do with reading, partly because reading generally meant seatwork and they were not at all happy to sit and work on anything. With low numbers overall, even a small number of students could have affected the means for a particular group.

Saint Theresa first and second grade students were considerably more motivated on every subscale than the first grade, low and middle income, African American and white students from the Baker and Scher (2002) study. Without raw data to compare, it was not possible to determine significance levels, but there appeared to be real differences in Full scale scores, and on the Enjoyment and Library subscales. Students at Saint Theresa have a small community library and, of course, the school library. Many students were probably only thinking of the school library when they answered the questions because few first and second grade students visit the community library regularly. The only other book source mentioned by students was WalMart, at least 30 miles away. The school library was therefore an important source of books for students.
It was not surprising Saint Theresa students also scored higher on the *Enjoyment* subscale. First and second grade students loved stories and they loved to check out books and follow the story through pictures, even when they could not decode the words.

Looking at the patterns of scores comparing Saint Theresa students to students in the Baker and Scher (2002) study, there was a question about social desirability bias or at least how certain groups respond to researchers that are inside or outside their cultural group. In Baker and Scher, children from the low income, African American group were tested by an African American female. All others were tested by a white female—one of the researchers.

It is possible that when low income white students claim they are competent but do not value or enjoy reading, they may not be as competent as they claim and are protecting their self-concept by asserting reading is not very enjoyable or valuable to them. Unfortunately, the Baker and Scher study did not compare actual achievement to motivation, so this is only conjecture.

The first and second grade students at Saint Theresa loved the stuffed lions I brought along for the testing. I was popular by association. Therefore, wanting to please the woman who carried around “Checkers” and “Bingo” could have affected students’ desire to choose an answer they thought I would like. In addition, even by first grade, students had been inundated with the message that reading is valuable and important, so a social desirability bias was definitely possible.

Reading motivation and reading achievement as measured by DRA levels, was weakly but significantly linked for Saint Theresa first and second graders. Students’ reading motivation as measured on the *Enjoyment*, *Value*, and *Competence* subscales and the Full scale scores were connected to student achievement on the DRA. Students’ love of the library did not parlay into a direct connection to achievement although library use could clearly affect students’ reading enjoyment and feelings of competence. The Full scale MRS score showed a greater relationship
to DRA levels than any of the individual scales, suggesting that, even at a very young age, different students show individual reading motivation patterns and that it was the overall patterns, not individual scales that were most closely linked to achievement.

**Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grade MRQ Results and Comparisons with Other Studies**

For third, fourth, and fifth grade students, the longer MRQ questionnaire was administered in classroom settings. Below are the scores, comparisons to students in other studies, and relationships to achievement for these older students.

**MRQ Scores**

Table 4-4 below, shows the mean scores and standard deviations by grade and gender for third, fourth and fifth grade students. There were differences in total scores between all three grades (3.25 for 3rd gr. to 3.06 for 4th gr. to 3.12 for 5th gr.). On the Competition subscale, girls’ means were lower in fourth compared to third grade (3.43 in 3rd and 3.06 in 4th) and were lower again from fourth to fifth grade (3.06 in 4th; 2.66 in 5th). Boys were also lower in fourth compared to third grade (3.18 in 3rd; 3.06 in 4th) but were higher again in fifth grade (3.13). On the Social subscale, both boys and girls showed lower scores in third compared to fourth grade (girls-3.21, boys-3.02 in 4th; girls-3.15; boys-2.65 in 5th) with another difference from fourth to fifth grade (girls-3.15, boys-2.65 in 4th; girls-2.85, boys-2.06 in 5th). Scores also differed across the three years on the Challenge subscale (girls-3.44, boys-3.42 in 3rd; girls-2.99, boys-3.11 in 4th; girls-3.27, boys-2.84 in 5th) with a slightly higher score for girls in the fifth grade on that subscale.
Table 4-4

MRQ mean scores and standard deviations by grade and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Girls &amp; Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Avoidance</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale MRQ</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There seemed to be important differences in means between grades for the Efficacy subscales, and for the Full scale scores. For the Efficacy subscale, girls were 3.47 in third grade, 2.82 in fourth grade, and just slightly higher at 2.91 in fifth grade. Boys also differed, from 3.34 in third grade to 3.06 in fourth grade, remaining virtually the same at 3.05 in fifth grade. On the Full scale score, girls were at 3.34 in third grade, 3.10 in fourth grade, with a slightly higher 3.15 in fifth grade. Boys were at 3.20 in third grade, 3.03 in fourth grade, but remained almost the same in fifth grade at 3.04.

Girls’ Compliance and Competition subscales also showed important differences across grades. For the Compliance subscale, girls’ means were 3.73 in third grade, 3.07 in fourth grade, and 2.90 in fifth grade. Boys’ were 3.35 in third grade, 3.06 in fourth grade, and 2.80 in fifth grade. For the Competition subscale, girls’ means were 3.43 in third grade, 3.06 in fourth grade, and 2.66 in fifth grade. Boys’ were 3.18 in third grade, 3.06 in fourth grade, and 3.13 in fifth grade.

For the Involvement subscale, girls were at 3.52 in grade three, 3.30 in grade four, and a high of 3.63 in grade five; compared to boys who were at 3.34 in third grade, 3.17 in fourth grade, and posted a slightly higher 3.23 in fifth grade. On the Social subscale, both boys and girls showed lower scores in fourth and fifth compared to third grades, but girls were at 3.21 (3\textsuperscript{rd}), 3.15 (4\textsuperscript{th}), and 2.85 (5\textsuperscript{th}). Boys were 3.02 in third grade, 2.65 in fourth grade, and 2.06 in fifth grade.

**Comparison to Baker and Wigfield (1999)**

Means were not reported in the Watkins and Coffey (2004) studies. Comparing Saint Theresa students to students from Baker and Wigfield (1999) on means from the 11 subscales showed students from Saint Theresa scored exactly the same on the Work Avoidance subscale (2.43) and very similarly on the Self-efficacy (3.09 Baker & Wigfield versus 3.11 for Saint
Theresa), Recognition (3.25 Baker & Wigfield, compared to 3.24 for Saint Theresa), and Grades (3.58 Baker & Wigfield and 3.54 for Saint Theresa) subscales. As shown in Table 4-5 below, Saint Theresa students were lower on the Compliance subscale (3.37 Baker & Wigfield versus 3.16 for Saint Theresa), but higher on the rest of the subscales: Challenge subscale (3.08 Baker & Wigfield, compared to 3.21 for Saint Theresa); Curiosity subscale (3.20 Baker & Wigfield and 3.34 for Saint Theresa); Involvement subscale (3.14 Baker & Wigfield versus 3.36 for Saint Theresa); Importance subscale (3.40 Baker & Wigfield and 3.55 for Saint Theresa); Competition subscale (2.93 Baker & Wigfield, compared to 3.06 for Saint Theresa); and Social subscale (2.62 Baker & Wigfield, with 2.89 for Saint Theresa).

Table 4-5

Comparing mean scores and standard deviations on the MRQ to Baker and Wigfield, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saint Theresa</th>
<th>Baker and Wigfield, 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>3.34 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.36 (0.53)</td>
<td>3.14 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>3.55 (0.62)</td>
<td>3.40 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3.24 (0.66)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>3.54 (0.49)</td>
<td>3.58 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>3.06 (0.69)</td>
<td>2.93 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>2.89 (0.66)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>3.16 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.37 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>3.11 (0.59)</td>
<td>3.09 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>3.21 (0.64)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Avoidance</td>
<td>2.43 (0.91)</td>
<td>2.43 (0.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, Saint Theresa student means were well above the 2.50 midpoint on the likert scale, in all but work avoidance where a low score meant students were less work avoidant. Comparisons indicated Saint Theresa students characterized themselves slightly more motivated to read overall than students in Baker and Wigfield (1999). Saint Theresa students exhibited the same level of work avoidance as students in Baker and Wigfield (with more variance), which is to say they were not particularly work avoidant; however Saint Theresa students also appeared less compliant regarding school reading assignments.

Students at Saint Theresa exhibited a mix of extrinsic and intrinsic goals, although students who read more and showed greater skill on the state’s high-stakes assessment appeared more intrinsically driven. I discuss this further in the analysis section. With only 77 cases, factor analysis was not viable. However, a correlation of the original 11 subscales from the Baker and Wigfield (1999) study with the Full scale score showed strong relationships, again, in all but the Work Avoidance category (See Table 4-6 below). In Baker and Wigfield, the categories showed moderately positive to highly positive correlations with the total score (.47 to .89). Setting aside the Work Avoidance category, the range was similar in the present study (.46 to .82).
Table 4-6

*Correlations between Full scale score and the 11 original Baker and Wigfield (1999) categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Correlation with Full scale score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy (4 items)</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge (5 items)</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Avoidance (4 items)</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity (6 items)</td>
<td>.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement (6 items)</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance (2 items)</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (5 items)</td>
<td>.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades (4 items)</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition (6 items)</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (7 items)</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (5 items)</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Links between MRQ and Reading Activity Scores*

At the end of the surveys, students were asked if they had read a book for fun in the last week. If so, they were given one point. Those who had read a book were asked to provide the title of the book or author’s name. Another point was awarded if students could do so. Finally, students were asked to circle whether they read books for fun: 1=almost never, 2=about once a month, 3=about once a week, 4=almost every day. In total, students could receive six points for the reading activity (See Table 4-7 below). This was a self-report, so students could project a more positive image of themselves if they chose to do so, but asking them to name the book or
author seemed to ground them in the reality of yes, they read and could name the books they read, or no, they did not read much and could not name familiar authors or books. The self-reported reading activities seemed quite accurate for the students who were later interviewed.

Table 4-7

MRQ reading activity means by grade and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls &amp; Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 points possible)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(1.64)</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Girls reported reading more than boys at third and fifth grades (3rd boys-4.58, girls-5.78; 4th boys-4.65, girls-4.36). For boys in third and fourth grades, scores were about the same (3rd - 4.58, 4th-4.65) but were lowest in fifth grade (4.20). Girls in fifth grade reported scores almost as high as their third grade female peers (5.43). The reading activity mean for all grades was 4.82.

For students who liked hard, challenging books (Q2), generally, the higher the reading activity scores (RA), the higher the mean on this question (2.25=RA1, 2.50=RA2, 3.00=RA3, 3.29=RA4, 3.07=RA5, 3.46=RA6) (See Table 4-8 below).
Table 4-8

*Reading activity score and means on related MRQ questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading activity score</th>
<th>Q 2 mean</th>
<th>Q 5 mean</th>
<th>Q 10 mean</th>
<th>Q 11 mean</th>
<th>Q 14 mean</th>
<th>Q 48 mean</th>
<th>Q 50 mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25 (1.26)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.50)</td>
<td>3.75 (0.50)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.50 (2.12)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.71)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>2.50 (0.71)</td>
<td>3.50 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.60 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.40 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.29 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.38 (0.89)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.06 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.76 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.07 (0.88)</td>
<td>3.40 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.27 (0.96)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.94)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.46 (0.82)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.37 (0.97)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.93)</td>
<td>3.17 (1.01)</td>
<td>3.86 (0.37)</td>
<td>3.26 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students with high reading activity scores were also more likely to identify with the statement:

(Q5) *if the teacher discusses something interesting I might read more about it* (2.50=RA1, 2.50=RA2, 2.60=RA3, 3.38=RA4, 3.40=RA5, 3.49=RA6). It was not quite as straightforward for the rest of the questions. Students who did not identify with the question about reading fantasy and make believe (Q10), were low on reading activity scores (1 and 2) and the reverse was also true: students who said they read fantasy and make believe also had high reading activity scores (5 and 6). (2.50=RA1, 1.50=RA2, 3.00=RA3, 2.65=RA4, 3.13=RA5, 3.37=RA6). This was also true for students who read to siblings (Q11). The high reading activity score was related to a higher question mean and vice versa, but the middle range activity scores showed mixed results.
(2.50=RA1, 3.00=RA2, 1.60=RA3, 2.82=RA4, 2.47=RA5, 3.29=RA6). The same was true for question 14: *My friends sometimes tell me I’m a good reader* (2.25=RA1, 3.00=RA2, 2.40=RA3, 2.53=RA4, 2.27=RA5, 3.17=RA6) and question 50: *In comparison to other school subjects, I’m best at reading* (2.50=RA1, 3.50=RA2, 2.00=RA3, 2.76=RA4, 2.60=RA5, 3.26=RA6). The oddest pattern was from question 48: *If a book is interesting I don’t care how hard it is to read* (3.75=RA1, 2.50=RA2, 3.00=RA3, 3.06=RA4, 3.20=RA5, 3.86=RA6) where the relationship was straightforward except for students who had low reading activity scores but still claimed to tackle difficult books.

This information was interesting because many of the same questions that showed links with reading achievement scores were also closely linked to reading activity scores. The connections between these questions and reading achievement are discussed further below.

**Relationship between MRQ Results and Reading Achievement**

The last analysis examined the relationship between reading motivation and reading achievement for third, fourth, and fifth grade students. Since DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment) levels were available for all students, they were used, along with the state’s high-stakes Standards Based Assessment (SBA) in reading for fourth and fifth grade students.17 DRA levels and proficiency levels on the state’s Standards Based Assessment showed a strong positive relationship (.61, α=.01) but the relationship between subscales and achievement was less clear.

Only three MRQ subscales and the Full scale scores showed a significant relationship to DRA levels. Shown in Table 4-9 below, the *Social subscale*18 showed a moderate but negative

---

17 The state in this study has maintained relatively rigorous high-stakes reading assessments based on comparisons to NAEP assessments (Berman & Murfin, 2007).
18 The *Social subscale* included the following questions: *I visit the library often with my family; I often read to my brother or my sister; I sometimes read to my parents; My friends and I like to trade things to read; I*
and significant relationship to DRA levels (-.24, α = .05). This was true too for the *Compliance* subscale (-.27, α = .05). For the *Work Avoidant* subscale, the relationship was again negative and significant (-.33, α = .01), as it was for the Full scale MRQ (-.23, α = .05).

Table 4-9

*Correlations among MRQ subscale and Full scale scores, DRA levels, and state Standards Based Assessment for fourth and fifth grade students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Correlation with DRA</th>
<th>Correlation with state Standards Based Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Avoidant</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

The Full scale MRQ scores showed no relationship with the SBA. The *Curiosity* (.20), *Efficacy* (.23), and *Work Avoidance* (-.25) subscales exhibited some connection, but not at

---

*talk to my friends about what I am reading; I like to help my friends with their schoolwork in reading; I like to tell my family about what I am reading.* The descriptors for the other subscales adequately express the types of questions asked.
significant levels. Only the *Challenge* subscale showed a significant link to the SBA, and the correlation was a strong $0.47; \alpha = 0.01$.

To better understand what specific questions might correspond to proficient performance on the SBA and DRA, correlations were conducted on individual questions, DRA levels, and SBA achievement. Table 4-10 shows the questions with significant ties to performance. Only five questions appeared connected to SBA achievement. Self-efficacy for reading (*I am a good reader*) showed the strongest link to SBA performance ($0.51, \alpha=0.01$). Liking hard, challenging books was also connected to SBA scores ($0.38, \alpha=0.01$). Students who enjoyed a reading challenge if the project or book was interesting also seemed to do well on the SBA (difficult project, $0.38, \alpha=0.01$; difficult book, $0.29, \alpha=0.05$). Finally, learning difficult things by reading and reading to learn new information about interesting topics were also associated with higher SBA scores.
### Table 4-10

**Correlations among nine MRQ questions, DRA levels, and SBA achievement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRQ question</th>
<th>Correlation with state Standards Based Assessment</th>
<th>Correlation with DRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I like hard, challenging books</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do as little schoolwork as possible in reading</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am a good reader</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I read to learn new information about topics that interest me</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I usually learn difficult things by reading</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I like to get compliments for my reading</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. If the project is interesting, I can read difficult material</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. If a book is interesting I don’t care how hard it is to read</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I don’t like it when there are too many people in the story</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**  
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The only question that was related to both the SBA and the DRA was number two: *I like hard, challenging books* (.38, α=.01 for the SBA; .30, α=.01 for the DRA). Question four, *I do as little schoolwork as possible in reading* was linked to DRA levels (.34, α=.01) but not significantly to SBA achievement. The opposite was true for question nine--*I am a good reader*—which had the strongest tie to the SBAs (.51, α=.01), but no significant tie to the DRA. Questions 13 (*I read to learn new information about topics that interest me*) and 26 (*I usually learn difficult things by reading*) continued that pattern with significant (α=.05) and moderately...
strong links to the SBAs (.30 for Q13; .35 for Q26) but no significant link to the DRA. Question 36—*I like to get compliments for my reading*—showed the reverse relationship: -.25, α=.05 for the DRA; -.08 for the SBA. Questions 44 (*If the project is interesting, I can read difficult material*) and 48 (*If a book is interesting I don’t care how hard it is to read*) again showed some moderate relationship with the SBAs (.38, α=.01 for Q44; .29, α=.05 for Q48) but nothing significant for the DRA. Finally, question 52—*I don’t like it when there are too many people in the story*—linked negatively to the DRA (-.42, α=.01) but not significantly to the SBA. Table 4-11 shows the relationship between all the MRQ questions, SBA results and *Efficacy* Question 9 which showed the strongest connection to SBA scores.

### Table 4-11

**Correlations among MRQ questions, SBA results, and Efficacy Question 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence and efficacy beliefs</th>
<th>Drop in means for boys/girls in 4th/5th grade</th>
<th>Question 50 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .37$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy (4 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know that I will do well in reading next year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA $r = .51$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am a good reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I learn more from reading than most students in the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. In comparison to my other school subjects I am best at reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge (5 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I like hard, challenging books</td>
<td>Means decline in 4th and again in 5th grade for boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA $r = .38$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like it when the questions in the book make me think</td>
<td>Means for 4th grade girls lower than for 3rd or 5th gr. girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I usually learn difficult things by reading</td>
<td>Question 2 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .55^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA $r = .35$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 7 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .40^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. If the project is interesting, I can read difficult material</td>
<td>Question 26 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .43^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA $r = .38$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 44 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .40^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. If a book is interesting I don’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Avoidance (4 items)</td>
<td>Girls report working harder in reading in 4th/5th gr.</td>
<td>5th gr. boys working hardest in reading 4th gr. boys report working least in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I don’t like reading something when the words are too difficult</td>
<td>Question 48 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at ( r = .46^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I don’t like vocabulary questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Complicated stories are not fun to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I don’t like it when there are too many people in the story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goals for reading

| Curiosity (6 items) | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5. If the teacher discusses something interesting I might read more about it | Means for 4th grade girls lower than for 3rd or 5th gr. girls |
| 8. I read about my hobbies to learn more about them | Means for 5th grade boys higher than for 3rd or 4th gr. boys |
| 13. I read to learn new information about topics that interest me | Question 13 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at \( r = .29^{*} \)  
Question 16 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at \( r = .35^{**} \) |
| SBA \( r = .30 \) | | |
| 16. I like to read about new things | | |
| 35. If I am reading about an interesting topic I sometimes lose track of time | | |
| 45. I enjoy reading books about people in different countries | | |

### Involvement (6 items)

| Involvement (6 items) | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10. I read stories about fantasy and make believe | Means for 4th grade girls lower than for 3rd or 5th gr. girls  
Drop in means for boys in 4th/5th grade |
| 24. I make pictures in my mind when I read | | |
| 30. I feel like I make friends with people in good books | Question 33 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at \( r = .40^{**} \) |
| 33. I like mysteries | Question 41 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at \( r = .27^{*} \)  
Question 46 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at \( r = .40^{**} \) |
| 41. I enjoy a long, involved story or fiction book | | |
| 46. I read a lot of adventure stories | | |

### Importance (2 items)

| Importance (2 items) | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 53. It is very important to me to be a good reader | Means decline in 4th and again in 5th grade for girls |
| 54. In comparison to other activities I do, it is very important to me to be a good reader | Means are high for boys across the three grades  
Question 53 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at \( r = .28^{*} \) |

### Recognition (5 items)
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. My friends sometimes tell me I am a good reader</td>
<td>Drop in means for girls in 4th/5th. Means decline in 4th and again in 5th grade for boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I like hearing the teacher say I read well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am happy when someone recognizes my reading</td>
<td>Question 17 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .25^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My parents often tell me what a good job I am doing in reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I like to get compliments for my reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grades (4 items)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. I look forward to finding out my reading grade</td>
<td>Means for 4th grade boys/girls lower than for 3rd or 5th gr. boys/girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Grades are a good way to see how well you are doing in reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I read to improve my grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My parents ask me about my reading grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competition (6 items)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I like being the only one who knows an answer in something we read</td>
<td>Means decline in 4th and again in 5th grade for girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I like being the best at reading</td>
<td>Means lower for 4th gr. boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is important for me to see my name on a list of good readers</td>
<td>Question 18 correlated to Question 9 (I am a good reader) at $r = .25^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I try to get more answers right than my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I like to finish my reading before other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I am willing to work hard to read better than my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social purposes of reading**

**Social (7 items)**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I visit the library often with my family</td>
<td>Means decline in 4th and again in 5th grade for boys/girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I often read to my brother or my sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I sometimes read to my parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My friends and I like to trade things to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I talk to my friends about what I am reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I like to help my friends with their schoolwork in reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I like to tell my family about what I am reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance (5 items)**
4. I do as little schoolwork as possible in reading  
6. I read because I have to  
25. I always do my reading work exactly as the teacher wants it  
32. Finishing every reading assignment is very important to me  
47. I always try to finish my reading on time  

| Means decline in 4th and again in 5th grade for boys/girls  
| Means for compliance were lower for students of new teachers  
| Means for compliance were lower for students of teachers with low academic expectations, who yelled or made negative remarks in the classroom, or who made negative remarks about students’ parents/community to researcher.  
| Means for compliance were higher for students whose teachers were connected to the community and had high academic expectations.  

**MRQ Analysis**

It is important to remember when comparing across grades that this was not the same cohort across a span of several years. Rather there were three distinct cohorts, each of which possessed different characteristics that accounted for some portion of the variance. With that in mind however, there were interesting patterns between grades and genders on several of the MRQ subscales.

There were some differences between male and female groups on the *Involvement* subscale. Girls’ scores on this subscale were higher at all grade levels, but girls had lower scores in fourth grade compared to third grade with slightly higher scores posted in the fifth grade and boys had lower scores in third grade compared to fourth/fifth grade scores. These questions reflected personal, intrinsic goals and genre preferences (*I read stories about fantasy and make believe; I make pictures in my mind when I read; I feel like I make friends with people in good books; I like mysteries; I enjoy a long, involved story or fiction book; I read a lot of adventure*...
stories). Since almost all older interviewees claimed to picture what they read, it was likely the questions driving the differences in scores were genre-related or about getting involved with characters during reading. Since girls claimed to read more overall at 3rd and 5th grades, this difference might also be expected. Average mean scores for fourth grade boys ranged below 2 on this subscale, but fifth grade girls ranged at the high end, between 3 and 4. Fourth grade boys interviewed were beginning to think about what was “cool” for older boys. It was acceptable to have expertise on certain topics, to be good at sports, and to laugh at crude humor (Captain Underpants jokes were still funny), but the fourth grade boys might have been reluctant to claim too much affinity for other genres that might not be considered masculine. Boys, especially younger boys told me in interviews that there were “girl” books and “boy” books. By fifth grade, the boys had established themselves to a certain degree and could relax a little in this regard, though fifth grade boys did not range into 4s for this subscale. If such genre-stereotyping was occurring, girls would have been free to read genres such as fantasy, which might be considered too feminine for boys. Second and third grade boys told me that “boy” books were about things like animals and trucks, and “girl” books were about things like princesses and Barbies, so there is some direct evidence of this. Titles from reading activity responses also reinforced this possibility, with girls preferring books such as Babysitter’s Club, and Hannah Montana, and boys more often sharing titles such as Captain Underpants, and Sponge Bob. Genre exploration by teachers in fourth and fifth grade classrooms appeared missing as well. I saw some evidence of pro-forma introductions to genres, but little support or teacher enthusiasm for learning about different kinds of texts.

On the Competition subscale, there was an interesting difference in means between grades for female students. While boys showed little difference between grades on this subscale, except that their scores in fifth grade were considerably higher than the fifth grade girls, girls’
scores were lower in fifth compared to third grade. Interviews suggested this was an age when boys began thinking about future leadership roles. Third grade girls appeared quite competitive, with scores barely dipping below a 3, but the range in fourth and fifth grade spread considerably and dipped overall. Even though many of these girls continued to exhibit strong competitiveness in games, particularly basketball and softball, none of the girls envisioned themselves as tribal leaders and did not talk about needing to be the “best” at certain things in order to compete effectively with other girls or for future leadership positions; whereas boys, particularly the most motivated readers did talk about future positions as leaders in the tribe and also wanted to be known as “experts” on certain topics among their peers, something none of the girls claimed during the interviews.

Girls were not only less competitive in the upper grades, they were also less compliant with their teachers. Boys showed the same pattern and same levels of less compliance in the upper grades, although since boys were also less compliant at third grade, the differences between grades was less substantial for boys. I suspected two factors at work. First, three of the five fourth and fifth grade teachers were first-year teachers. These new teachers were not from the community, and the two veteran teachers did not seem to have strong or healthy relationships with the community. One of the veteran teachers complained about parents and community values. The other bickered with students and often seemed sarcastic, even angry during those interactions. Third grade teachers on the other hand had links to the community and had developed strong personal relationships with students. They also had high expectations of students and set clear standards for behavior and academic work. I believed some teachers had students who reported greater compliance because of the student-teacher relationships in those classrooms and a closer look at student means on this subscale by classroom revealed this was probably the case. Students reported markedly less compliance with the new teachers and
teachers who seemed negative in interactions with students or who were negative about students’ parents and community. Another factor might be that interviews suggested older girls were pressured to begin complying with more passive gender roles in the community by fifth grade, so resisting at school could be a way to assume greater control of their lives in a place where that was possible.

The Challenge subscale also showed interesting patterns and differences between boys and girls. This was an important subscale because it was linked with efficacy and SBA performance. Means for both boys and girls were lower in fourth as compared to third grades, but girls in the fifth grade scored almost as high as third graders, while the boys’ fifth grade score was even lower. If boys were competing more in fifth grade, one possibility was that challenges that could cause them to slip in ranking might be avoided. Also, although researchers and reading specialists (e.g., McGee & Richgels, 1985; Pressley, 1998) assert that students should be reading to learn from their earliest experiences with text, there is still a tendency in school curriculum—and this was certainly the case at Saint Theresa—to transition students at fourth grade from skills instruction to reading more for comprehension and information. With new expectations for “reading to learn,” questions like: *I like hard, challenging books; I like it when the questions in the book make me think; and if the project is interesting, I can read difficult material* might be viewed differently by fourth and fifth grade students.

The subscale that showed the greatest differences between grades was the Efficacy subscale. Efficacy scores were lower in fourth compared to third grade and remained about the same at fourth and fifth grades. Third grade girls had higher ranging means with substantially lower mean ranges for girls in fourth grade. Boys ranged to the highest possible scores in third and fourth grade but in fifth grade the top scores were considerably lower. As noted above, many researchers (e.g., McGee & Richgels, 1985; Pressley, 1998) have discussed this age as the time
when some reading programs transition to more reading comprehension tasks that assume adequate decoding skills. It is important to remember this is not the ideal since students should be attending to comprehension from the beginning, but it is, nonetheless, a reality in many schools, including Saint Theresa. Students who do not cross this so-called “reading divide” successfully may begin to feel less confident about their reading ability. Also, this was not the same group moving from third to fourth grade, so it would be critical for leaders to track these differences in cohorts to see if they were repeated at this grade over multiple years. If so, it would suggest several possibilities.

First, as mentioned above, a dip in efficacy after third grade for students at Saint Theresa makes some sense based on the reading curriculum the school was using, which does increase demands for reading comprehension at the fourth grade. Increased demand for reading independently for academic purposes may be taking a toll on students’ sense of reading efficacy. In addition, I saw no instruction in fourth or fifth grade that would help students take advantage of text structures (e.g., headings, bold print, signal words in expository text; or story elements, plot structure in narrative text) and no reciprocal or comprehension strategies that might support students’ reading comprehension. There was also no classroom instruction in advanced code, such as syllable structure, spellings based on word origin, etc., and no systematic vocabulary instruction based on affixes, morphemes and so forth. In short, students seemed to be asked to cross the “reading to learn” divide without the support of a systematic curriculum developed for that purpose. Had fifth grade efficacy remained high, it would have been a greater surprise.

*Other Subscales*

Students were generally quite positive about the *Curiosity* subscale (*If the teacher discusses something interesting I might read more about it; I like to read about new things, etc.*).
Average mean scores ranged from 2-4 across the grades, with older students the most curious. *Curiosity* questions represented personal choice and control, something that appeared very important for Saint Theresa students. Having information others might not have also provided status among peers, particularly for boys.

Third grade girls found reading important (*It is very important to me to be a good reader; In comparison to other activities I do, it is very important to me to be a good reader*), but in fourth grade, girls’ average mean scores ranged quite low and stayed near that range (very low to highest possible) in fifth grade. Boys means’ were lower than girls’ in third grade, comparable in fourth grade, and higher than girls in fifth grade. Boys seemed to accept reading as important at all three grade levels, while girls unanimously endorsed this view in third grade but seemed less sure in the fifth grade. With boys and girls possibly thinking differently about future roles in the community, I wondered if some girls began to wane in their enthusiasm for the importance of reading. What may be keeping scores on the *Importance* subscale high overall is that almost all the students interviewed said they were going to college and linked good reading skills with success in high school and, later, in college. However, I wondered if some girls were beginning to view their caretaker roles as an alternative to college and adjusting their views of readings’ importance as a result. In retrospect, this would have been a good question to ask girls directly, but, indirectly, girls interviewed were less likely to name future careers, so there is some evidence to suggest this as a possibility.

Means on the *Recognition* subscale were wide-ranging for boys and fourth-grade girls, less so for the other girls. Girls appeared more interested in being recognized for their reading overall (*My friends sometimes tell me I am a good reader; I like hearing the teacher say I read well; I am happy when someone recognizes my reading; My parents often tell me what a good job I am doing in reading; I like to get compliments for my reading*), but both genders, across grade
levels, showed a range of individual preferences. Average mean scores showed fifth graders were the least interested in recognition for their reading, with girls showing higher means than boys at each grade level. This linked to approval-seeking behavior that was more prevalent among girls than boys during the interviews. As noted above, older students may also transition to more individual and intrinsic reasons for reading and show less need at the higher grades to comply with teachers or receive school recognition. However, Lepper, Henderlong Corpus, and Iyengar, (2005) suggested motivators such as grades might involve intrinsic factors if students saw grades as indicators of mastery over a goal they had set for themselves. This could be true of recognition too. This may explain the weaker relationships between the Full scale MRQ and the Importance and Compliance subscales but stronger connections with the Recognition and Grades subscales.

**Full Scale Scores and Comparisons to Other Studies**

Overall, Saint Theresa students were quite motivated to read. Fourth grade scores were slightly lower for both girls and boys than third grade scores and fifth grade scores were essentially the same as fourth grade scores. Fourth grade boys showed the greatest range of scores, but all of the groups seemed highly motivated to read.

Direct comparisons of subscale means from the Watkins and Coffey (2004) report were not possible because scores were not reported. However, Saint Theresa students reported slightly more motivation for reading on almost all the subscales than the low and middle income white and African American fifth and sixth graders in the Baker and Wigfield (1999) study. Saint Theresa means were lower on the Compliance subscale than means in the Baker and Wigfield study; and I have suggested teacher effects may account for some of this difference. Because the Compliance subscale was not linked to achievement, this difference does not appear immediately
critical to students at Saint Theresa, although, over time, non-compliance could have academic consequences.

At first glance, the *Work Avoidance* subscale seemed related to grade levels, in that boys appeared fairly work avoidant in third and fourth grade but then seemed to reverse this tendency in fifth grade, perhaps because of their interest in playing on sports teams; but there seemed to be more to it. The subscale includes negatively worded questions, including: *I don’t like reading something when the words are too difficult; I don’t like vocabulary questions; Complicated stories are not fun to read; I don’t like it when there are too many people in the story.* As discussed earlier, a case could be made for different interpretations by different students (and the greater standard deviations at 3rd and 4th grades supported this), although I do not believe students generally failed to understand or respond appropriately to the questions, and the subscale proved to be one of the most reliable. Third grade boys and girls showed almost the same level of work avoidance. In the fourth grade, girls were a little less work avoidant than third grade peers, and boys a little more work avoidant. However in the fifth grade, there was a reversal and boys were less work avoidant than girls who were less work avoidant than their third and fourth grade peers. Thus, fifth grade boys were the least work avoidant group. Many students at fifth grade might be less enthusiastic about difficult reading tasks than some of their younger peers, but they also seemed more willing overall to accept more reading work.

If younger students believed it was nonsense to *like reading something when the words are too difficult* or to *like it when there are too many people in the story,* this would also help explain the differences. Older students might begin to understand these questions as: *I can and will (rather than like to) read something when the words are very (rather than too) difficult; and I don’t like it when there are many (rather than too many) people in the story.* In other studies (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Watkins & Coffey, 2004), *Work Avoidance* was the least reliable
measure (or one of the two least reliable in Watkins & Coffey, study 1), while here, *Work Avoidance* was one of the most reliable subscales.

What students were thinking when they answered the negatively-phrased items remained a question. I did ask three highly motivated students about their responses. Two said they liked complicated stories with lots of characters; one said she liked complicated stories but not when there were *too* many people. I believe this was a matter of discernment and personal preference, not necessarily work avoidance. In a future study, I would recommend substituting positively phrased questions or checking reliability with duplicate, positively phrased mirrors to assure the wording did not affect responses.

**Links between MRQ and Reading Activity Scores**

It is important to remember that, so far, results were based upon students reporting how motivated, or not, they were to read. This revealed little about how much they actually did read. To find out more about what students read and how much they read, students were asked if they had read a book in the last week, the name of the book, brief description of the book or book’s author, and how often they read for fun. From these answers, they were assigned reading activity scores.

The reading activity scores were not substantially related to subscale scores but they did show some connection with seven MRQ questions. Students who said they did not read for fun were also less likely to say they liked difficult books, would not seek more information about an interesting topic in a book, did not read fantasy and make believe, did not often read to siblings, *did* care how hard a book was too read, and did not often hear their friends tell them they were good readers. For students who said they read often for fun, the reverse was true. Students whose reading activity scores were in the middle varied in their responses to these questions. It
was interesting though that students who read for fun (activity score=6) or did not read for fun (activity score=1) did not report being best at reading in comparison to other school subjects. If students are not good at reading they might avoid it, so that makes sense, but if students read often for fun, there is some expectation that reading would also be a favored school subject. One reason this question may have diverged from that expectation is Saint Theresa students seem to enjoy math very much and many of the best readers also believed math was their strongest subject.

Girls’ scores on the reading activities were higher than boys at third and fifth grades but a little lower than boys in fourth grade. Boys’ scores were about the same in third and fourth grade but were a little lower in fifth grade. Third grade teachers worked hard to engage students in reading and writing activities. In fifth grade, the veteran teacher provided time for students to read independently. He was also assigned the better readers, so in fifth grade, good readers were given substantial blocks of time to read daily, although reading selections were chosen by the teacher. Problems in the fourth grade included two new teachers and a veteran teacher with difficult student interactions and views on parents and community. The second factor that might change for boys in the fifth grade seemed to be involvement in organized sports. Many boys and some girls were beginning to juggle the demands of after-school practice with schoolwork and reading for fun might have been jettisoned as a result. I heard this from one third grade girl during the interviews, from a fourth-grader who said he had to devote more time to Keres language study, and from a fifth grade boy. There was no time allotted in the curriculum to read for enjoyment and only the one fifth grade class with an extended period of independent reading time—and this was the result of a teacher who did not seem to want to exert much effort in terms of classroom planning.
Reading Achievement and MRQ

Older, fourth and fifth grade students reported complying less with teachers, but my observations suggested this was partly related to classroom pedagogy and the fact that three of the five 4th and 5th grade teachers were new teachers. Means for compliance were lower for new teachers’ students and also for students whose teachers yelled or made negative remarks in the classroom, or made negative remarks about parents/community during my member checks with teachers. Girls might have also believed it was safe to exert personal choice and control at school at a time when their independence may begin to be limited in the community. Generally, the Compliance, Social, and Grades subscales were not linked to achievement, so I do not discuss them here.

Also, while students may not have complied well with teachers, they were not necessarily avoiding reading work, in that 4th and 5th grade girls and 5th grade boys said they did not mind reading difficult books, doing vocabulary questions, or reading complicated stories with lots of people in the story. Since the Work Avoidance scale was not connected to reading achievement, these differences were also considered less important in terms of reading achievement.

There were six questions that were closely connected to achievement: 9—I am a good reader, 2—I like hard, challenging books, 44—if the project is interesting, I can read difficult material, 26—I usually learn difficult things by reading, 13—I read to learn new information about topics that interest me, and 48—if a book is interesting I don’t care how hard it is to read. Four of these questions (2, 26, 44, and 48) were from the Challenge subscale and another (13) was from the Curiosity subscale. Both the Challenge and the Curiosity subscales had strong intrinsic components suggesting students who were achieving the highest levels on the SBA were also intrinsically motivated. It is important to note also that 5th grade boys appeared more curious than 3rd or 4th grade boys, but less interested in a challenge that their 3rd and 4th grade peers. As I
suggested earlier, boys in the fifth grade talked about future leadership roles in the community as well as career goals, but they were also beginning to jockey for status among the other boys. One way for boys to achieve that status was to become an expert on a particular topic. The strong curiosity scores could have been related to this. Accepting challenges, however, exposed boys to the risk of failure and this may have also impacted the Challenge subscale.

Girls in the 4th grade reported lower means than both their 3rd and 5th grade peers on both the Challenge and the Curiosity subscales. Girls in the fourth grade seemed to struggle with challenge and curiosity but the girls in fifth grade appeared to have an easier time. With the important connections here to SBA achievement, these findings are noteworthy.

The question with the strongest link to the SBA was question 9—*I am a good reader.* Social cognitive theory would predict this strong association, since questions like number 9 get to the heart of a student’s reading efficacy beliefs, and efficacy, in turn, is thought by these theorists to predict reading achievement. Question 9 was also strongly correlated with another efficacy question, 50—*In comparison to my other subjects I am best at reading.* This was no surprise, but it was a concern that, compared to 3rd grade peers, both boys and girls reported lower efficacy in 4th grade and even lower efficacy in the 5th grade. Whether it was a change in curriculum, a problem with ineffective teachers, or combinations of these and other factors, the link between reading efficacy and achievement suggested this is an important finding to which school leaders, community, and parents should attend carefully.

Question 9, with its strong link to achievement, was also closely connected to all the questions in the Challenge subscale. This makes the lower scores for 4th grade girls and lower scores for both 4th and 5th grade boys on this subscale an important finding.

Another scale that seemed closely linked to question 9 was the Involvement scale, with three questions that connected to reading efficacy. Again, 4th grade girls reported lower means
than 3rd or 5th grade girls, and 4th and 5th grade boys had lower means that their 3rd grade peers or any of the female cohorts. This subscale was related to what students were reading. Students who were the most efficacious also seemed to like long, involved mysteries and adventure stories. Since this was only a correlation, it is difficult to know which came first, enjoying the genre and becoming more efficacious as a result, or feeling confident enough to tackle such stories in the first place. It appeared that teachers could be exposing students to more genre exploration, particularly at fourth and fifth grades. There was also some gender stereotyping in regards to types of books acceptable for boys and girls, and boys at this age may be opting for more expository text to gain expertise on topics that would impress other boys.

The other three questions related to efficacy were: 53—*It is very important to me to be a good reader*, 17—*I like hearing the teacher say I read well*, and 18—*I like being the best at reading*. It is interesting that the importance of reading was high for boys across the three grades, but for girls the importance of reading was lower in 4th grade and even lower in the 5th grade. Again, girls who were motivated readers did not report diminished career goals, but interviews suggested less motivated girls may have lowered their expectations for future careers by fifth grade. Again, cohort changes in this regard over time would be helpful.

In terms of being recognized for their reading, 4th and 5th grade girls did not seem as interested as 3rd grade girls, and 4th and 5th grade boys were even less interested in being recognized than their female peers. On the competition subscale, girls were much less interested in competing at reading in 4th compared to 3rd grade and means were much lower again in 5th compared to 4th grade. Boys took a slight dip in 4th grade means but the differences across grades were not substantial although boys appeared quite a bit more competitive about reading in the 5th grade than their female 5th grade peers. Possible explanations were discussed above, but the issue
might be addressed head-on with girls to get their ideas and thoughts. It is possible teachers will find it difficult, however, to address these gender differences and also respect community values.

Chapter Summary

Results from the Motivations to Read Scale (MRS), showed Saint Theresa first and second graders were generally quite motivated to read, more so than the first grade, low and middle income, African American and white students from Baker & Scher’s 2000 study. Unfortunately, MRS reliability for this population was lower than desirable.

First grade boys seemed a little less motivated to read than other Saint Theresa first and second grade students. Based on classroom observations this could have been because reading generally meant seatwork and there were a number of first grade boys who had a particularly difficult time remaining seated.

First and second grade students at Saint Theresa reported enjoying reading. The students also said they valued reading and felt competent as readers. The value scores might have had an element of social desirability but the second grade students interviewed seemed to corroborate that these younger students at Saint Theresa did believe reading was important and valuable. Interviews with second graders also supported findings that these young students believed they were competent readers, even when their quantitative scores showed they were less motivated to read overall.

Reading motivation and reading achievement, as measured by DRA levels, were weakly but significantly linked for Saint Theresa first and second graders, but no major differences were found based on gender or grade level. Students’ reading motivation as measured on the Enjoyment, Value, and Competence subscales and the Full scale scores were connected to student
achievement on the DRA, but overall Full scale scores showed a stronger relationship to DRA reading achievement levels than any of the individual subscales.

**Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grade Summary**

Girls posted higher scores on the *Involvement* subscale. Interviews with students suggested strong gender stereotypes, so it may be that older boys were beginning to distinguish “acceptable” genres, and fantasy may not have been among them. Gender stereotyping around genres suitable for boys or girls may have affected this subscale and lack of exposure in classrooms might have contributed to results as well.

Girls showed important differences in means on the *Competition* subscale and had lower means in fourth compared to third grade and even lower scores in fifth grade than in fourth grade. Boys, on the other hand, showed less difference by grade level but fourth grade boys had lower means than their third or fifth grade peers. Boys may embrace competitiveness as a result of sports participation and also in anticipation of future leadership roles in the community, whereas girls did not share plans for future community leadership roles during interview sessions.

Girls also showed notable differences in means on the *Compliance* subscale. This may have been a way for girls to gain some personal control at school at a time when they may see themselves losing control in the community. It might also have resulted from interactions with inexperienced teachers and certain other teachers who disparaged them, their culture, and their community. Since compliance was not linked to reading achievement, these differences may not be critical for Saint Theresa students unless they were sustained or exacerbated over time.

The *Challenge* subscale also showed differences between boys and girls. Boys who seemed to be competing more by fifth grade might avoid challenges that could cause them to slip in ranking. The differences between younger and older students may also reflect a change in
curriculum when students moved from “learning to read” to “reading to learn.” With higher
expectations for performance, challenges may be greater and less welcomed by older students.
The findings on this subscale were critical because the Challenge subscale showed the strongest
links to reading achievement on the state’s high-stakes test (SBA).

Scores on the Efficacy subscale were considerably lower in fourth and fifth grade as
compared to third grade scores. Again, increased expectations with the change in instructional
focus from decoding to comprehension may take a toll. Lack of classroom instruction aimed at
helping students master greater comprehension demands may have also contributed.

Students from Saint Theresa claimed to be more positively motivated to read overall than
students in the Baker and Wigfield (1999) study, but Saint Theresa students had lower means on
the Compliance subscale, likely related to teacher effects, but possibly also related to other effects
discussed above. Again, the lack of connection between compliance and reading achievement at
Saint Theresa makes these findings less important overall.

Certain MRQ questions were related to reading activity scores designed to assess how
much students said they read. Generally, students who reported reading more also enjoyed “hard,
challenging books,” might read more about an interesting topic the teacher discussed, might read
fantasy and make believe, might read often to a sibling, had friends who complimented them on
their reading, would tackle an interesting book no matter how hard it was, and believed they were
better at reading than at other school subjects. These findings suggested reading activity was also
related to reading achievement since several of these questions were from the same subscales that
showed additional links to efficacy and challenge, which were strongly connected to reading
achievement.

Standards-based assessment scores were tied significantly to the Challenge subscale, and
means on this subscale were lower for fourth grade students as compared to third graders. Boys
were lowest on the Challenge subscale in fifth grade, with possibly important implications for future performance.

I turn now to the primary research question, which centered on what students, identified as highly motivated or less motivated to read by the MRS/MRQ, said about what influenced their reading motivation. Chapter 5 shares qualitative results and analyzes social influences on students’ reading motivation and personal responses that resulted from those surrounding influences. Chapter 6 discusses the implications of both qualitative and quantitative findings.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS: QUALITATIVE QUESTION

This chapter addresses the study’s primary aim, which was to learn what Saint Theresa students, identified as highly motivated to read, would say about reading and how that compared to peers who appeared less motivated to read on the MRS or MRQ. Results are divided into two sections that emerged from transcript analysis. The person sections were the outside influences that seemed to affect students’ views of reading, or their view of themselves, as readers. The self sections present intrapersonal characteristics, or what students said about themselves as readers.

Qualitative Results

Students’ stories were analyzed using procedures recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1998). I began with a microanalysis of transcripts to develop categories and dimensions. Although I initially noted some differences between grade levels and genders, more careful analysis showed that these differences were less distinct than the differences between the highly and less motivated readers.

During microanalysis, words and phrases emerged that seemed to fall into two categories: one related to “self,” and one related to “person.” Statements related to “persons” were further separated by societal dimensions, cultural dimensions, school/peer dimensions, and a hybrid dimension that seemed to be a blend of cultural, school, and peer effects. Most of the codes related to “person” could have been grouped with what Eccles (2002) termed “socializers’ beliefs,” but it seemed important to try to distinguish which “socializer” was exerting the
influence in order to make the results more practical to educational leaders and other community members.

A very clear “self” also emerged from the students’ words, and seemed to separate into past, present, projected, and present and projected dimensions. According to Harré (1984), individuals mine surrounding influences and organize what they find into a unique collection of thoughts, feelings, wishes, desires, and beliefs, in other words, a unique “self.”

Because these were case studies, I developed memos for each student, which I referred to before the next session and revised afterwards. Moving the interviews to the village library improved the quality. Students were comfortable there and students who had not been selected wanted to talk too. I also learned a good deal about the community by working in the village after school.

**Person—Societal Dimensions**

The society that surrounded students appeared to influence their reading primarily through the books available to read and conceptions about the importance of college. Most students got their books from the school library, the village library, or from WalMart, a discount store about 30 minutes from the community. Two of the most highly motivated readers—both boys—talked about their parents taking them to libraries in nearby urban centers, to museums, and to bookstores in other cities during trips with family. By and large though, students depended on local sources for books and these sources were limited.

With only a few beginning reading books available in Keres, controversy over whether Keres should be written at all, and few books by or about Pueblo people in local collections, books to which students had access were primarily produced by the surrounding non-Native society. Only one student interviewed mentioned a book by a Native American author or a book
about Native Americans. This was Meredith\textsuperscript{19}, a highly motivated third grade reader, who said her mother knew a woman who was Native American who had written a book, which the school librarian had acquired. Meredith had not read it, but she found the fact quite interesting. Mostly though, students talked about the *Harry Potter* series, *Goosebumps*, and the new teen vampire novels. Books mentioned during the interviews and listed on the reading activity question for the MRQ would be among those typically read by their middle class, grade level peers in almost any school in the country. Reviewing transcripts, I was unable to find a single reference—other than Meredith’s—to any text a student had read that might be considered culturally relevant. There were only two references that even came close: *Island of the Blue Dolphins*, and *Morning Girl*—both stories about adolescents from indigenous island societies.

Culturally relevant literature was largely missing from classrooms too, although teachers from the surrounding community and the Anglo teacher who worked to establish ties with the community had a few offerings for children. I asked several other teachers what students read in their classroom that might link to students’ lives or their culture. One told me there were no stories available that would relate to their lives—she said this as though none had ever been written. Two others showed me the textbook series and pointed out the multicultural stories there—mostly involving African American and Hispanic characters. Thus, the society that surrounds this Pueblo influenced students by providing the texts students read.

The surrounding society also exerted influence on students by pressuring them to attend college. Invited speakers from the community disseminated this message. District visitors mentioned it to students. Students said they saw such messages on T.V. The message seemed to

\textsuperscript{19} As with the district name, all student names are pseudonyms to preserve anonymity. Throughout this section “highly motivated” means the student was identified as highly motivated in reading on the MRS/MRQ (75\textsuperscript{th} percentile or above) and the teacher rated him/her as average or high in reading motivation. “Less motivated” means the student was identified as less motivated in reading on the MRS/MRQ (25\textsuperscript{th} percentile or below) and the teacher rated him/her as having little motivation.
inundate students from the outside in, but not exclusively so, which is why I discuss it further under _Blended dimensions_ below.

**Person—Cultural Dimensions**

The societal influences students experienced were moderated by cultural influences that were closer and more immediate. The filial aspects of culture seemed to exert powerful pressures on students. Many of the most motivated readers had family members who were also avid readers or who encouraged their children to read and achieve at school. However, culture influenced reading motivation in other ways too, as discussed in the following sections.

**Keres**

Students spoke often about becoming more proficient in their native language. Keres language skills were considered critical for future leadership roles in the community, particularly for future tribal positions. Brent (HM4=Highly motivated 4th grade student) said he was working hard to learn Keres and that it was very important because, “I want to be in the culture of Keres so I could—how would you say—be like in the customs and like others. [Do you want a leadership role in the tribe some day?] No, because if I have the whole responsibility—well I would but I don’t think I could because I’m still learning Keres and I don’t know how to speak yet.” Charity, a less motivated 5th grade student, explained Keres “will keep our tradition, our culture together.” There was also some fear of immediate consequences for those who did not take their language instruction seriously. Kimber (LM2) said if she did not learn Keres “they might spank you.”

Keres was mentioned, too, in terms of inter-tribal connections and protection from outside influences. Darin (LM3) said that Keres was very important “so you can speak to—like
my mom wants me to speak Keres—to know those Indians [from other tribes]. Some speak Keres and some English.” Meredith (HM3) added, “Everyone in the village is afraid if we lose our language people not from here will move in and they will do different.” Roland (HM3) expanded, explaining, “If we stop talking our language it will be lost and nobody will be speaking it and the few people who speak when they die they might not have time to teach their grandchildren. Then some guys might take over the village and turn it into a city. Like what happened at [another Pueblo].”

Learning Keres was so essential to students’ futures that one fourth-grader told me, “If you don’t learn, the governor won’t accept you and you won’t stay there [in the community]. They’ll take you somewhere. [So in order to stay in the village you have to learn Keres?] Yes” (Keesha, HM4). Meredith (HM3) added, “when we dance he [her grandfather—a tribal official] wants us to speak our own language so people on the sides aren’t going to understand us.” Her grandfather told me in a separate interview that Keres was integral to local ceremonies and his grandchildren were not allowed to dance until they had a certain level of competence in Keres.

The desire to speak Keres fluently was great and students articulated strong, clear motivations for learning their language well. Given the choice to learn Keres or read English, there would be no contest; it would be Keres hands down. This was important in terms of motivation and also because Keres language skills may have implications for English reading skill and motivation, which I discuss further below.
Impact of Reading on Traditional Practices and Vice Versa

In early talks with the Pueblo Governor, he mentioned that, traditionally, it was considered rude to take a book and go off by oneself to read. This proscription seems to have been lost on most of the study’s respondents. Only two students said it would be rude to read alone. These two also said reading alone was acceptable if they gained permission first from their parents. Another less motivated second grade girl told me when she watched the community’s traditional dances, it made her want to be a better reader. I asked why and she said, “Because it will help me with my grades and all the things I need to learn.”

I was not sure students would know what I meant by “traditional practices” or “traditional family,” so I asked them what they thought it meant to be “traditional.” Speaking Keres well was one of the most important characteristics. Participating in the traditional dances was also considered crucial. Feast days and other holidays, “like the Easter Egg Hunt and all that” contributed to their definition of “traditional,” as did celebrating other events such as the birth of babies. Cleaning and making “traditional” food was important, as was caring for younger siblings. Traditional food, I was told, “is the food we always eat, like bread.” Shelly (LM4) explained that “traditional means that they like speak well and they like to dance down here and when we have a feast that’s our traditional day.” Meredith (HM3) gave a more detailed explanation. Traditional to her meant: “For the village to learn the language and know my language of my Pueblo and people not to be drinking and people not to be smoking and burning up the place where animals live because we have a lot of people and a lot of animals out there and all kind of plants that we grow and for people not to be making roads on the mountain on the dirt place because they make a lot of dirt roads on the mountain. When you used to look at the mountain, the mountain used to look pretty now it looks so weird because people like to drive on it and they make roads on it.”
On a likert scale of one to four, with four being most traditional, all students except one rated their families four—most traditional. The exception rated her family a three, but was not willing to explain the reason. (This was a student with lower status in the community—something discussed in detail later.) I then asked if being traditional affected students’ reading. Shelly (LM4) told me “when I spend more time at home and at my grandma’s house I read more books over there.” Several students suggested more traditional families spent more time at home. Charity (HM2) believed more traditional students read better “because they are better students.” Jason (HM2) had a surprisingly sophisticated answer. He told me reading helps children maintain traditions because “reading makes you better at language.” It seemed important that this came from a second grader who was still learning to read. Keesha (HM4) believed reading in Keres helped students “learn the words” and that this could then be transferred to English.

On the other hand, Brent (HM4) told me reading had a cost, as it could affect students’ ability to practice their traditional ways “because when I read I have less time for Keres.” Keesha also said, “Sometimes if you read something it takes time. [So it might take time away from practicing your traditions?] Uh huh.” William (LM4) shared another problem. He said, “I have to go to the classes [special education resource room]. . . and at my other grandma’s house I have to talk Keres over there. Talking Keres can get me confused and that makes it harder to read in English.” Meredith’s family seemed to have worked out these difficulties and Meredith (HM3) had no problem speaking different languages in different settings. She said, “I can understand both languages and I can talk both and I practice Keres but I can speak. I can only talk English at school but at home the rule is to talk Keres. That’s how we know how to talk and my grandpa is strict.”
Mentoring

I asked students: “Is there a special person in your life who’s really helped you do well in school?” All students readily answered “yes” and most (14 of 17) said their parents, particularly mothers (12 of 14), encouraged and helped students succeed in school. All of the highly motivated readers talked about parents serving in this mentoring role. Two of the less motivated readers mentioned an older sibling rather than a parent helping them with school and reading. Only one less motivated second grade boy and a highly motivated second grade girl mentioned teachers, as well as parents, in a mentoring role. Both students had the same teacher and she was from a nearby community married to a person from their own community.

Status and Reading Motivation

Besides mentors, students received support from other relationships at home and school. Teachers, whether they were connecting with students effectively in terms of curriculum and pedagogy or not, seemed to enjoy students who were motivated to read. Struggling teachers mentioned these motivated readers to me informally or during member checks and held these students up as examples of what they could achieve as teachers when, as one teacher put it, students “just tried.” They also mentioned some of the less motivated readers as examples of the failure that resulted when parents were not supportive. Generally, motivated readers had high status with teachers. I heard teachers compliment and praise them and occasionally hold them up for other students to emulate—something the motivated readers themselves did not all enjoy. Also, some students came from families with high community status and thus had the attention of teachers from the community as well as instructional assistants and other staff (all from the local community). However, at least two of the more motivated readers did not have high status in the
community. Their parents were not among those who organized and led traditional ceremonies or participated in community decision-making, according to at least two community insiders.

One of these students, Roland, had substantial family support from his mother and brother.

Another, Brent, did not have the family support, but had attended the local Head Start program and claimed he was a precocious reader, which may have garnered teacher attention to him early.

Thinking of these and other students in terms of status and reading motivation, I realized the interviews had identified three quadrants of a status and reading motivation matrix (see Figure 5-1 below).

**Figure 5-1.** Family status and reading motivation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High community status</th>
<th>Low community status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low reading motivation (no examples identified)</td>
<td>Low reading motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High community status</th>
<th>Low community status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High reading motivation</td>
<td>High reading motivation (mitigating factors: Head Start, teacher/school status, family support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community status was defined here as a family’s social and cultural capital within the community and was determined mostly by information from community insiders. Cultural capital included status markers, such as advanced Keres language skills, knowledge of traditional ceremonies, including dances and songs, cultural transmission to children. Social capital entailed access to networks of influence engendered by cultural capital, including participation and leadership in community events and tribal planning and other government activities. Generally, children took the status of the parent with which they were living; however in some cases this was more complicated, since some children were not living with parents. Also, adults might have cultural capital but may have violated community norms (for instance by marrying outside the tribe) resulting in lost social capital. This was the case with parents of at least two students in the study with low community status, one of whom, Brent, had a high-status grandfather. This child seemed to believe that with enough work he could gain the grandfather’s approval and improve his own status. The other student, Javin, had a parent from outside the tribe and he seemed to accept his low status in this community. It was possible this student had higher status in his other parent’s tribe.
No students were identified as fitting in the high status/low motivation quadrant, though conceivably there may be students like this at Saint Theresa. Javin was typical of the low status/low motivation quadrant. One of his parents was from a different (non-Pueblo) tribe; his skills were low and so was his reading motivation. Meredith represented the high status/high motivation quadrant; and Brent was a good example of the low status/high motivation quadrant. Brent seemed to have caught the attention of teachers at the school but, despite his relationship with a high-status grandfather, he lived with a low-status family. He was determined to gain his community status back and was highly motivated to read and learn Keres. Students with high reading motivation had status either in the community or in school, strong family support, or combinations of these factors.

Reading for the Future of Others

Three highly motivated students explained that their own reading was important for the future of others. Brent (HM4) said he might want to be a babysitter or a teacher in the future and he would need to know how to read well in order to teach other children. Lenny (HM4) explained that he read nightly bedtime stories to his little sister because that was important to her future. However, the most extensive projection came from Meredith (HM3), who mapped her future all the way to her own children. She said, “Once I get that job I’m gonna work there for a long time and learn different stuff so I get to do and learn different stuff. And then when I have my kids I’ll tell them where I went up to and how I got my degree and for them to go to high school and college and never drop out of school and for them to keep on reading and do their homework every day.”
Gender Roles

Probably the most surprising finding was students’ views of appropriate female roles within tribal leadership. Women were stereotyped in supportive roles for male leaders. This did not become apparent in answers to questions about whether girls or boys were better readers. Answers to that question were mixed, so I did not yet understand how clear students were that women could not be the tribal governor or hold a tribal office.

In casual conversation one day, I asked a community informant why I could not think of any female governors among the Pueblo tribes right now. She gave me a quizzical look and said because there were none. She went on to discuss a Pueblo tribe she thought would probably be one of the first to accept women as tribal leaders, but added that she also thought her tribe would be one of the last to allow women in official tribal leadership roles. I decided to ask students about this and they clearly had the same understanding. Thirteen of the seventeen students said a woman could not be governor of their tribe. All of the less motivated students believed this, except for a second grade boy who would not answer the question, a second grade girl, and another who had an unusual but important answer, which I share below. Only four students believed it might be possible for a woman to become a tribal governor—all male, one second grader, the less motivated reader mentioned above, and two students, Brent (HM4) and Roland (HM3), who were clearly the most avid readers. Roland had a strong female role model, his mother, and this was reflected in his answer. One highly motivated girl believed women should be governors but also said it was not currently possible. Because this became an important issue in the final analysis, sharing students’ exact words seems warranted. Depending on where we were in the conversation, I may have phrased the question a little differently, but essentially it was, “Can women become tribal governors?”
Brent (HM4):

I think not. [What are women’s leadership roles in the tribe?] They make dough and bread, teach Keres, cook. [But what about leadership roles?] They teach Keres.

Cody (HM5):

Maybe. There’s not women governors now because they don’t speak up and try to get elected. [Would you want a woman governor?] They’ll probably want the same things for the village.

Danelle (HM2):

No [a girl could not be governor]. Only the police. [Why can’t you have a girl governor?] Because they don’t know what to do. Because if girls be the governor, the boys would tell her what to do. They would tell her to quit because girls can’t be at war.

Charity (LM5):

They only let guys do that. [Why?] Because they’re stronger than women and the women have to do chores. [Why do you have to be stronger to be governor or tribal officer?] You have to be stronger because the guys have more strength. And they have to catch drunk people and stop whatever trouble there is.

Meredith (HM3):

The governors only represent the boys. But my little sister is mean and she’s bossy. When she’s asleep my mom says if there were girls who could be a tribal officer it should be your little sister because she’s so mean. [So maybe your little sister?] Yes, she’s mean and bossy. But there’s no women governors because at night the guys drink and get tough and the tribal officers have to get rough and protect the church because the boys are stronger. [What do girls do then?] Girls start to cook when they turn seven. [How do girls influence the community?] They make
decisions and then tell the governor who tells all the people. [Do you want that to change?] No, because I really want the tribe to stop drinking.

Javin (LM5):

There’s like stuff we can’t say. [Well, do you think a woman should be a governor?] I don’t know. [If some girl here said she wanted to be a governor what would you tell her?] Go to another Pueblo.

Roland (HM3):

Some men don’t want girls for governors. [Why?] The guys say something will go wrong if a girl’s the governor. [What do you think?] That’s kind of wrong. I think they should give a woman a chance. Some say the problem is that women are not strong enough to handle the men who are drinking. [What do you think about that?] No. Because my dad used to be a drinker and my mom handled him and she told me what she would do when he’d get drunk and start something. [So you think women could handle it?] Yeah.

Keesha (HM4):

Because it’s only for boys. [Why is that?] Because girls can’t handle boys when they’re drinking. [What if the governor had men handle the men who were drinking then could a woman governor do other things?] No, because they might need help. [So how are women leaders in the community?] Cooking cleaning, going shopping and that’s it.

Lenny (HM4):

No, because the boys are mostly the ones that have to do the important stuff, but the girls just stay home and wait for the boys. [Why?] Because the boys have to do important stuff and sometimes they have to go to important places where girls aren’t allowed. Sometimes they have to be busy. [So what are the leadership roles for women?] Their roles are waiting for the boys
and cooking, cleaning, taking care of the kids—but the boys have to work. [Do you think that will change in the future?] No.

Keesha (HM4):

There’s only boy governors. Because girls only work in the front office. [Why?]

Because it’s not allowed. They’re not allowed in the governor’s office without permission.

[Why aren’t there women governors or tribal officers?] I don’t really know.

Elena (HM5):

[Do you think you might be a tribal leader one day?] No because it’s only for boys.

[Why?] I don’t know. [Should that change?] Yes. [Tell me about that.] So girls can see how it’s like to be tribal leaders. [If girls are not tribal leaders what are they responsible for in the village?] Cleaning, cooking. [Do you think women would make good tribal leaders?] Yes because … so… women could… [(Stopped talking) What do women maybe have that men don’t?] They’re brave and they know how to do stuff on the farm. But one thing that tribal leaders do is handle men who have been drinking. [Could women do that?] Well, they could just call tribal officials to handle that.

William (LM4):

[Could women be governor?] No. They’re not allowed. Only the boys, the men, could be to guard the church and do all that. [A girl is the librarian. What other leadership roles do women play in the village?] They can be going to this place where all the girls go like all the old girls. I don’t know what they do in that thing but they have to wear dresses. [What’re their jobs in the village?] Don’t know. [An educational assistant from the community entered and William stopped talking altogether.]

Darin (LM3):
We never had a girl governor. So we need to get a girl governor [tribal] and a girl president [U.S.]. That’s something I was thinking.

Attitudes about whether girls or boys were better readers were more subtle, but still noteworthy. In second grade, students exhibited typical gender affiliation. Jason told me there were “girl books” about Barbie and princesses and “boy books” about animals, and boys were better readers. At this age, girls thought girls were best and boys thought boys were best at everything. This was the tendency in third grade too, although Darin thought maybe girls and boys were “the same” as readers. In the fourth and fifth grades, all but two students believed boys and girls were equal as readers. The exceptions were one fourth grade girl with low motivation who thought girls might be better readers and one highly motivated fifth grade girl who thought girls were definitely better readers. The exchanges with both were interesting:

Asked, “Who do you think reads the most: girls or boys?” Shelly (LM4) said, “Girls, well sometimes girls and sometimes boys. [Why do you think some girls read more?] Well, sometimes the girls are smart [pause] but sometimes the girls don’t really want to be smart.” She would not explain her statement.

Elena (HM5), the more motivated reader explained that girls are better readers “because sometimes boys don’t understand [Why don’t they—they seem smart] Sometimes we (girls) read hard books [They don’t challenge themselves?] Right!”

Person—School/Peer Dimensions

In addition to societal and cultural influences, students were also immersed in a school setting where peers, teachers, and others at the school exposed them to additional thoughts and ideas about reading. Teachers were charged with providing students not only the motivation but
also the skills needed to read well. What students said about these influences was particularly interesting.

**Teacher-talk about Reading**

Asked what teachers at the school told students about reading, Cody (HM5) said, “They think it’s good to read so I have a good job when I grow up.” However, this encouragement from teachers was not universal. The other fifth graders could not remember their teachers talking about reading. One of them said she thought her teacher believed it was important to learn how to read. However, when I asked her if the teacher explained why, this highly motivated reader responded, “No. but probably there’s like tests.”

In second grade, only two students could think of anything their teachers had told them about reading (one with high and one with less reading motivation). The highly motivated reader said his teacher told him reading was “good” and that it “helps us learn.” The less motivated readers said her teacher told her to “put [her] hands under the words” when she was reading and “whisper.”

In third grade, the less motivated girl could not think of anything her teacher had told her about why it was important to read. In contrast, the three other third grade children were in the same class and had very specific things to report. Meredith (highly motivated) said her teacher “tells me it’s good to get my brain on. I told her I wanted to become a nurse and she told me to keep on reading so I could be a better reader and I could learn what the nurses do.” Meredith’s male counterpart, Roland, also listed specific things his teacher had told him about reading, and gave an example of reading’s importance: “like that one time she was testing us—if we knew how to say the words for science—like the minerals, like marble and stuff like that, and that’s why it helps to read.”
In fourth grade, a highly motivated girl said her teacher explained the negative consequences of not reading well and a highly motivated boy said his teacher told him reading “was good, because in high school and college the work gets harder so we have to learn now and get ready for that.” The less motivated fourth graders said their teachers had explained that reading “makes you smarter” and “helps you go to college.”

**Regrouping for Reading**

The school regrouped students during reading by ability, so second grade students might work with first grade students if they were struggling; other second graders might work with a group at grade level, or with third grade students if they were advanced in reading. This practice was instituted when the school was using the *Success for All* reading program and continued after the program was discontinued. Four of the more motivated readers and three of the less motivated readers tried to explain why students were placed in different reading groups. The criteria were not clear. Meredith, an articulate and highly motivated third grade student said, “Because at the beginning of the year, I was still reading third grade level. [How do you know?] Because they test us at the beginning of the year to see whose class we go to in reading.” Brent, another articulate informant, was vague on this subject. He said, “It’s about our strategies and our level. [How do they decide what level you are?] You know, there’s like some teachers and they test you to see how fast you could read in a minute.” The highly motivated students seemed disconnected from the process. But one less motivated fourth grade boy believed his placement in a lower reading group was because “I get confused with the lines—following the lines.”

I asked a less motivated third grade girl if anyone at her school ever mentioned that some students were in a reading group with younger students. This was a little girl teachers said could be a behavior problem. I said:
[Do they compare kids like that at school?] Actually, they even say that to me. I know one person but I forgot her name [who said it]. [Do the teachers ever say that?]
Sometimes the teachers say that. [How does that make you feel?] I do not like it [resounding do not]. [It seems a little rude.] Yeah! [emphatically, and as though I was finally beginning to understand].

**Writing Connections**

Very little was said about writing. I did not have specific questions about writing and I only noticed two classrooms in the entire school where it seemed students were doing significant amounts of writing. One was a first grade classroom and the other was in the third grade. However, the students who mentioned writing spontaneously during our interviews were older. One was a highly motivated fourth grade boy who told me simply that it was important to stay focused in both reading and writing; and the other was a highly motivated fifth grade boy who shared his plans for becoming an author one day. The fifth grade student was interesting too because he was in a classroom with a teacher who seemed to have a poor relationship with students. Apparently though, this teacher had encouraged Cody by commenting on the quality of a story he submitted for a classroom assignment. This had started Cody thinking about a career as a writer and he seemed to be forming distinct and substantial plans to pursue that goal.

**School and Library Changes to Motivate Reading**

Students shared that they thought the school could do more to motivate readers. The more motivated readers had the most specific ideas (11 motivated v. 6 less motivated shared ideas for school-wide changes; 9 motivated v. 3 less motivated shared ideas regarding library changes), but some of the ideas from the less motivated readers were very creative. For instance, William (LM4) thought it would be a good idea to build a bigger gym so students who finished their
reading in class could have 30 minutes free time. Another less motivated second grade boy said the principal should just tell students to read, listen, and behave. An older girl—also less motivated—said the school should purchase more challenging books but with pictures so students could understand what they read better. The rest of the less motivated students thought more books and free books would improve students’ reading.

More motivated students agreed with the notion of more books. One also thought it would be a good idea to advertise reading throughout the school with posters. Like her less motivated second grade counterpart, Danelle (HM2) believed it would help if the principal would just tell students to go to class and read. Some thought students should be allowed to keep library books; one highly motivated reader said there should be school-wide reading time that lasted at least 40 minutes to an hour daily or that students should be required to read 30 minutes at school and 30 minutes at home every day. Some of the more motivated readers complained that their teachers sometimes directed what books they could choose from the library. They hated that. Two highly motivated students mentioned writing to improve reading skills. One thought students should write poems and their own books for themselves and for others to read; and one thought writing after reading would allow students to see their improvements over time. One student believed the better readers should be given access to more difficult books and enlisted to help the students who did not read as well.

The comments suggested appropriate motivators may depend on the reader’s skills and age. Younger students thought students responded to direct commands to read. Less skilled students seemed to struggle to find books that they could read but were also interesting.

Specific ideas for library improvements came mostly from the more motivated students. A second grade, highly motivated reader asked for more books in the library that kids could actually read—many were “too hard” for him. Less motivated readers wanted to keep their books
longer and check out an unlimited number. Another less motivated reader said the librarian should explain to students in the library how reading would help them. Highlighting success stories, such as students who liked to read and had gotten college scholarships was one idea a more motivated student suggested. More motivated readers also seemed to want more order during library time. Meredith (HM3) said the librarian needed to straighten the books so students could find them and Lenny (HM4) wanted more rules forbidding talking, running, and playing during library time. Several motivated readers thought book fairs would be helpful. Roland (HM3) wanted the librarian to let students read about books on the internet before they had to choose one.

Darin (LM3) relayed a personal experience that seemed to have affected his enthusiasm for the library. Asked why he thought some kids hated to read, he said, “Sometimes I keep forgetting why because I guess—maybe they keep losing their books all the time and they won’t like get a book [They won’t get it because they’re afraid they’re gonna lose it?] Sometimes, but if they did get one they might lose it. [Have you ever lost a book?] Yeah, that Mother Goose. [And then what happens?] Ah, they make you find it but I didn’t find it. They make me have to buy the book.”

Students also wanted a greater variety of books. Specific suggestions for new books included books about: airplanes, snakes, spiders, insects, horses, dinosaurs, other animals; earth, planets; cheerleading, sports; math; books telling about science experiments; funny books like *Calvin and Hobbes*; books telling how to draw and other art topics; more books from *Frog and Toad* series, *Arthur* series, and *Magic Schoolbus* series (these were always checked out); history books; books about famous people; “big” dictionaries, almanacs; and books in Keres.
Teacher Motivators

Whether motivated themselves or not, students believed there were things teachers could do to motivate students to read more. For one thing, two motivated students believed they should be called upon (as good readers) to help other students—Danelle (HM2) said she could model good reading for others and Roland (HM3) said he could help struggling students directly. Several said struggling readers should be given more time in school for reading and more choices of books they found interesting. Interests varied, but many liked books about animals and “funny” books. A less motivated student said teachers should structure lessons that involved group activities, and both motivated and less motivated students thought it was important for teachers to remain calm in the classroom and never get mad or yell when students were struggling with reading.

Both a motivated and less motivated reader said some students needed instruction from the teacher on how to read words (decoding), and how to understand what they were reading (comprehension). As one of the less motivated girls put it, “I would be a better reader by my teacher telling me how to be a better reader.” Meredith (HM3) also noted that students like to see the progress they have made. She said students should “have to read big books and they’ll probably get like folders and put chapter books in there and they can do definitions and put it in the folder. Then when they graduate we can give it to them and they can see how much their reading went up so they know that they’ve been reading. So they know it’s good to read so when they get older they teach their child how to read and their child can teach their child so everybody in the whole family knows what to do when they get older for reading.”
How Students would Motivate an Unmotivated Reader

The less motivated readers did not have many specific ideas for motivating unmotivated readers. However, the more motivated readers were very certain they could get other students reading more and more often. For one thing, Danelle (HM2) and Lenny (HM4), (Lenny wanted to be a police officer) both said it was important to “tell students to read,” and, Lenny added, “make them do it.” Lenny also thought it was important to take T.V., video games and other distractions away from student to force them to read because there would be nothing else to do. Roland explained that some students could not read well and they needed help learning how to “read the words.” Roland also believed struggling readers should not be given homework, but instead should be required to read every night at home until they could read better. Two other students said children have to find something they are interested in and then start reading about it. Several said more time had to be committed to reading at home and at school. Lenny also suggested students find “cool places” to read and said he would tell an unmotivated reader: “Don’t you want to know more than the other kids? If you read you could be a smart boy and learn more.”

Person—Blended Dimensions

There were several dimensions that blurred the societal, cultural, and school/peer boundaries. Not limited to a single dimension, these were, nonetheless, factors that appeared to have the potential to exert important pressures on students’ reading motivation.

College Plans

Beginning with the wider forces at work in these students’ lives, one of the most important seemed to be long-term goals. Both highly motivated and less motivated readers talked
about their plans for the future. The only exceptions were the less motivated second grade
students. It was no surprise that the highly motivated readers mentioned college more often and
their understanding of what it meant to go to college was better, but even the highly motivated
students had misconceptions about what college entailed and what it took to get there.

Highly motivated students mentioned college twice as much as less motivated students
(95 references by students who were highly motivated: 42 references by students who were less
motivated), but all students seemed to believe college was obligatory whether they understood
what it actually meant and how to get there or not. For instance, Shelly, a less motivated girl in
the fourth grade said, “…and if you graduate [from the middle school] you could go to the other
school the good school in adjacent city—[which one?] The Torreon Trojans [the district high
school].” I asked her what happened after high school and she said, “Then you go to the high
school—well you go to college. [And why do you do that?] So it could help you learn and be a
good student and do your homework every day.”

Even Brent, a highly motivated fourth grader was unclear about what college meant
exactly. He said: “Like my goal—college—every step that you take—you learn a lot from high
school and if you go to college and pass that college test you’ll get a degree [What kind of degree
are you going to get?] Any kind. [What will you study when you go to college?] I think it will be
easy. [What will you study?] I think I’ll study about science, social studies all the subjects.” This
level of understanding may or may not be typical of other students his age but Brent, like most of
the other students in the study—motivated or not—also failed to understand that college was not
free. This contrasted sharply with one exception, a highly motivated third grade student whose
grandfather had helped her make very specific plans for college. She shared, “My grandpa says if
I don’t learn now I won’t understand later on. . . And I like cheerleading, drawing, and different
sports and all that stuff is in college too. And I said ‘ok’ and he said to save my money now.”
Several of the highly motivated students said their mothers had talked to them about college. Asked why their mothers wanted them to go to college, they just looked at me like “everyone” knows why mothers want kids to go to college. Only Brent gave a specific answer, saying “my mom wants me to go to college because she never went to college.” Students who did not mention their mothers seemed unable to articulate the source of this message; and students did not generally report teachers talking about college in the classroom, except for two students who said their teacher (same teacher) talked about college “all the time.” Over time, I came to understand the push toward college was a message from parents, some teachers, and the larger society. Every student believed s(he) was going to college, even if s(he) could not say where the message was coming from. Saying they planned to attend college seemed to be a social norm for these students and almost all of them made a direct link from reading to high school to college to job (12 of 17). No matter where students went, they were bombarded with this message. Some said they “hear[d] about college all the time on T.V.” (Elena, HM5). The message was also likely among interactions with adults in the larger society. For instance Lenny, a highly motivated fourth grader told me, “I went to New York City and saw ground zero for 911 and the firefighter I met told me to go to college.” According to virtually all the more motivated readers and most of the less motivated readers, the order was also clear: people who liked to read graduated from high school, then “they go to college and get their degree” (Meredith). One of the less motivated students (Jessica), and another who was more motivated and wanted to go to college to be a professional basketball player (Cody), said that even students who did not like to read had to go to college. I asked Cody how a student who did not like to read would manage college and he said, “Same as someone who likes to read. Just push themselves to read and not give up.”
Career Goals—Careers v. Jobs

The less motivated students were just as likely to mention future career goals as the highly motivated students (25 references-HM; 23 references-LM) but the careers they were choosing diverged. Career goals for highly motivated students included: police officer, two teachers, nurse, professional basketball player, babysitter or teacher, and army officer. The only specific goals mentioned by the less motivated students were: potter, professional basketball player, rancher/business owner. The future rancher/business owner said he hates to read and math is more important to his future than reading, but he still plans to go to college. I asked him if he really needed college to ranch or to take over his father’s business and he shrugged. Pushing him for a definitive answer, he said “probably.” I asked another student who plans to be a potter if he needed college and he said, “Sort of—kind of.”

Only two of the more motivated students failed to mention a particular profession. Both (one second grade boy and a fourth grade girl) thought college would help you get a job at Wal Mart. This was more typical of the less motivated students, one of whom, when asked what she would do after college, said “Go to work at the Alltell place [The phone store?] Yeah.” For almost all students, reading led to college, which led to a “good job.” As Charity said when asked what she would say to a friend who thought reading was boring: “I would just tell her, ‘well later on in the future you’ll need to read and if you don’t know how to read you won’t get a job.’ [You can’t get any job if you can’t read or just not a good job?] Not a good job.”

Praised for Reading

Asked if people ever told them they did a good job in reading, all students said “yes,” and almost all mentioned a teacher and family member who had praised them for something related to their reading. The exceptions were five of the less motivated readers, two of whom said only their teachers praised their reading, and three who said only family members encouraged them in
reading; and two motivated readers who were either recognized by a teacher or a family member but not both. Two highly motivated readers told me the teacher from the community in charge of the computer lab was the only person at school who had ever commented on their reading. I also asked students if they liked for people to comment on their reading and they all replied that they did.

**Social Interactions around Reading**

Highly motivated boys and less motivated girls reported sharing and talking about books with friends at school. Two of the highly motivated readers also talked about discussing books at home with sisters and cousins. Only about half (10 of 17) of all interviewees said they talked to others about books they had read or were reading. Most said they talked to their friends, usually at school about books they had read or were reading (less motivated readers talked about “funny” books on the bus). Two of the most motivated students (one girl, one boy) said they also talked to family members—usually cousins—at home about books. One of the most motivated boys discussed how he, his brother, and his mother all loved books and talked often about what they were reading. The younger boys had a series, *Captain Underpants*, that they thought was outrageously funny, and which they often shared among themselves. Surprisingly, only two students, a second grader and a fourth grader, mentioned classroom activities structured to allow students to share information about books.

**Self—Past**

As students incorporated societal, cultural, school/peer, and blended influences into their own views of reading, they developed concepts about themselves as readers. These reading
selves were expressed in past, present, and future forms. Speaking about their past reading selves, most students concentrated on who had taught them to read.

**Who Taught Me to Read?**

Students were adamant about who taught them to read. Two of the more motivated readers said they could never recall not reading. Roland (HM3) said he learned to read at about three months of age—his mother smiled but did not contradict him. She told me she started reading to Roland before he was born and that he did learn to read very early, in *Head Start*.

Three of the five highly motivated boys said they learned to read in *Head Start*. Additionally, all of the highly motivated readers mentioned family members who taught them to read, even if they also credited a *Head Start* teacher. Among less motivated readers, none mentioned *Head Start*, two credited kindergarten teachers, and only three of eight mentioned a family friend or member in connection with learning to read. A less motivated third grade girl said she missed kindergarten so her second grade teacher was now teaching her to read and her male counterpart said he did not learn to read in kindergarten so his special education teacher was now teaching him to read and he shared that she also “yells a lot.” The differences between highly and less motivated readers in terms of early support and support from home was striking.

Most students did not report difficulties learning to read, and all but a few of the less motivated readers believed they were competent readers. Students’ past reading selves were simple views of engagement with a person or persons who “taught [them] to read” in much the same way they learned to tie their shoes or dress themselves. Although none of the students articulated this directly, I sensed that as soon as students could decode a few simple books, they believed they had “learned to read.”

---

21 A program funded out of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to provide preschool experiences for children from low-income families. The program also provides health, nutrition, and parenting services to families in low-income communities.
Self—Present

Students not only articulated who they had been as readers in the past, they were also clear about their present reading selves. Most students seemed quite confident of who they were as readers at that moment and all seemed quite willing to share their views with me.

Reading Efficacy and Outcome Expectancies

To better understand students’ reading efficacy, I asked whether students believed they could read a book one grade level higher than their present grade and if they could but they were not doing so, why not. I also asked if they preferred reading easy, medium, or hard books and if they had specific strategies they used if they found themselves in difficult text.

Except for Trenton (LM2), all students believed they could read books above their present grade level. Only two wavered slightly in this belief. Jessica, a less motivated second grade student, said “probably, a little,” but then quickly added that she was reading chapter books. The move to books with chapters, even if the chapters were very short, (as in Frog and Toad) was seen as a major advance by first, second and third graders, and struggling readers generally. Javin (LM5) hesitated too, but said he could “probably” read a sixth grade book. The more motivated readers were firm in their belief that, given the chance, they could read at least a grade level above their present grade. Lenny (HM4) said, “I could read a seventh grade book, probably even tenth grade.” Lenny also felt confident enough to read to both his little sister and his mother, something he said he did almost every evening before bedtime. Brent (HM4) felt equally confident but did not want to talk about this subject at any length. I assumed this was because, as he told me in the first interview, “I kinda get nervous. [How come?] I don’t know, it’s just inside me that I think, I mean that my body’s telling me don’t do this ‘cause they might be
jealous.” Danelle (HM2) had no such compunction. Asked what teachers could do to help
struggling readers she said, “Well you could tell them to read a lot, to read a lot like Danelle.”

Asked whether they would prefer to read an easy, medium, or hard book, it was no
surprise that the more motivated students all chose hard, except for Brent who said medium or
hard, Keesha (HM4), who said medium, and Elena, who said easy, for a very interesting reason.
According to Brent, “If I do a hard or medium, my experience will rise up and I’ll know more
about them and learn new vocabularies and how to pronounce them.” Cody agreed, and also
explained how hard books expanded his vocabulary. Roland’s choice was “hard, because I like
to challenge myself. [Any other reason?] Because I like exploring new worlds.” Elena’s choice
of easy books was a surprise. Even though she said girls are probably better readers because they
"read hard books," she also said given the choice between an easy, medium, or hard book she
would choose the easy book because her mother told her reading easy books would "get [her] to a
higher level."

Only one less motivated reader, Kimber (2nd) said she would choose a hard book but was
unable to explain this choice. Charity (5th) and William (4th) said they would choose a medium
book but also failed to articulate any reasons for the choice. Darin was quite clear about his
choice and his reasons. He responded, “Easy. I like easy. I don’t like the hard book. It’s making
me say all those wrong things. [What about when you read to yourself?] Seems like it’s still kind
of hard. ”

To test whether students were just claiming they could read difficult books or if they had
specific strategies to use when they came to a difficult piece of text, I asked them what they did
when they found words they could not read. Students verbalized similar strategies, whether
motivated or not. These included: sound the word out, break the word into syllables and sound it
out, look it up in a dictionary, ask an adult, and reread. I posed the question as: “If you came to a
word you didn’t know, what would you do?” Answers from second and third graders were clearly related to decoding the word. Starting in fourth grade, the students began to understand that “a word you didn’t know” could mean a problem with decoding or with comprehension. Consulting a dictionary and rereading for context clues were strategies only a couple of fourth and fifth grade students employed. I asked the older students if they ever just skipped the word and they all insisted they did not skip words. Lenny (HM4) told me, “No; I always get a dictionary and find it.” He also said he had a dictionary at home as did most of the other highly motivated readers.

All students had strategies for attacking unknown words except for a less motivated third grade boy and a less motivated fifth grade girl. The less motivated third grade boy was receiving reading instruction from the special education teacher who yelled and seemed to confuse some students. This young man was clearly confused and talked about trying “what the monkey and lion did” (dividing by syllables) on the PBS show Between the Lions. However, he was not sure how they did it. He and the less motivated fifth grade girl said their primary strategy would be to ask someone for help. This contrasted sharply with other students, who were rejecting the option of asking an adult for help by third grade. Charity (LM5) and Darin (LM3) said they had been instructed to simply memorize many words, even phonetically regular words—a strategy that might have negative long-term consequences. Charity was in a classroom where the teacher seemed overwhelmed with behavior management issues. Darin was also receiving services outside the classroom from the special education teacher who seemed frustrated with her job.

**Reasons to Read**

At some point in the interviews, all the students except Javin and Charity (5th grade, less motivated) told me reading was, as Cody (HM5) put it, “just fun and I can teach myself many
things while I read.” Roland (HM3) said it was not only fun, but “it takes most—it’s like—mmm—it’s fascinating for me to read. It takes my time away.” Charity (LM5) found reading more effortful, but still she said, “I think that reading can be fun if you try.” Brent, Roland, and Lenny waxed most enthusiastically about books. When I asked them if they liked to read, Brent and Roland gave me a list of books they enjoyed and in-depth summaries of their favorites. Lenny not only explained his interest in books about weather, but how he had gotten started on the topic and some of the contradictions he was beginning to notice in different books about weather. That books might disagree about the facts had become very interesting to him. Brent got so excited telling me about one book, the librarian came to see what was happening. I asked him if he had read any books about Harry Potter. He said, “Oh yeah. I’ve read Chamber of Secrets [Did you like it?] Yeah [What about Diary of a Wimpy Kid] Oh, I love that book! I love that book! [So do they have that at the school library?] No—I got it for Christmas. [There’s supposed to be another one out.] I know! The Diary of a Wimpy Kid—Last Straw! I’m gonna get it.”

Students told me they only read books that interested them. I challenged these statements by asking if they would read a book that didn’t interest them if someone paid them to do it. Charity (LM5) told me immediately it depended on how much money I was offering. We laughed, but I started the price at $10 and went up to $50 to see what she would say. Like most others, she insisted there was no enticement that could make her read a book in which she had no interest.

Asked about a favorite author, less motivated students gave me the name of a book they liked. The second grade boys both liked books about Arthur (cartoon bear seen often on the Public Broadcasting Station). Other less motivated readers just named a single book. More motivated readers might not name a favorite author but they talked about books they were reading in a series. Favorites were the Lemony Snicket series, Goosebumps, Harry Potter, Twilight, and
Captain Underpants. When asked about a favorite author, Roland (HM3) said: “I don’t really look at the author or illustrator. [What do you do? How do you choose a book?] I would read the back part. Like with Chronicles of Narnia, it told you about the story and I was already hooked to the story. [By the time you read that?] (Nodded).” Lenny had facts about his favorite author. He told me, “Yeah, Warren Bradley. He’s a storm-chaser. He writes his own books and chases storms and makes his own books of real-life stories.” In the course of the interviews, I tallied the number of books students named. Six of the more motivated readers named two or more books during our conversations. None of the less motivated students did this, but most talked about at least one book they had read or were reading.

Strengths beyond Reading

Whether motivated to read or not, all students could name several things at which they believed they excelled. Boys were likely to list different sports activities as something they were “good at,” (6 out of 9) although half the girls said they were also good at sports (4 out of 8). Most students, whether more motivated to read or not, also said they enjoyed and were “good at” math (10 of 17). One less motivated fifth grade girl and one less motivated third grade boy reported artistic talent, and one highly motivated second grade girl said she was very good at cleaning and helping out around the house. More motivated students listed core content, such as science and social studies as personal favorites, while the less motivated students rarely talked about being good at schools subjects, talking more about sports, artistic endeavors, or things at school like physical education.

Interest in Reading

I asked students what they would tell a person who was struggling with reading and who said reading was boring. Most students said they would simply tell the person to do it anyway.
However, three of the most motivated students had specific advice. Brent (HM4) said he would tell the person, “I would like you to read and realize it’s not that boring. [How will they realize that?] By discovering the facts. Like think of the book like you’re in it and you’re one of the characters and it wouldn’t be that boring.” Second grade Danelle (HM) said she would tell the person, “No it’s not (boring). [But what would you tell her--to help her so reading wasn’t so boring?] You can help yourself to read [by reading], then you won’t be bored.” It also seemed simple to Meredith (HM3), who said she would tell the person, “It’s _interesting_ because you get to learn what happens around the world.” Javin, the only less motivated reader who weighed in on this topic, said his advice to a bored reader would be “get a book you like to read.”

It was no surprise that the more motivated students named more books and were more interested in talking about books they had read. The difference was apparent when I compared a more motivated reader’s response to that of a less motivated student. Asked if he had read any good books lately, Roland, a highly motivated third grade reader, said:

> Oh yeah I like books about dinosaurs, about Merlin, wizardology, egyptianology. [I think I remember you saying that when I was in your class. Did you ever read those Harry Potter books?] Yeah. [Did you like them too?] I liked _Order of the Phoenix._ [Ok.] And I read a book—_Twilight_—[Oh yeah. What did you think of that?] It’s a good book and we have the movie. [I wonder about that whole vampire thing.] They’re like different than other Vampires. Instead of burning when they go into sunlight, their skin is crystals. [So they don’t need blood like the other vampires?] They like to think of themselves as vegetarians. ‘Cause they only feast on animal blood.

This response contrasted sharply with Shelly’s. A less motivated reader who was a year older than Roland, Shelly simply said, “I’ve been reading Frog and Toad.” Less motivated students
usually referred only to the book they were presently reading or one they had just read and had little to say about plot, characters, or details.

**Becoming a Good Reader—Smart or Hard-working?**

When asked if, to be a good reader, it was more important to be smart or hard-working, three of the four most motivated boys believed being smart was more important. Two older girls (one motivated and one less motivated) and a less motivated second grade boy also believed intelligence was more important than hard work. However, when asked if someone who was not really smart could work hard and become a good reader, all students agreed hard work could lead to reading success.

According to students, good reading skills also required focused time and attention. This was mentioned by both boys and girls and both motivated and less motivated readers. Also, students (not all, but some from both motivated and less motivated groups, older and younger, and girls and boys) believed people who were very good at sports or art were probably not good readers because their time and attention would be devoted to their sport or their art in order to excel. As Brent (HM4) explained, good athletes would probably not be good readers, “because I ain’t good at sports either. [So, why does that make you a better reader?] Because I don’t spend that much time on sports. . . . So instead of just doing sports I read.” Keesha, a motivated fourth grade girl also mentioned that time spent reading could be time unavailable for learning one’s culture. The overall message was that focusing time and attention on something, whether it was reading, sports, art, or one’s culture, would help one excel at that activity.

What I failed to ask was whether they focused time on something because they were good at it, or if they became good because they focused time and attention on the activity. Though not a patterned response, various students told me good readers “read every day,” and
“force themselves to read even if they don’t want to.” I was also told good readers “think libraries are fun,” “do better in school because they have a better vocabulary,” and are better public speakers. One less motivated second grader had somehow gotten the message that good reading was synonymous with fast reading. She told me it was important to read so you could read faster; if you wanted to be a better reader just put your finger under the words and read faster; and that good reading helped you later in life, “to read really fast.” Most, however, believed it was not speed, but time spent reading that mattered. Students cited the need to read for 20 minutes per day as though it were a mantra. My guess would be this is something they have been told consistently at school in years past, since this particular response cut across gender and motivation levels beginning in the third grade. Students could not explain why only 20 minutes was necessary or what they should be doing while they were reading, but they were clear that this the time required for good reading skills.

**Pleasing the Teacher**

Three of the least motivated students seemed to want to tell me what I wanted to hear on several occasions. Asked about things they would do on a Saturday, they named some favored activities and then, as if worried they had almost forgotten it, added reading to the list. Because, with all three, it seemed an afterthought, I asked them directly if they were just saying that to please me. All three solemnly assured me that given the choice of doing only two things they had said they really loved to do (and reading had not been something they named in that list) they would also read. I continued to believe, however, that they were saying it because they believed it was the “right” thing to say to this person who obviously thought reading was a big deal. This was not the only time I got a sense of this and usually from younger girls.
At Home and at School

I asked students if they were different at home than in school. There were some interesting responses. Brent (HM4) revealed that he really did not like being “taught” anything except Keres. He said most of what was covered in school he could learn by himself just by reading, but that Keres was different because “it’s hard to pronounce it and say the words correct. [So you need help with that?] Yeah. Well, we need teachers sometimes to help me pronounce it and help me use it and learn what the word is.” Charity (LM5) told me, “I feel like doing more activities at my house than at school. [Why?] Nobody helps me or plays with me here. [At home you have people to help you and play with you?] Yeah. [What else is different?] I get to read because I have a lot of free time. [At home?] Yes.” Meredith (HM3) thought school was different because students did not have to clean and work like they did at home. Meredith saw this as a positive, but Kimber (LM2) enjoyed cleaning and therefore preferred to be home. Elena (HM5) enjoyed reading at home more than at school because “at school we sometimes read together.” This “round robin” reading where everyone in the classroom took a turn was dreaded by most students—the highly motivated because the struggling readers were so slow and the less motivated because they were usually the ones struggling to read.

Self—Projected

All students were able to project themselves into the future in an obligatory “I’m-going-to-college” sort of way (see College plans above). However, only highly motivated students, starting in third grade, projected themselves into a more immediate future that connected to that more distant one. Almost all students, beginning at third grade could also imagine themselves in a story they were reading, with a few important exceptions.
Connecting Immediate and Distant Futures

Meredith noted that reading was critical for her immediate future, because, “if you don’t learn, you’re not going to be able to do your math, read, multiplication, division. [What happens if you can’t?] Everywhere you go you won’t be able to do that and then you won’t know what’s going on around the world.” The most elaborated response though, came from Lenny, the highly motivated fourth grader who loved reading informational texts. Lenny was reading to “learn what to do like for anything you would want to do.” I asked him what he thought students would do if they were no longer graded on reading. Here is our exchange:

[Let’s say you came to school tomorrow and your teacher said from now on we’re only gonna’ grade you on math. We’ll only give you tests on math and only grade you on math. We’ll still do other things, but you’ll only get graded on math. The principal calls a big assembly and says you’re still going to be studying what you did before but we’re only going to give you grades for math. What do you think that would do to kids’ reading?]

They would be amazed. That would be a shock. [That would be a shock?] Yeah, because some kids like the reading. [So would they quit reading do you think--if they were just graded on math?] No. I think they should just keep reading because they might find more information. They might learn stuff or learn more things. [But what if your parents started to give you a hard time and they said ‘you’re spending so much time on reading—they’re only grading on math at school. Why are you reading so much? What would you say to them?] I would say to them, ‘I won’t listen to you because I want to be a smart boy and I want to keep on reading. Or I sometimes would go to the library and check out a challenging book.
Two of the four second grade students had a hard time imagining a situation where they were not graded on reading but they thought they would keep reading anyway, except for the more motivated second grade boy who said he might not. Other than the less motivated third grade girl and the less motivated fifth grade boy, the rest of the students interviewed said they would continue reading as much as they did now even if they were not graded on reading at school and even if their parents told them they did not need to read so much anymore. However, the more motivated fifth grade boy and girl also said they “might” not read as much if they were not graded on reading. I got a sense that fifth grade students were better able to imagine this scenario and were, therefore, a little more realistic about how they might respond. The important point was that students did not believe they were reading just to get good grades and all the third through fifth grade students interviewed could think of other reasons to read.

Looking ahead just to the summer, all students except Javin, the less motivated fifth grade boy, and the two less motivated second graders had specific summer reading plans. Javin said he would not be reading because he and his friends in another state where he would spend the summer were “trying to build a clubhouse—like a treehouse—and there’s no time to read.” In contrast, Brent’s (HM4) goal was to read 80 books during summer vacation. Others had specific titles they wanted to read. One third grade girl wanted to start reading chapter books. All either already had books they intended to read or knew exactly how they were going to get the books they wanted to read in the summer.

*Visualizations during Reading*

Beginning in the third grade, both highly motivated and less motivated students interviewed were able to project themselves into stories they were reading. As Brent explained, “Whenever I read, I’ll just like read it; and whenever I read it, I know what to think in my head.

---

22 It is important to remember that interviews were conducted in the spring. Third grade students might have answered differently in the fall, as this seemed to be a transition stage.
It comes to me like a picture.” Beginning with the third graders, all said they pictured what they were reading as they read it. The more motivated students talked about feeling as if they were living within the story as one of the characters. One of the less motivated students who said he wanted to be an artist one day also provided vivid descriptions of how he “almost felt like I was in it, that story, and that it was me doing all that.” Another less motivated fifth grade student, another future artist, said when she reads she “feels like as if you’re in it and like the character is your brother or sister.” A less motivated fourth grade girl said she “feels like a character in the book,” or as if she were writing the story herself. This was not true of the other less motivated students. All said they pictured the story in their heads as they read, but did not feel that they were part of the story. A less motivated third grade girl said she could picture a story if she wrote it herself, if it was about her, or if it was a story about horses or something else she loved. Otherwise, she said, “I will read the words and when I’m done I would look at the pictures.”

While students in the third grade and older could explain the cognitive processes they engaged during reading, second grade students seemed to be missing this meta-cognitive language. The two second grade boys said, no, they did not see pictures in their heads when they were reading. The highly motivated second grade girl told me she did see pictures but could not explain the process. Kimber, the less motivated second grade girl, said she did not see pictures in her head when she was reading but, with much prodding, there was the possibility she did so when someone was reading to her. Second grade students struggled to understand what I was asking and to explain their thought processes.

Highly motivated readers created visualizations in non-fiction books too. Cody (HM5) explained: “Like when I’m reading it—like fiction—I feel like I’m in the story and I’m right there with the characters talking to them and I just like to talk to them when I feel like it and it feels good. [When you read fiction do you see the story happening in your head?] Yeah. [Is it the
same when you read, say, a book about science—do you still see the pictures in your head—let’s say the science book doesn’t have any pictures.] Yeah. I try to picture them in my head. Like if there’s a machine but there’s not a picture of it, I try to imagine what it would look like and what it would do and I just keep reading about it to figure out what it would look like, then I have the picture in my head.” Roland (HM3) also had an interesting explanation. I said, “[Are you making a picture in your head about the science stuff—it’s kind of hard because it’s not a story—so how does that work?] I switch—like in the video games—I change modes for different types of books. [What does that mean exactly?] Like, sometimes I read an encyclopedia. [Ok. I gotta hear about this. Let’s say you’re reading an encyclopedia and there’s not a picture on this particular entry. What happens in your head—are you making a picture in your head] (Nods.) [How do you know what the picture should look like?] Because I could look stuff up on Google and I look up the pictures. [If you didn’t look up the pictures what would you do?] I know a lot of things about books about how their pictures look and I most of the time see them in the museums and I buy books from the museums and I already seen what they look like.” Lenny, another highly motivated reader, told me that in non-fiction books he “makes stories” in his head out of the facts.

Definitions of a “Good” Reader

Two students believed that being a “good student” was synonymous with being a good reader, and both of them were highly motivated and skilled readers themselves—both boys. Two students, one motivated reader and one less motivated, believed reading was part of being a good student, but that other things were also important. “Good students,” according to study participants: “help the teacher clean up,” “behave,” “do their homework, finish up their work on
time, [are not] tardy, not absent, wear heavy clothes so they don’t get sick in the winter,” “get As, are smart, work hard,” “listen, don’t make other kids cry,” “are happy,” “respect the teacher,” “ask for help, study math,” “help the teacher,” “are nice and caring,” and “try their best.” Girls tended to talk about cleaning, behaving, not getting sick, helping the teacher, while boys were more likely to discuss grades, homework, and other academic tasks.

Costs of Choosing Reading

Students were asked to imagine a Saturday when they had a choice of doing four things they had told me they really liked. If reading was not on their list of favorites things I noted that but added it. Then I told them to imagine on this Saturday they only had time to do two of the four or five things—what would they choose? Almost without exception, students refused to buy this scenario. First they would say they could do all the activities—after all it was a Saturday. Often I would then try to get them to choose between reading and an activity they had mentioned really liking during other interviews. Again, at least half, from different ages, genders, and motivational levels believed there was no reason to force such a choice. It was clear to them I was odd for trying to make things “either/or” when they clearly saw it could be “both/and.” When I forced the issue, all students except the less motivated boys (and one motivated girl in fourth grade) chose reading as a preferred activity. However, I noted in daily memos that I had a sense two of the less motivated girls were simply trying to please me with this answer.

Reading was clearly a preferred activity for the more motivated students (Keesha, a highly motivated fourth grade reader was the exception) and reading would not be a choice most of the less motivated students would make. Roland and Darin illustrated the differences. Roland, a highly motivated reader, said, “Like at school if she [teacher] says to do math –like in our practice books I kind of don’t—because if I’m reading; I don’t really like to get up to do math. I
like to read a lot. You can ask my mom. She says that I like to read a lot. [Does she—is she glad?] She said in high school she read like a lot a lot [So you’re like your mom?] Yeah. I would read anything. That one time when I was like 7, I read a Capricorn book. [Wow, so you’ve been reading a long time?] Oh yeah.” On the other hand, Darin, a less motivated reader in third grade, said the cost of reading was literal. If he read on Saturday, he would have to give up the chance to make money by making pottery—and he needed the money to support his love for “play station” and so he could go bowling, something else he really enjoyed. Reading was definitely a “no-win” for Darin on the weekends. Javin (LM5) said the only way he would actually choose to read was if he had a lot of time and was really bored.

**Self—Present and Projected**

When students explained the uses of reading, their answers seemed to fall into both present reasons and reasons related to future purposes. A few of the more motivated readers talked about reading for pleasure and as Roland put it “to take my time away” when he was bored, but most of the reasons students gave me were tied to practical purposes.

**Uses for Reading**

All students seemed to believe reading would make them smarter; or, as Shelly put it, you read “so you won’t be dumb when you grow up.” Most of the reasons to read well were related to future purposes. However, a second grader (highly motivated), two third graders (one highly and one less motivated), and a fifth grader (less motivated) said reading was important for their present purposes because it helped them with math. Another highly motivated fifth grader said reading helped him now with all school subjects.

One interesting difference between the highly motivated and less motivated students was the less motivated talked about reading purposes related to specific and simple tasks such as
following directions, finding toys in a store, or reading letters and bills. More motivated readers talked about reading in terms of future jobs and also said reading now would help them in the near future as well as in achieving their long-term goals. Lenny (HM4) said he needed to read because he plans to be a police officer, and “for that you need to go to college and read well.” Roland (HM3) wanted to join the military or the police force, and explained that, “if your sergeant or your commanding officer tells you what to do—if he’s like far away and sends a letter, you have to understand the words he writes.” Elena wanted to be a teacher and knew she would have to get good grades and read well for that job. All three talked about specific uses for reading in their future careers. Both of the highly motivated fourth grade boys also said reading was important for future tribal leadership roles.23

One of the biggest differences between the highly and less motivated readers in this study was associated with reading for information. Every highly motivated reader except for one second grade boy talked about the information that could be gained through reading. For instance, Lenny explained, “I like to read to learn information to know about things. Like right now I’m reading about weather and also planets.” Lenny is in the fourth grade and has been reading about weather since the first grade. This is in stark contrast to the less motivated readers, only one of whom (fourth grade boy) mentioned reading as an important source of information.

Several students also made the connection between reading and grades. Danelle, the highly motivated second grader told me, “They [parents] say well my brother is kind of down in his grades and they say it’s because of his reading. We have to practice reading so you get good grades now and later on when you’re in high school, you’ll be good.” Several boys mentioned reading in connection with grades. One was William, a less motivated fourth grader, who explained that “to stay on the team you have to keep your grades up. [But how does reading help

---

23 In the fourth grade there were two highly motivated boys, but only one per grade in the other grades. One simply insisted I interview him and he turned out to be an important informant, so I kept his transcriptions.
you in school?] It helps keep your grades up.” One other highly motivated third grade girl and the motivated fifth grade girl also connected reading to grades.

Analysis

Analysis of findings related to students as “persons” reflect the societal, cultural, school/peer, and blended influences that were exerted on students in terms of reading in their various environments. The “self” analysis focuses on how students incorporated these influences into their own views on reading and themselves as readers.

Person

Culturally relevant text was generally missing from Saint Theresa School; and what the community would consider appropriate in this regard was an open question. Many students wanted more information about specific topics and enjoyed challenging themselves with difficult text and topics. Students wanted more books overall, and more “interesting” books. This was likely because the school and village library had limited collections and other sources were considerable distances from their homes.

Keres language was important and pervasive at Saint Theresa, and older boys may have a stronger motivation to learn Keres for future tribal roles although there were some indications it was also important for girls to learn the language well in order to fulfill future caretaker roles. There were interesting connections between these questions and quantitative reading motivation results, as I explain further in Chapter 6. Boys also said they have to be “smart” and “know things” to be community leaders. Though differences in the measured reading motivation of boys and girls in this study were minimal and there were not major gender differences in reading
achievement/reading motivation relationships, this desire to learn in order to fill leadership positions in the community could eventually affect effort and motivation. If reading English was not needed for successful integration into the community, when students get older and are distracted by other activities, it might become something they are willing to forego. On the other hand, if boys see more need for English reading, writing, and speaking for future purposes, some might remain more motivated than girls as they progress through school.

However, girls said they challenged themselves in reading more than boys—a fact that was born out in that subscale in 5th grading reading motivation means, and a fact that could have an impact on boys’ achievement since the Challenge subscale and SBA reading achievement seemed closely connected. More motivated readers also reported setting greater reading challenges for themselves.

Students at Saint Theresa heard both Keres and English at school. For many, this was true at home as well. This may provide important phonemic awareness skills that could be used to support early reading attainment, which could also affect reading motivation. Students from “traditional” families, where Keres is spoken and stressed may benefit from better, early phonemic awareness and stronger family support for student learning, since students and community informants shared that “traditional” families spent more time at home with children. Students defined “traditional” families in different ways, including: Keres language use; participation in cultural activities (particularly dances); food; religion; relation to environment; rejection of alcohol; care for young people. Since almost all students believed their families were very “traditional,” the way individual families interpret traditions may affect reading motivation, particularly through language practices that might support early phonemic awareness and home support for learning. Conversely, at least one older student talked about having less time for reading English because he was working harder to improve his Keres language skills.
Mothers and other family members appeared important as early reading teachers and ongoing reading mentors. Cultural and social capital within the community also seemed to play a role in determining which students received the most help from community members who worked at the school. Teachers were surprisingly absent when students spoke of their academic mentors. Because of status positions in the community and varying levels of family support and other resources, some students seemed to be receiving little adult support while others were getting substantial support. Some teachers credited their own efforts or student initiative for student successes and blamed failures on families, with little understanding of how community and school status might be influencing reading motivation and achievement. Students with high community status seemed to be motivated readers and vice versa. Some students with low community status were motivated readers, but these students had status among teachers, had received early reading instruction, and/or had strong support from one or more family members.

Most students professed stereotyped gender views. Students told me there were “girl” books and “boy” books and women cooked and cleaned, while men served as tribal leaders. Only four of the seventeen students believed that it might someday be possible for a woman to serve as tribal governor. Others gave very concrete reasons why such a scenario would never be possible. This may also affect the way students relate to male and female teachers and administrators and may explain why teachers reported much better student behavior when male principals were at the helm.

Teachers need to know their students in order to motivate them and this includes understanding what their students say does or does not make them want to read more. Students, understandably, said they did not like teachers who yelled or became angry, preferring teachers who knew them and gave students specific reading strategies and assistance. Only in classrooms where teachers were from the community and in one Anglo teacher’s third grade classroom did I
see teachers who knew their students well enough to connect classroom lessons to their lives. The school’s regrouping for reading may also have a de-motivating effect on some students, yet none of the teachers seemed to take this into account when they told me about the “bad” behavior of a third grade girl who “hated” having to go to the second grade classroom for reading instruction.

Some students at Saint Theresa may not understand exactly what it means to go to college or how college connects to future jobs. Some students also seem to have constricted ideas about what careers are possible. Students might choose to become cashiers or clerks but it would be helpful if they knew all the options before they made those choices. More motivated readers could name specific professions as goals. This may simply be the result of exposure. More motivated readers were more likely to have stronger family and school support, with more opportunities to hear about possible professions. Less motivated readers seemed to be picking up their information from what they saw adults in their community doing. The lack of support for some of these less motivated readers was discouraging.

The most memorable event regarding students’ past as readers seemed to be how they learned to read. A few of the most advanced readers said they could not remember learning to read because they could never remember a time they were not reading. An important finding was that more motivated readers seemed to have had family members who taught them to read and many also mentioned Head Start experiences. Again, certain students have had much more initial support than others and seem to be reaping the benefits of that support.

**Self**

This section focuses on how students incorporated their societal, cultural, school/peer, and blended influences into their own ideas and beliefs about reading and themselves as readers.
Efficacy and Strategies

Students at Saint Theresa appeared to feel quite efficacious about their reading ability. They said they could read difficult text and most said they had strategies for attacking words and for comprehension. Most also said they liked to challenge themselves by choosing difficult books. This was true of all the more motivated students and generally true of the less motivated students with a few exceptions. This supported the findings for the Challenge subscale on the quantitative measure and was good news since that subscale was closely connected with reading achievement.

Reasons to Read

Most students interviewed said you couldn’t pay them to read a boring book. Students who were the most motivated gave excellent summaries of books they had read, could name favorite authors or book series, and talked at some length about why they favored certain books. One of the most motivated readers had started noticing how different authors sometimes provided contradictory information. Their enthusiasm was contagious, palpable, and if it could be shared with other students, I think it might move some of them to catch that same reading fever. Students interviewed shared many intrinsically-motivating reasons to read and this, too, was aligned to findings on the quantitative measures.

Becoming a Good Reader

The more motivated boys believed innate intelligence trumped hard work in explaining why they were good readers, even though all students believed a struggling reader could work hard and overcome lack of inborn intelligence for reading success. Students generally believed that committing time and attention to the task of reading would make anyone a better reader.
Teachers and parents should be interested in these findings because less motivated readers and those still struggling with reading skills at the upper grades needed to be reassured that this struggle is not about intelligence but rather about appropriate teaching strategies, effort, and time spent reading.

**Pleasing the Teacher**

Some of the less motivated readers seemed quite adept at telling me what they thought I wanted to hear. Interviewing them made me feel like I was in a poker match and they were looking for my “tells,” or signs of what I might be thinking. If I blinked or shifted my position, they might change their answer. These students appeared to be thinking deeply, even critically, about me, but not necessarily about the topic at hand. They seemed to have been trained to deliver the “one” right answer; and this may be both a curriculum matter and a pedagogical problem. I saw it play out particularly in one fourth grade classroom where students waited for the teacher to “give” them the “right” answer, rather than thinking critically themselves.

**Projected Selves**

Although McInerney (2004) reported success collecting information about “beliefs and values about the present and future” from students from Native American backgrounds (p. 148), he also believed the Native American (Diné, or Navajo) students he interviewed had more difficulty than those from white, middle class backgrounds articulating future goals. Students from the Saint Theresa community readily articulated future goals, but for many of the less motivated readers, these were vague, formless goals rather than specific ideas about what they would someday do and become.

All of the third through fifth grade students could name other reasons for reading besides just grades. All but two of the less motivated readers said they would continue reading for
personal reasons even if they were not graded on reading and even if their parents told them they did not need to read so much anymore.

That more motivated readers were more intrinsically-driven was no surprise. The important point was that students at Saint Theresa had a clear future-time perspective, and just like others in other studies, were motivated by different factors. This fits with quantitative data showing links between teachers who got to know their students and formed personal bonds with them and higher motivation scores on the quantitative measures. Knowing a student likely means you also know better how to motivate him/her for learning.

*Reading Requires Time and Attention*

Another “what if” had to do with whether students would project certain reading characteristics onto certain occupations, such as athletes or artists. Generally students believed if a person was known as an artist or an athlete, that person would not read as well as someone not known for those skills simply because the person was focused on that pursuit rather than on reading. Students understood that to be good at something requires time and attention. The younger students were still of the opinion that “good” at one thing meant the person was “good” at other things as well. Students generally had not considered there might be time for both a time-consuming pursuit and reading, even though they had clearly let me know this “either/or” thinking was strange when I asked them to choose between favorite activities on a free Saturday. In that case, they believed there was time for all activities. The difference seemed to be a matter of “free time” versus pursuits that were perceived as non-academic.
“Good” Students

There was also the question of whether “good students” were “good readers.” Surprisingly, many students listed mainly behavioral characteristics in their descriptions of a “good student.” Primarily, they said good students followed rules and complied with teacher requests. If girls believe “good students” are compliant students, what happens to older girls, whom the quantitative evidence suggests may be less compliant in the fifth grade?

Visualizations during Reading

Students were also asked if they could project themselves into stories or even visualize stories as they read. This is an important skill for reading comprehension (Bell McKenzie & Scheurich, 1991; Wormelli, 2005). Students interviewed vividly expressed how they visualized stories as they read and this cut across motivational levels. Second grade students were either not yet visualizing stories they read or had difficulty articulating that process to me, or both, although with much prodding, one second grade student claimed she did see pictures in her head when someone else was reading to her. It is likely that children still working to decode fluently would not have the cognitive capacity necessary for facile comprehension and visualization during reading. Therefore, being able to visualize a story someone else read to them but not a story they read themselves made sense. This seems to indicate the need for continued read-alouds so students can practice comprehension and learn to mentally “see” and understand narrative and expository forms. This might also smooth the later transition from “learning to read” to “reading to learn” and minimize that fourth grade slump.

Cost of Reading

When students are reading, they are not doing something else. So a final “what if” was related to what students would choose to do if they had: free time on a Saturday, a list of
preferred activities (if they did not include reading as a preferred activity, I added it), but only enough time to do two of four possible activities. The first thing that was striking was that most students simply rejected my scenario. They thought it was odd that I was suggesting there would not be enough time to do everything they wanted to do. Clearly my perception of time was different, but when I insisted there was really only time for two of the four things, they played along with this crazy notion, and the more motivated students said one of their activities would be reading (with one exception), while the less motivated students did not choose reading (with two exceptions that I believed were girls trying to please me). This brings us back to a circular inquiry though: do motivated readers choose to read because they are motivated, or do they become more motivated because they choose to read—and vice versa for the less motivated readers? Also how were skills playing into these choices?

Purposes for Reading

When discussing the purposes of reading, there were clear differences between students who were less motivated and those more motivated to read. Students less motivated talked primarily in terms of present purposes and common tasks, such as reading a map, reading bills, using signs to find a toy in a store. Students more motivated to read connected reading to future jobs and future tribal leadership roles. Several girls said reading helped students get better grades in school. A more motivated boy said reading helped keep grades up for sports eligibility. Several students who were more motivated to read also reported reading helped them gain new information. Though less motivated readers could name authentic purposes for reading, these purposes were not particularly important for their futures, or connected to their present progress in school. More motivated readers named important reasons, both present and future, for reading.
It was interesting that students interviewed who were less motivated to read could sometimes think of only one thing reading was good for and that was to help them with their math; and math, they said, was more important to them than reading. This may have been a way for struggling readers to protect self-concepts. By claiming they were not good at reading because it was not important and, therefore, they did not put effort into it, students could also preserve their sense of efficacy by also claiming it was this lack of effort, rather than ability that made them less able to read well. None of the students mentioned teachers’ roles in their reading development.

Summary

Students said that speaking Keres fluently was more important for acceptance and integration into their community than reading English. Because of this, older students, distracted by other concerns and activities, may not pursue English reading goals as vigorously as necessary to become proficient readers. On the other hand, if boys see more need for English reading, writing, and speaking for future leadership positions, they might remain more motivated than girls as they progress through school. Fortunately, girls said they challenged themselves in reading more than boys, a fact which, over time, could impact reading achievement since the quantitative Challenge subscale and SBA reading achievement appeared closely connected.

Students from “traditional” families, where Keres was spoken and stressed may benefit from better phonemic awareness and stronger family support for student learning, which might also have positive effects on English reading development. In addition, the status of certain families in the community meant that some students received support at home, from others in the community, and from community members at school, while students from less prominent families might receive little adult support for learning. Mothers, in particular, seemed to play important
roles as early reading teachers and ongoing reading mentors. More motivated readers seemed to have had family members who taught them to read and many had attended the local *Head Start* program before entering the local elementary school. These students started with advantages and were gaining even more as they progressed in school.

Most students professed stereotyped gender views, reporting that there were “books for girls” and others that were “just for boys.” Three quarters of the students interviewed believed only men could serve as the tribal governor or as tribal officers and leaders in the community. Women’s roles were to cook, clean, and care for children. These gender stereotypes were important in terms of motivation because they may affect how students saw themselves in the future, a future that might be diminished in the case of some girls.

Students were bothered by teachers who yelled or became angry, and wanted teachers to provide specific reading strategies and assistance. There was nothing surprising about wanting calm, patient teachers, but it was noteworthy some of the students themselves understood they needed better reading instruction.

Whether they were highly motivated to read or not, most of the students interviewed said they chose to read difficult books because they liked to challenge themselves. Students generally, and particularly the more motivated readers, reported intrinsic reasons for reading and said they would not read a “boring” book no matter what the enticement. Except for two of the less motivated readers, students said they would continue reading for personal reasons even if other, more extrinsic motivators, such as grades or parent recognition, were eliminated. This speaks again to the generally intrinsic nature of student motivation at Saint Theresa. Students had and wanted authentic reasons to read.

More motivated boys believed they were smarter than other students, but all students said hard work was the most important factor for improving reading skills and students generally
believed that committing time and attention to the task of reading would make anyone a better reader.

Students from the Saint Theresa community readily articulated future goals, but for many of the less motivated readers, those goals were vague in comparison to the specific goals named by the more motivated readers.

According to many students, particularly girls, a “good student” was one who behaved in class and cooperated with teachers. From the third grade, students interviewed described how they visualized stories as they read and this cut across motivational levels. Second grade students did not have the language to express what they experienced as they read, so it is unknown if second graders also visualized the stories they were reading, though one said she could do this when others were reading to her.

Most students said they would and did give up other activities, even some they enjoyed very much, to read, and all but two said they read for pleasure at home. Less motivated students said reading was important because it helped them with common tasks, such as reading a map, or reading signs in stores, whereas more motivated readers connected reading to future jobs and community leadership. Most of the students believed I was odd for suggesting there would not be enough time to do everything they wanted to do on a Saturday. This different conception of time might be interesting to explore further. Differences in time perceptions could have interesting implications for the classroom.

It seemed that students who were less motivated to read may have been protecting self-concepts by claiming they liked math more than reading and asserting that math was more important for their futures. These students may have been identifying more strongly with the subject that seemed easier for them; however math was a popular subject for most students and one named as very important by most. If less motivated students struggled with reading though,
they may have been trying to convince themselves that reading was not important—certainly, they may have found no joy in it.

In Chapter 6, I synthesize these findings with those from the quantitative study and discuss conclusions and recommendations based on that synthesis.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

In this final chapter, I discuss inference quality and transferability. The study’s limitations are explored as well as missed opportunities that might inform future studies. I synthesize findings from both phases of the study and draw conclusions that emerged from those findings. With each conclusion, I offer recommendations based on one year of directly observing this school and community, and another year and a half of observations as a teacher in the school district. Finally, I suggest ideas for future research and tender final thoughts.

Inference Quality and Transferability

Teddle and Tashakkori (2003) suggested mixed method researchers employ the terms inference quality rather than internal reliability, and inference transferability rather than external validity (quantitative) or transferability (qualitative). The quantitative portion of this study was not designed to generalize, so inference transferability was moot. However, I believe there are findings from the study that might become questions or possible directions for other studies. For example, some well-known research about learning styles (e.g., Pewewardy, 2002) and some lesser-known studies on future-time perspectives (see McInerney, 2004) have suggested American Indian students exhibit distinct learning styles and may struggle to articulate a vision of the future. The more motivated readers in this study readily projected themselves into the future and articulated those future visions clearly. Some of the less motivated readers struggled to express clear futures, but, generally, future-time perspectives were not problematic for students in this study. In terms of learning styles, the teachers in the study who tried to accommodate
different learning styles were also the teachers who relied on relationships for classroom management and who knew and used information about students and their families to motivate students. This suggests that studies of students’ learning styles might easily be confounded by teacher relationships with students. In other words, when teachers report their Native American students respond better to certain types of pedagogy (often visual presentations, whole-to-part instruction), it is not clear whether it is the pedagogy that elicits better learning or whether it is the students’ response to teachers who care enough to get to know their preferences. It may be worthwhile to question whether it is the pedagogy of the learning style, the pedagogy of the relationship, or some mix of both that produces the effect. While these are not questions the study addressed, the findings do suggest the study of specific Native American groups and individuals within those groups might be more helpful than the broad generalizations that are often found in the literature about Native American learning styles.

To determine inference quality, the quantitative data was checked using standard psychometric measures. Inference quality was questionable for the MRS but adequate for the MRQ. There was a real question about how the puppets may have impacted the inference quality of the MRS. Students were obviously more positively inclined toward me and what I was interested in—in this case reading—because of the puppets’ appeal. Quantitative inference quality was important because information from the quantitative assessment, along with teacher evaluations, were used to choose case study samples. Because of the questionable inference quality of the MRS and based on personal experience with first graders during administration of the MRS, first grade students were determined to be less helpful informants and only second grade students were sampled for the qualitative phase. This reduced the number of students chosen for interviews using the less reliable MRS. Also, to improve qualitative inference quality, samples were randomly drawn for case study from a pool of students who were considered
motivated, or not, by both teacher evaluations and quantitative measures. Though this improved inference quality in one way, it also limited the sample pool for interviews because students had to meet both criteria. This pool was further limited by students whose parents would allow their children to participate in the MRS/MRQ surveys and students who refused to participate even though their parents had consented. As discussed earlier, the students who refused assent in one of the most effective classrooms with little pedagogical dissonance seemed to feel empowered to make choices and may have provided interesting and different answers about reading motivation.

In the Baker and Wigfield (1999) study, MRQ inference quality was threatened minimally because there were limits on the amount of time students had to complete the questionnaire, although the authors concluded that evidence in the patterns of responses, variations in the means of the various scales, and correlations with achievement/activity results indicated “that many of the children responded to the measures openly and honestly” (p. 474). Knowing time limits could affect responses, I provided more than enough time for students to respond to questions, so this was not a problem.

There was, however, some evidence of a social desirability response, particularly for the MRS, as indicated by high positive means. On the MRQ, older girls appeared less competitive than older boys. If older boys saw the survey as a competition, it might have made them more likely to respond in socially desirable ways. However, the fact they knew their answers would be anonymous made this less likely. Older girls appeared less competitive than younger cohorts on the MRQ but also less compliant. If girls were trying to be non-compliant this might have led to less socially desirable responses; though again, the anonymity and my status as an outsider would appear to lessen the payoff.

For the qualitative portion of the study, Miles and Huberman (1994; and cited in Maxwell, 2005) listed a number of “tactics” (p. 263) for confirming qualitative findings. First,
with only one researcher coding, analyzing, summarizing, and interpreting, there was the real risk of “generalizing wrongly from specific instances” (p. 264). This risk was minimized by talking often with a community informant, formally interviewing another, and engaging in casual conversation with several more community members. I also conducted 51 interviews with students, three for each of the seventeen students, which gave me a chance to clarify and follow-up with additional questions.

One community insider was especially important to this process. This was the village librarian. I happened to meet this woman at the school one day. She invited me to visit her at the library in the community. She became critical to the success of the study, guiding me in my interactions with the Pueblo Governor and other tribal officials and talking to me at length about the study, about ways to approach students, and what their responses might mean. This woman had a unique perspective and role within the community. Originally, from the Pueblo community, she earned her bachelor’s degree and worked as a school librarian in a public school in another Pueblo community, about two hours away, for many years. Finally, she had the chance to return to the community as the village librarian, and was quite happy to be working back in her own Pueblo. Her children were grown and lived away from the community while maintaining close ties to home, and she was one of only a few women in what might be considered a leadership role in the Pueblo.

Miles and Huberman (1994) also believed researcher and reactive effects should be considered a possible threat to inference transferability (see also, Johnson & Turner, 2003). Again, inferences drawn here are not generalized to other students who are Native American, but some of the issues are nonetheless worth considering. I mentioned above that the younger students, in particular, seemed to exhibit a social desirability response. Response sets are one form of reactive effects, but there are others as well. For one thing, participants may see
themselves in the spotlight and respond artificially. I saw a version of this in an early interview with one girl, but most seemed centered on the questions I was asking. None of the other students appeared self-conscious. The first interviews were definitely more hesitant than subsequent interviews for many students. Others seemed as comfortable from the first moment as they were in the last interview, although they talked and told me more in subsequent interviews. Two things helped the process. One was that the students saw me all over the school almost every day and I had been the substitute teacher for many or participated in projects with them. The second was that the librarian gave us a place in the community, and away from the school, where students could see what others were doing, but could not be seen well or heard by the rest of the children.

If I had any doubts about outside effects in one interview, I had a chance to ask questions again in the next. My status also seemed to change slightly during the course of the year. An extreme outsider when I administered the MRQs, I had moved somewhat closer to the community by the time I started interviewing, and by the third interview, students were telling me quite personal things about themselves and their families.

There was also a chance that participants might change their interview reactions and responses because of their experience with the initial MRS/MRQ measurement. As discussed earlier in the conceptualization of “self,” participants might choose to project a version of self in the interviewing activity that is different than the self that emerges in authentic reading activities. This threat was reduced by the timing and the time lapse between the quantitative assessments and the interviews. The MRS/MRQ measures were completed before the winter break. When students returned to school after the first of the year, I was still talking to the Governor and tribal officials about the interview questions and where and how I would conduct interviews. I also had to finish analyzing the quantitative results. So, considerable time passed between the student surveys and the interview sessions. Nonetheless, students knew I was studying reading, so I
could assume they knew I considered reading important; and my access to them at school and in the community sent the message that others at school and in the community also found reading important.

Finally, participants might respond in different ways to me as the interviewer based on their experiences with others who were similar or different. As Brayboy and Deyhle (2000) explained, not

only Indigenous people can conduct research pertaining to American Indian people. Instead we [Brayboy & Deyhle] believe that those who conduct research must be aware of their positionality in relation to their research participants, their lack of objectivity in getting, analyzing, and reporting data, and how ‘traditional’ methods may influence their work (p. 168).

To minimize my outsider status, I spent considerable time on-site for the data collection, which helped me understand the context better and helped students, teachers, and administrators become accustomed to me. This did not, however, change the fact that I remained an outsider in terms of the community. I was a white researcher and how the students felt about Anglos could definitely affect how they responded. In retrospect, I would like to have devised a way to elicit information about how students viewed those from other groups. My sense was that the students were initially wary of Anglos, but responded over time on a case-by-case basis according to the interactions they had with particular people. I do not know exactly where I stood with them. In the beginning, the older students—especially the middle school students I was sometimes asked to supervise—were very hostile, but over time, most students became friendly and welcoming, even many of the middle school students.

Another potential source of error was consistency in the interviewing process. After a few interviews, I would learn better ways to phrase questions and would think of better ways to
probe further. Fortunately, I did not interview students in a set order. I took them as they were available, so even though a student might not have the advantage of being one of the later interviews in the first round, they might be in the second or third round. I never tried to schedule too many interviews at once. One or two per day was the average, although the last round went quickly and sometimes I could manage three per day. I interviewed, transcribed those interviews, and then interviewed again. This way, I could benefit from hearing the interactions and use what I learned in the ongoing process. Proceeding in this way also allowed me to annotate transcripts if anything unusual had happened or if I wanted to remember a nuance or other important detail.

I followed up with older students at the beginning of each interview to make sure I had gotten things right in the previous interview. I did not go over the transcripts line by line but rather summarized the major points. The second graders and some third graders seemed unwilling to correct anything I reported but the older students occasionally clarified something. Even with older students this was rare and I was not sure if I was really doing a good job or if they just felt uncomfortable correcting me.

I was prepared to, as Miles and Huberman described it, “follow up on surprises” (pp. 269-271) and one of the best was finding that two of the participants were related and had benefitted from the influence of mutual grandparents. I was able to interview the grandfather and gained important insights. This information came in the last round of interviews and without the continued contact, over time; I doubt the student would have thought to share this fact with me.

Only two highly motivated readers ever volunteered more information than I requested. Brayboy and Deyhle (2000) warned that ‘traditional’ research methods may influence results and that seemed to have happened in this case. Generally, students expected that I would ask a question and they would answer. No amount of wait-time—and I pushed the envelope on wait-time—and no number of “tell-me-about-that’s” could persuade some students to extend a
response. I had asked and they had answered and that was that. Some students—and these were all students who were more motivated to read—volunteered additional information in response to a probe and some would even take the interview in their own direction—which I encouraged—but many of the less motivated students showed no interest in saying more and seemed to feel no pressure to do so just because I was waiting or had asked them to clarify or expand.

**Limitations and Missed Opportunities**

This study was limited by its design. Although appropriate for the research questions, it was not as collaborative or as empowering as a design that involved students, teachers, and parents from its inception. While a more participatory design would be preferable, the pragmatic use of both quantitative and qualitative data provided a practical approach to questions about students’ reading motivation and one that was possible given my time and resources.

Additionally, since both the MRS and MRQ used likert scales, there was also the potential for response bias. Shulruf, Hattie, and Dixon (2008) have proposed that questionnaire respondents engage in three Impression and two Expression dimensions when responding to questionnaire items that measure attitudes and beliefs. In the first dimension, understanding and interpreting the content, respondents decide if they “know” or “don’t know” about an item. Fortunately, the scales for the MRS and MRQ do not include “don’t know” responses, which can be skewed by level of knowledge. However, as I discussed earlier, the negatively-phrased questions, though highly reliable, may have posed problems for some students.

The second dimension, retrieving environmental and contextual information, can be affected by information the respondent hears just before the question/item. Therefore, item order could be important. Items from the various dimensions on the MRQ have been mixed so
respondents do not simply answer all questions in one dimension, then move to the next. On the MRS, Baker and Scher (2002) did not specify the order of questions. I asked one question from one category, one from the next, and so forth. On the MRQ, the Importance subscale suffers in this respect because the items are asked one after the other. It also does not help that the scale only has two items.

The next dimension of response set involves retrieving relevant information and related behavior, events, constructs, beliefs, and feelings. This dimension includes the priming effect of questions and both an egoistic and moral component, in which respondents may exaggerate their social and intellectual status and claim what they consider positive attributes. Due to time and access constraints, local experts were not consulted to discuss ways question order and social desirability might affect students’ answers. Because only a few studies have verified social desirability effects, Shulruf, et al. warned, “it is important to not overstate the influence of social desirability” (p. 64).

In the fourth dimension of response sets, comprehending and judging all the available data (content and context) and decision-making, Shulruf, et al. also suggested social desirability, impression management, and self-deception enhancement could come into play. I did not notice this in students who were the highest of the more motivated or the lowest of the less motivated readers. The most motivated seemed very pleased with themselves generally, and I did not sense that they were trying to project more positive images. The least motivated students seemed resigned. In my notes, I sometimes wrote “low energy” or “depressed??” The exception among the most motivated readers was a fourth grade boy who seemed to have a number of status issues in the community related to family dynamics. He told me I might think it was “crazy” but he thought he might want to be a babysitter when he grew up and several other times he mentioned that he thought something he was going to say might surprise me. However, he always told me
whatever the “surprising” thing might be—he just wanted me to be aware he knew that what he was saying might not be what I expected. Primarily, it was the less motivated students, but not the most extreme of the less motivated, who seemed to be trying to impress or provide the “right” answer, as I discussed in Chapter 5 (Please the teacher).

The fifth dimension—interpreting the answer from within the available range of answers, involves extreme, neutral, and acquiescent response sets. According to Shulruf, et al., there have been differences noted in the response sets of Hispanic, European American, and African American respondents. Hispanics may employ a more extreme response set than European Americans or African Americans and African Americans may use a more extreme response than European Americans. Unfortunately, only one study that included Indigenous students and a discussion of response set was located (Bognar, 1980). Bognar suggested a possibly “rigid” response set, but did not differentiate between the native and non-native Labrador students in the study. Shulruf, et al. suggested that the degree of collectivism or individualism present in a group might affect response with collectivists more susceptible to social desirability effects. I looked carefully at individual ranges and mean ranges to find evidence of a response set. A few questions showed some rigidity (reported in Chapter 4) but overall I could not identify a characteristic response set.

The use of puppets for MRS administration may have also impacted student responses. Students were, first of all, anxious to participate in the study in order to have a chance to interact with the puppets. Puppets were quite novel for students at this school and may have led to more favorable responses toward reading simply by creating positive student affect at the outset of the questioning.

The study may have also been affected by what seemed to be a constant tension between the school and the community. When the tribe did not allow the school’s reading specialists to
conduct their study and they found out I was studying reading motivation at the school, it strained my interactions with those individuals. The principal kept me away from them and tried to minimize my presence in some ways. I did not have a chance to meet and talk with the school’s Keres language committee and finally had to establish a direct contact with the tribe and community on my own. These tensions, and others discussed below, seemed to create an “us/them” mentality at the school, and I believe students saw me as one of the “others,” until they got used to also seeing me in their community after school. Because a white teacher’s presence in the village was not usual, I was placed in a different category—“other,” but maybe not like “them.” Within the community, there were also “insiders” and “outsiders.” The status of a students’ family and how well the family maneuvered politically in this small community with limited resources also affected how students fared with their peers, with teachers from the community, and as individuals in households that felt the effects of these relationships.

Finally, I was unable to survey or interview some students who may have had interesting ideas to contribute. Some parents refused to allow their children to participate in the study and some said this was because students at Saint Theresa were being “tested all the time.” School leaders have not spent time explaining to parents why students are assessed or sharing results so parents understand assessment practices and uses. I interviewed some of the most motivated readers at the school, but I know some very motivated readers were excluded because either their parents refused to consent or the students themselves did not assent. If parents and students were used to talking about the purposes and results of assessments, more students might have participated and additional information might have been gained.

In retrospect, it would have also been a good idea to ask students about their participation in the survey during the interviews. Specifically, I could have asked them what they thought the purpose of the survey was and who might use it. I told them before we started what I was doing
and why, but it would have been interesting to query them about their perceptions of purpose and any consequences they might have expected.

I was also disappointed that some students chose not to participate, even though their pleasure at having made that decision was interesting, even fun to observe. What made these students resist when their parents had consented? It seemed to me these were individuals whose opinions about reading could have been quite informative. Their teacher worked hard to empower her students to think for themselves and, in this case, they clearly did.

Two people from the community provided most of the “insider” perspectives on findings during the interview sessions, though I did have additional informal conversations with several other parents and community members. Talking in depth to more people with different perspectives might have introduced different questions and ideas for me to use during the interviews.

Additionally, I questioned whether the question/answer interview format was adequate to getting inside student thinking. I thought about having students tell me a story about a child who grew up to be a great reader and one who did not learn to read well. This is an activity I think classroom teachers could use with good results. I think even working on such a project in pairs or triads would yield interesting information that might alter classroom instruction. I also thought about using pictures as prompts to get students talking about reading. There are other similar ideas classroom teachers, with more contact time, might use to better understand what students think, feel, and believe about reading motivation.

Ideally, four to five researchers would conduct this study in conjunction with administrators and classroom teachers and it would extend to students’ homes and local community activities. This would enable prolonged observations of students as they engaged in reading at school, at home, and in the community. This would also allow researchers to compare
students’ reports to their actual reading activities and conduct additional follow-up interviews to
discuss possible discrepancies. With enough researchers, the study could also expand to
additional interviews with teachers, parents, administrators, school board members, and
community leaders. It would also help to assess students’ reading with independent measures of
reading achievement. With one researcher and one school year to collect data, the scope was
considerably reduced. The hope is that more research will be possible and the findings and
process will be helpful to teachers and other school leaders who might want to take on these
additional inquiries.

Finally, my own subjectivities, discussed further in Appendix D, may have impacted
what I focused on in terms of findings and conclusions drawn from them. My own experiences
working with students from cultures other than my own may have, in some cases, made me more
sympathetic to certain teachers. On the other hand, trying to journal and remain aware of these
subjectivities may have made me less tolerant of other teachers. For instance, did I see myself in
the one Anglo teacher who seemed to be making a good effort to connect with students and
community, and did I give her more credit than she deserved as a result? Did the teachers who
were Anglo or Hispanic and did not seem to be making enough effort remind me of my own
weaknesses and therefore draw more criticism than they deserved? The findings regarding
amplification of Matthew effects clearly relate to my own interest in stratification and the role
reading plays in social justice.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Though the surveys were primarily intended to provide a sampling pool for the student
interviews, there were findings that resulted from both the MRS and MRQ that seemed important
to include. Thus, this section synthesizes the quantitative and qualitative findings and, after each synthesis, provides associated conclusions and recommendations.

**Reading Motivation was Multi-Dimensional with Varied Influences**

Quantitative results showed reading motivation was multi-dimensional for students in grades 1-5 and student interviews suggested reading motivation was also variously influenced for children in grades 2-5 at Saint Theresa. First and second grade students were generally quite enthusiastic about reading, more so than students in other, similar studies of students from different ethnic groups in different areas of the country. This enthusiasm held overall through the third grade with slight dips in fourth and fifth grade reading motivation scores overall and lower scores posted for the Efficacy dimension in fourth and fifth grades. This may indicate students’ efficacy is slipping as they are faced with greater reading challenges—which would be no surprise—but since this is not a single cohort tracked over time, it would require monitoring over several years to ascertain patterns. Reading efficacy scores were lower for older students and given the connection between efficacy and achievement, this could have important consequences for later reading achievement. The lower efficacy scores posted by Saint Theresa’s fourth and fifth grade students may be a normal dip in confidence when students transition to greater comprehension requirements. Unfortunately, three of the five 4th and 5th grade teachers were first-year teachers and observations of the other two suggested ineffective curriculum and pedagogy, so it was difficult to distinguish student response from teacher effects.

This dip in efficacy among older students could also be important because there was a connection between intrinsic motivators and reading achievement, primarily the Efficacy, Challenge, Curiosity, and Involvement subscales (with one question from the Competition
subscales also linked). Interviews suggested students who learned to read early felt the most efficacious, developed the intrinsic motivators noted above, maintained them through the later grades, and were the most motivated readers. This finding was, in turn, supported by the higher reading activity scores of the most motivated readers on the MRQ. However, almost every student interviewed also claimed (s)he could read a book at least one grade level higher than his/her current grade.

While these group characteristics were important, interviews with students also showed that each child represented a unique individual—in Harré’s words: a ‘self’ arising from a “person”—with individual motivations for reading that could change from day-to-day, year-to-year. Multiple interviews over the course of several months indicated reading motivation was stable, but not fixed, for second through fifth grade students at Saint Theresa. Sometimes individuals talked of drawing motivation from the surrounding society, sometimes from their culture, sometimes from peers or others in their immediate environs. As social “persons,” students at this age were trying on new “selves” regularly. These emerging selves were implicated in an ongoing evolution that affected why, what, and how students read.

The society surrounding students primarily influenced their reading choices and their conceptions of the importance of college. Culturally relevant text was mostly missing at Saint Theresa. Cultural influences are discussed further in the section below on the importance of the Keres language as are school and peer effects.

**Conclusions for Dimensions and Influences**

If reading motivation for students at Saint Theresa was multi-dimensional and variously influenced, particularly by intrinsic motivators such as efficacy (which was strongly and positively linked to reading achievement), this is good news for parents, teachers, and other
educational leaders, who can conclude that reading motivation may be positively influenced through ongoing efforts at school, at home, and in the community. However, it will be important to remember that, because the influences are varied and multiple, each child may respond differently to particular interventions. If, as Pressley (1998) and Bandura (1993) assert, students have difficulty maintaining positive self-concepts when faced with ongoing academic struggles, then early reading successes might also promote greater reading efficacy for students at Saint Theresa. In turn, Bandura (1993) and others (e.g., Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 2000) have suggested self-efficacy helps predict how much effort students will expend and how resilient they will be when faced with failures, so greater early reading efficacy might motivate students to challenge themselves, and remain curious and involved in text, all of which was positively linked with reading achievement for Saint Theresa students. Also, older, struggling students may need extra support to maintain reading motivation, particularly in the face of reading failure.

**Recommendations for Teachers**

Based on the conclusion that it is possible for parents, teachers, and other educational leaders to positively influence reading motivation among students at Saint Theresa, there were some patterns that should probably be addressed school-wide. I discuss these patterns further below. In addition, though, because each student represented such a unique collection of preferences, skills, and motivations, teachers also need to get to know their students individually for maximum effect. This could be done through various writing, drawing, speaking or other assignments and through teacher interviews with students. Once teachers know what currently motivates their students to read, they will be in a better position to provide the array of supports that might positively influence their students’ reading motivation. For instance, some students had family members who encouraged them to read. Others were without this family support and
needed other community or school mentors. Some students had career goals that would facilitate reading motivation. For example, one boy who wanted to become a police officer or fire fighter visited the 911 Memorial in New York City. A fire fighter he met there told him to read information about the career and go to college and that simple conversation had affected the student profoundly.

Students should also engage in daily individual reading, before or after which teachers would share (not necessarily every day, but regularly) what good readers do when they read, how they sound out difficult words, ask for help, re-read for understanding, use context clues but verify the context was not misleading, and so forth. During this time, teachers could listen to individual students read aloud quietly so they could provide direct individualized feedback and could collect words with which several students are struggling for short lessons providing explicit instruction targeted to their students’ specific needs. The most motivated readers told me they sounded out words and looked them up in the dictionary. These are two good strategies, but there are others. Students could add to this repertoire: asking another student, asking an adult, trying the accent in different places, attacking new words based on syllable types, and so forth. I am not advocating sustained silent reading where the teacher does nothing but watch students read. I am suggesting teachers stop using the less effective “round robin” reading that students dislike and start developing a longer list of strategies for students, more time with text, and a better idea of what good readers do in effective classrooms. Also, students at Saint Theresa showed greater interest in using and sometimes just perusing reference books like dictionaries and thesauruses than students I have worked with in other schools. This is another opportunity teachers could weave into their curriculum.

Along with this, the time spent on daily individualized reading should be extended gradually over the course of the year so that first graders might start out reading five minutes or
more on their own, increase it to at least ten minutes by winter break and maybe even push it to
twelve minutes or more by the end of the year. First grade students could start at ten to twelve
minutes, move to fifteen plus by midyear, and end the school year at twenty minutes or more.
This could continue at each grade level, so students drop the notion that “good” readers—no
matter their age—read “twenty minutes a day.” That may be too much for beginning readers and
is certainly too little for older readers. Teachers should talk to parents about these expectations
too because some are latching onto catchphrases like “20 minutes a day” without understanding
the purpose or how to adjust for different student needs. Teachers and parents need to remember
that the more time with text—reading and writing—the better. Teachers and parents should also
understand that text difficulty will matter in such a project. Younger readers, developing initial
sound/symbol connections will need “easy” or decodable books for this project but they should
also be hearing and interacting with stories at much more advanced levels. There will be
different text needs for students moving into advanced code and students with good decoding
skills should be encouraged to move between texts at different levels of difficulty.

Almost every student loves a good story, but even more than students in other schools
where I have taught, the students at Saint Theresa loved a tale. Whether it was me making the
stuffed lions talk to each other, a simple story about something I did growing up, or a ghost
story—a fourth grade favorite—they would clamor for more when I stopped. Most of the state’s
English language standards could be adapted to an oral narrative, so it would be possible to use
this genuine interest to enhance comprehension skills. Struggling readers could continue to
improve their comprehension skills as they became more fluent decoders. If there are students
who do not yet visualize while reading, activities around oral narratives could make those deficits
more apparent by separating this skill from other reading skills. The more motivated readers
interviewed reported an ability to visualize and involve themselves in expository text as well as narrative text. Other students could learn and benefit from this ability.

A mother from the community suggested continuing a practice one teacher had tried several years ago whereby students wrote and published their own books that were then added to the library’s collection. The mother said this had been very motivating for both the student authors and their younger peers, who enjoyed reading books by other children.

**Recommendations for other School Leaders**

I would also recommend tracking and correlating student motivation and reading achievement from second through fifth grade, and beyond, if possible. This could be done with student writing projects, by asking students directly, and with the MRQ or similar instruments; and reading achievement could continue to be followed through SBA and MAP\textsuperscript{24} testing, or with Gates MacGinitie or similar assessments. Teachers then need to be trained to use these assessments to develop more effective curriculum and pedagogy.

Some of the less motivated students in the earlier grades told me in the interviews they really hated being moved to a lower grade level classroom for reading instruction. They had been teased by other students and seemed to have lost some confidence as a result. One third grade teacher was experimenting with rotating stations during reading instruction so she could pull small groups of students who needed specific skills and work with them while others were independently engaged in other reading activities. This teacher might help her colleagues implement similar strategies and this would eliminate some of the negative connotations associated with the current regrouping strategy.

\textsuperscript{24} MAP stands for Measures of Academic Progress and is an assessment developed by the Northwest Evaluation Association and used by the district to measure growth and predict performance on the high-stakes test.
Furthermore, in their interviews, the students themselves provided many ideas for increasing reading motivation, including improving the resources in the library and making it more appealing in terms of texts available and as a place to read or listen to stories. At least one student also suggested that students might read more if they knew how to read better. This aligns also with the idea that early readers are more efficacious, so there should be a strong push to provide the most effective reading instruction to beginning students and to promote reading components such as vocabulary and comprehension through oral activities while students are learning to read. Because early reading success could have such an important impact on efficacy, which seemed tied to both reading motivation and reading achievement for students at Saint Theresa, I devote this next section to recommendations related to early reading success and intervention.

**Recommendations for Early Reading Success**

First, educators should directly address the finding that students interviewed almost all said they were good readers who could read a book at least one grade level higher than their current grade. SBA scores suggest this is not true. Students may have been trying to impress me or they may not realize their current reading ability. This is tricky. On one hand, reading efficacy helps maintain effort and so educators would not want to demoralize students who were struggling. Chances are, though, that struggling students know they are struggling and even if they feel efficacious now, they probably will not for long if they continue experiencing reading difficulties. I would recommend teachers talk to students directly and honestly but carefully about their reading strengths and challenges, with the aim to preserve the student’s efficacy but also set achievable goals. If a student is struggling (s)he needs effective and timely intervention to continue to maintain motivation.
As Chall, Jacobs, and Baldwin (1990) have explained, early reading instruction should target the skills students need. For instance, early on, students need to learn how to make sound/symbol correspondences. This does not mean hours of phonics instruction. In fact, short sessions of direct and targeted instruction, often including oral activities that can be done while students are waiting in line, cleaning up from an art activity, etc. are preferable. This leaves plenty of time for students to write, read, listen to stories, tell stories, and explore the wonders of language and text.

For older students, one way to stimulate this type of motivation would be to provide students with challenging and intellectually stimulating text and assignments. More inquiry learning might help. For instance, curriculum adapted from Guthrie’s (Guthrie & Cox, 2001) concept-oriented reading instruction (CORI) might be welcomed by students at the school. In the CORI approach, students are first engaged in hands-on science activities. Then, students choose what they will read to deepen their understanding of the topic. A similar approach could also be taken with topics other than science. In such approaches, students work together, reading to each other and supporting each other in individual inquiries, which include substantial writing, an activity that seemed to be overlooked in many classrooms at Saint Theresa.

When Reading First came on board at Saint Theresa, the school had been using Success for All curriculum and pedagogy but switched to another well-known reading textbook and curriculum. Apparently, there was no one at the school who understood which portions of Reading First would be most useful to students at Saint Theresa and which might be adapted for better results. For a while, one of the teachers, who had an effective journal writing activity for first graders, quit asking students to write because the principal insisted the reading block had to be devoted only to reading. Too much time was likely spent on code instruction; probably too little time was spent engaging students in authentic reading and writing experiences which would
appeal to the intrinsic drives so important to students at Saint Theresa. Teachers seemed largely unaware of findings that students engaged in self-expression “experience an emancipatory and direct connection between literacy learning and their own lives, identities, values, and ways of thinking” (Oldfather, 1996, p. 97). As reading programs changed, one principal insisted teachers “implement with fidelity,” leaving no room for flexible pacing or teacher discretion, and flexible pacing is important for students from low socioeconomic communities (discussed further below). The year of this study, the principal took the opposite tack, allowing some teachers almost complete discretion. When new curriculum and pedagogy is undertaken, extensive professional development might help teachers understand what elements are critical, and why, so they could adapt curriculum to meet the needs of students at Saint Theresa.

Recommendations for Parents/Community Leaders

Since the community has expressed concern over many students’ lower reading scores, it might be helpful if parents and community leaders got together to discuss possible explanations for the decrease in fourth and fifth grade reading motivation scores overall and the lower efficacy scores for students at these grades. Since interviews suggested students who learned to read early felt the most efficacious, what local resources are currently available to support early reading success? Is the local Head Start still having a positive effect on early reading? Which parents were successful in teaching their children to read even before kindergarten? How did they do it, and would it be possible to use this local expertise to help other parents?
In interviews, students could name many more important reasons to learn Keres well than to read English well, although this varied somewhat depending on the future goals students identified. Students said they had to speak Keres well because the language provided leadership opportunities for boys in the community, it gained students membership in the community, saved them from punishment, assured their acceptance within the family and inclusion in family and community events, and even had the potential to “save” the community from disintegration. In contrast, some of the less motivated readers said reading English enabled them to find the toy aisle at Wal Mart. Granted, more motivated readers who were planning specific careers could think of more important reasons to read English well but often the reason was to “do well” in school and help them succeed in college. Students whose families were supporting their career plans appeared more motivated to read and were more likely to link current reading activities and success to their career path—and that path was clearly articulated.

Comparing reading English and speaking Keres side-by-side showed the quality and nature of these differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading English—Individual</th>
<th>Speaking Keres—Individual and community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success in school</td>
<td>Leadership opportunities for boys in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good grades for sports participation</td>
<td>Membership in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve college/career goals for those with clear goals</td>
<td>Escape punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable for some</td>
<td>Acceptance within the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do well in math</td>
<td>Inclusion in family/community events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find aisles at stores</td>
<td>Potential to “save” community from disintegration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conclusions from Keres/English Reading Findings**

The conclusion from this finding seems to be that reading English is connected to individual purposes that may or may not relate to the community, while speaking Keres relates to students’ lives in the community and even to the life of the community itself. These are important distinctions, since for certain students without plans for careers or even those who plan careers but intend to also fill leadership roles in the community, learning Keres may take precedence over English literacy. Thus, teachers and other school leaders may need the community’s help to show students the ways in which English reading is also vital to the life of the community. In fact this message might best be delivered by the community with support from teachers and others at school.

**Recommendations for Teachers and School Leaders**

Parents, teachers, and others at the school could share more information about careers and engage students in more career exploration, so that all students can articulate paths to chosen careers and see how reading fits into their goals. Currently, the less motivated readers and some motivated readers talk about jobs rather than careers and are largely unaware of how to connect the dots between school and career. An introduction to instrumentality as described by Husman, Derryberry, Crowson, and Lomax (2003) might aid in this effort. These researchers distinguish between exogenous instrumentality, which refers to a task that may have utility for a future goal but is not necessarily important for that future task, and endogenous instrumentality, when the task itself will be used in the work related to a future career. The differences could be simplified and explained to students with examples from adults’ own lives.

**Recommendations for Parents/Community Leaders for Keres/English Reading**

Primarily though, parents and tribal leaders should decide how the community would like to address this conclusion. A community project that identified ways English reading is used in tribal work, in government to government contacts, in contacts with the schools, to apply for grants, etc. might benefit students greatly, particularly students in the upper elementary grades. Students need to know why tribal
leaders care about their reading proficiency scores and how reading English might impact the community in the future. If parents and community leaders would share this information with teachers and school leaders, the messages the community wants students to learn could be reinforced at school.

**Teacher Disconnect with Students’ Reading Motivation**

To create a sample of students who were at both ends of the motivation spectrum, I included students as highly motivated or less motivated only if teacher evaluations matched students’ MRS/MRQ characterizations. In the process, I found teacher awareness of student reading motivation was fairly low, as seen in the limited relationship between students the teachers identified as motivated, or less motivated, to read and what the students themselves reported on their surveys.

This suggests teachers were either not attending to students’ reading motivation as carefully as they could, or students were representing themselves differently on the surveys than they did in the classrooms. Since several teachers were able to predict students’ reading motivation levels quite accurately, I would suggest some teachers are simply not attuned to this aspect of their students. This is unfortunate, since two of the students from the more attuned classrooms shared with me during the interviews that their teacher also knew the careers they were planning to pursue, knew what books they did or did not like to read, and specifically linked these future plans to current reading purposes and activities. Clearly, more classrooms like this are needed.

If more teachers knew not only how motivated individual students were to read, but also, as discussed above, what dimensions of reading motivation were strongest or weak for their students and who or what might spark student interest in reading, this might help students develop the intrinsic motivators that appeared so closely connected to reading achievement and overall reading motivation for students at Saint Theresa.
Student Conception of Time

During the interviews, I was trying to get students to think about what they might be willing to forego in order to read (costs of reading are one factor in Eccles’ expectancy value theory, 2001). I created an imaginary scenario in which they identified things they liked to do on the weekend. I then told them, in this imaginary case, that it was a Saturday but there was only time to do two of the things they had identified. I wanted to see if reading would be one of the activities they chose and if they would be willing to give up another preferred activity in order to read. Students simply rejected my scenario. For these students, time expanded on Saturdays; so engaging in all the activities was possible and almost without exception they saw no reason to give up anything.

Hargreaves (2001) provided an interesting account of the different ways teachers and administrators perceived time. During interviews, students shared a view of time entirely different than my own and it was difficult to know whether this was related to our different cultures, different ages, different positions in life, or something else entirely. I concluded that students, like principals and teachers, may have different conceptions of time.

I think this is a possibility worth exploring with students in the classroom. Many teachers at the school reported students would not return homework. The teachers would talk about the students’ afternoon commitments, and how even if students were playing sports or helping parents, the assignment only required “x” amount of time so there was no reason students could not do the assignments. On the other hand, the teachers rarely assigned homework on the weekends. There is a possibility that students view evenings as compressed and weekends as expanded. It is certainly a conversation worth having with students, since it might provide insights into a problem that seemed to frustrate teachers at the school.

Deficit Discourse and Student Response

Observing in classrooms in various capacities throughout the year, I discovered a number of what Shields, Bishop, and Mazawi (2005) termed “pathologizing practices.” In many classrooms, I observed low
expectations, teachers doing the work for students, yelling, making negative remarks about students, and students’ community, or simply disregarding students’ culture completely. I was confident, however, that teachers would understand this was unacceptable and make excuses for themselves when I interviewed them. I was surprised when several teachers told me directly they blamed parents, community, and the students themselves for school failure without any thought to how their own pedagogy or the school curriculum might be affecting student achievement. There were, of course, teachers who did not fall into this negative discourse. Many of these teachers named strengths the students brought to the classroom, but even some of these teachers appeared unaware that several of the school’s most motivated readers had learned to read from mothers and other family members or at the local Head Start program. There were resources within the community that were positively affecting student achievement and teachers and other school leaders seemed largely unaware of those resources.

This hegemonic discourse could be one reason students at Saint Theresa scored lower than students in a similar study in another part of the country on the Compliance subscale and why older students, particularly girls, did not score as high as their younger peers on this dimension. At first, I thought these results were odd given that girls were more likely to give answers during the interviews I thought were designed primarily to please me. Also, girls were most likely to tell me “good” students were ones who complied with the teacher and behaved well in class.

Deficit View Conclusions

This blatant deficit discourse on the part of some teachers suggested educational leaders, including the school’s principal, assistant principal, and other district officials were either unaware or accepted the deficit view held by these teachers. I also concluded most third through fifth grade teachers were unaware of when or how their students learned to read, assuming students had been taught to read by teachers at the school. This was true for many students, but not for some of the best and most motivated readers. Kindergarten through second grade teachers were busy teaching students to read, but it would be interesting to know if they thought all their successes were a result of their own efforts or if they were aware of the
community’s resources regarding reading instruction, in the form of parents and the local Head Start program.

I also wondered whether older students simply got tired of hearing teachers’ negative remarks and resisted this hegemony passively by refusing to comply. After learning more about gender roles in the community, I also wondered if older girls—most of who began to take on adult female responsibilities for cooking, cleaning, and caring for children at about this time—resisted at school as a way to exert control in a place where they felt it was possible. Considering how compliant third grade girls were, how eager to please me, and how likely to define a “good” student by compliance, I continue to suspect this could be the case.

Students who adopt a non-compliant stance may eventually suffer academic consequences by continuously resisting reading and other assignments. The questions in this dimension included: 4. I do as little schoolwork as possible in reading 6. I read because I have to 25. I always do my reading work exactly as the teacher wants it 32. Finishing every reading assignment is very important to me 47. I always try to finish my reading on time. Even though compliance was not directly linked to achievement, a habit of rejecting reading curriculum could eventually impact reading skills.

**Recommendations for Teachers/School Leaders**

Discussing students’ actions and possible consequences directly with students might unearth the root of this problem. First though, it seems worthwhile to set higher expectations for teachers engaged in these negative practices, to help them understand why such practices are not acceptable and to counsel them into other careers if they cannot change their classroom climate. Several new teachers lamented the lack of mentoring, so a more formal mentoring process with professional learning communities might be another helpful tactic.

Teachers and administrators might also want to consult the *Funds of Knowledge* research by Gonzales, Moll, and Armanti (2005) for ideas about how to find and use family and community resources to improve student outcomes. Also, if students, particularly girls, believe “good students” are compliant students, it seems possible these older students, who were less compliant, could begin to view themselves as
“bad” students, become less motivated, with consequences for reading practice and reading proficiency. Bandura (1993) and others (e.g., Schunk, 1991; Zimmerman, 2000) have discussed this cycle at some length.

This finding connects not only to Bandura and the social cognitive theorists, but also to Wentzel (1991), who found socially responsive behavior led to social competence and helped predict academic achievement in classrooms. Wentzel suggested the reasons could be that social responsibility is simply valued and rewarded in classrooms; that classroom environments influence levels of social responsibility; or that students who experience repeated failures reject class norms and become socially irresponsible.

**Recommendations for Parents/Community Leaders Regarding Deficit Views**

Although some information no doubt comes to parents and community leaders about this deficit discourse from instructional assistants, it might help if parents and other community leaders were in classrooms on a regular basis, observing teacher practices firsthand. I did not see parent volunteers helping in classrooms as might be expected in white, middle and upper class schools. This inserts my own subjectivity, but I know some of my own “volunteer” work at my children’s school was designed to not only help teachers but also to observe what was happening in their classrooms—an unspoken understanding among white parent “volunteers.” With this direct contact, parents and other community leaders would be in a better position to understand and thereby address hegemonic practices and why older girls, in particular, might be non-compliant.

**District versus Community**

To address hegemonic practices within the current school system will probably require community interactions with school personnel. Throughout the year, I watched and listened as members of the local community complained about the district, and district personnel expressed their frustration with the community. Community informants told me certain actions taken by school leaders at the district level indicated a lack of respect and concern for the Pueblo’s children. For instance, there were problems with the
school’s physical plant. The school district addressed some of these issues. The gym roof was repaired. District leaders made sure the school was thoroughly cleaned at the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year and they became more responsive to maintenance issues, but questions remained about the allocation of district resources. Several school officials told me the school was receiving its fair share of limited resources, and community members should understand this and help school officials gain more resources rather than expending energy continuing to express their hostility and resentment. A legislative finance report on the ratio of state expenditure to student success fueled further resentment (Report to the Legislative Finance Committee, 2009).

There was an “us/them” mentality among many staff members. Teachers and staff from the community were “us.” Principals, white and Hispanic teachers were “them,” although a few of the long-time teachers became accepted and at least one Native American teacher was not considered part of the community group. Students did not talk about this, but their reactions to questions about it gave me the sense they were aware. Battle lines were often drawn at school board meetings, with Native American groups sitting together in one part of the room and Hispanic groups sitting separately. White audience members were monitored to see “which side” they would take. In the spring of 2010, several Pueblo governors attacked the district superintendent and pressured school board members not to extend her contract. The school board acquiesced and the superintendent was not rehired (See Appendix E).

I did not sense that either side was interested in understanding the motivations of the “others.” Rather, I concluded this was another encounter in a history of struggles over power and resources—essentially an effect of the legacy of colonization by Spanish and Anglo settlers. At the heart of this struggle were the students. The recommendations that proceed from this study would be difficult under the best circumstances. With this centuries-old conflict continuing, the work seems daunting. This is a conflict that has seen the virtual enslavement of Native Americans by the Spanish conquistadors and bloody rebellion by Pueblo leaders. White settlers, backed by the U.S. army, forced many Native American children into boarding schools that were cruel and inhumane, and grabbed land for homesteaders from both Chicanos and Native Americans.
Students study this history but the tensions are often ignored. Dealing with the issues openly and honestly and resolving to work toward solutions rather than continued recriminations could help. Though this matter is beyond the scope of this project, it definitely influences the work that proceeds in this particular school within the district.

**Gender Effects**

The different roles for men and women in the community were clearly articulated by students in the interviews and confirmed by other community members. The differences went beyond “girl books” and “boy books.” The students were clear that men had the primary responsibility for leadership in the community and women, in the words of several students, “cooked, cleaned, and took care of the kids.” This linked in interesting ways to other findings from the study.

First of all, third grade girls rated reading as vitally important on the MRQ, but fourth and fifth grade girls reported substantially lower ratings on the importance of reading. Boys’ scores on the *Importance* subscale were about the same across the three grades. Fourth and fifth grade girls were also less competitive in regards to reading than their third grade peers, with boys again remaining stable. This meant that, for the *Importance* and *Competition* subscales, girls, who in third grade were higher than boys on both scales, at fifth grade were considerably lower than fifth grade boys on both scales. Gender differences for Saint Theresa students on the *Importance* subscale contrasted sharply with other findings that have reported girls valuing reading more than boys (e.g., Durik, Vida, Eccles, 2006; Kush & Watkins, 1996; Marinak & Gambrell, 2010; McKenna, 2001; Wigfield, Eccles, Suk Yoon, Harold, Arbreton, Freedman-Doan, Blumenfeld, 1997). Also, there had been no differences between boys and girls on the *Competition* subscale in Baker and Wigfield (1999).

Linked with competition, the interviews also suggested boys read to gain expertise on topics in order to gain additional status among their peers. Because of the link between the *Challenge* subscale and reading achievement on the SBA, it also seemed important to note that fifth grade boys showed the least interest in reading challenges and this was confirmed by highly motivated girls in the interviews who said
girls took on greater reading challenges than boys. On the other hand, while as many girls as boys named specific future professions, most boys had a clearer vision of the path they would follow to get there. Often, girls could name a professional goal, but were less clear about how they would achieve it. While boys’ had concrete future goals, the girls’ goals were often vague. The more motivated girls did talk about future careers, however, for all but one, it was difficult to know if these were concrete plans or “selves” they were trying on as “persons” at school where teachers and others sometimes asked them what they planned to do when they got older.

Anyone who happened to sit in the tribal offices waiting area (and many community members did so) could see that to be a tribal governor or leader required English reading, writing, and speaking skills as well as Keres language proficiency. However, girls would notice two secretaries in the office using these skills, but not female tribal officials. Boys, on the other hand, would notice at least ten high-status positions for men in that same office and five of those positions rotate every year, so the chances for boys to serve in an important leadership role in the community were much greater.

Added to these findings was the fact that at least three of the 13 teachers were young women of a different culture who may not notice the differences or may discount these effects coming from a generation that often takes gender equality more for granted. In the history of U.S. education, women have been viewed as more appropriately suited to elementary teaching positions, with men filling more secondary and post-secondary positions. There are remnants of these views with us still (Blye, 2001). In a community where gender roles have not been challenged throughout the last half century, this attitude may be working in ways that would surprise teachers and others who have learned to accept men and women in diverse roles. This may be true as well of the more experienced white teachers and younger teachers from the community who have been educated and lived for extended times outside the community. On the other hand, teachers from the community may not notice the effects because the differences are so much a part of their world that they go unnoticed.

When I understood how clear and stable the roles were for men and women in the community and how few positions of power were held by women there, it also made me wonder if the principal’s difficulties with effective discipline might be a result of her gender. Teachers told me students had been “much better
behaved” under the leadership of the past two male principals. This could be a difference in personal styles or it could indicate the students’ rejection of women as authority figures.

**Gender Conclusions**

Whatever the case, I concluded gender roles may affect various dimensions of students’ reading motivation at Saint Theresa and this is an area that seems largely overlooked by teachers and administrators at the school. Girls at Saint Theresa, in contrast to girls in other studies, may come to believe English reading, writing, and speaking skills gain them little in terms of community opportunities and may begin to devalue English reading as a result. If older girls begin to accept the expectation that their futures are comprised of cooking, cleaning and caring for children, motivation to read, or at least certain aspects of their motivation to read, could change. Instead of requiring ever greater reading proficiency to succeed in school, girls may believe they only need enough reading skill to read to young children or help them learn to read.

If the consequences of competition among boys became more serious over time, it might explain why some boys did not want to risk losing their status by accepting challenges that might cause them to slip in the ranks. Older girls may not be competing as much in reading and other areas because they are not jockeying for future leadership positions generally.

**Recommendations for Teachers/School Leaders**

The ways gender may be affecting reading motivation should be explored further across cohorts. If, in fact, girls and boys show patterns of change over time based on gender, and if these patterns are detrimental to motivation or achievement, they should be addressed directly. Continued study may show that boys are affected negatively as well—for instance, in setting challenges. If girls do begin to devalue reading, this should be of great concern to teachers and other school leaders. If boys value expository text partly because it gives them expertise among peers, this is an interest teachers could encourage and something girls might learn to value as well. Mohr (2006) has reported some first grade students prefer expository text, particularly informational text about animals. Several less motivated readers suggested the
library offer more books about animals. Perhaps this is an opportunity and interest teachers could encourage early on and continue with older students. There may be other such interests that could also be encouraged.

**Recommendations for Parents/Community Leaders**

Students could be coached and shown ways to appropriately question and challenge gender differences at school. However, if the school teaches children to question their roles and this is unwelcomed in the community, the backlash could have other implications. Knee-jerk reactions seem destined to fail. It is a complicated issue and will require open and sustained dialogue between teachers, parents, the students themselves, and other community and school leaders. First, students’ views should be explored across time. Since females seem to be affected the most, possibly females from the community could serve as a resource to discuss and plan ways to address the issues, although there may be mixed views about appropriate responses among the women in the community.

It seems parents and other community leaders could discuss their goals for student to achieve better reading performance on the SBA in light of these findings. Understanding that valuing reading and accepting reading challenges may be problems that could impact reading achievement provides opportunities to solve those problems in ways that make sense to parents and community and also value the maintenance of students’ language and culture. Because these gender effects appear connected to cultural issues, and because the current school leadership may not fully understand these linguistic and cultural issues, this is one area where the community should take the lead.

**Amplification of Matthew Effects**

The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods uncovered interesting interactions between the students’ social and cultural capital, teachers’ curriculum and pedagogy, and reading motivation and achievement. Socioeconomic status was originally slated for inclusion as a variable. However, the school was not able to distinguish socioeconomic levels since all students received free lunches, there was no information on parents’ level of schooling, and I could find no other non-intrusive way to determine
differences. Knowing there was both theory and practice connecting certain pedagogies to success with students from communities of low income, I looked for use of these more effective pedagogies during classroom observations (see Appendix F for notes on these classroom observations). I then ran correlations between reading motivation scores on the MRQ and classrooms with pedagogy identified in the literature as most effective with students from lower socioeconomic groups (Bernstein, 1996; Morais & Neves, 2001). I found that third, fourth, and fifth grade students whose teachers had high expectations for learning, flexible curriculum pacing, and clear academic standards exhibited stronger reading motivation.

Kalantzis & Cope (1999) have pointed out that many teachers come from middle class backgrounds, where individualism is celebrated along with “progressivism.” There were certainly teachers like this at Saint Theresa. Unfortunately, as Kalantzis & Cope explained, when middle class teachers interact with students from a lower socioeconomic group, what may seem to teachers like “reasonableness” could be based on “cultural imperatives” that students find hard to read, understand, or accept (p. 259). Bernstein (1996) theorized, and his former graduate students, Morais and Neves (2001), found that many students from poor communities perform better academically when there is more student control over pacing and sequencing, along with criteria that are clear and explicit. Also, according to Vansteenkiste, Lens, and Deci (2006), when teachers ignore student needs for pacing, they create a more controlling environment and reduce intrinsic motivation. By paying attention to students’ learning pace, setting high standards but communicating to students what it looked like to meet those standards, some teachers at Saint Theresa seemed to bridge what could have been a serious gap between teachers and students. As a result, their students appeared more motivated to read, which, for Saint Theresa students, was largely driven by intrinsic purposes. Unfortunately, there were a number of other teachers at the school who were not connecting with students through effective pedagogy.

In addition to certain classrooms that appeared to create pedagogical dissonance between teachers and students, I also found in interviews with students and other community informants, that within this generally poor community, there were clear differences in status among various families. 25 I discovered

---

25 Community status was defined here as a family’s social and cultural capital within the community and was determined mostly by information from community insiders. Cultural capital included status markers, such as advanced
that some students from higher status families were also the most motivated readers. Students from strong “traditional” families, with higher status, may have multiple advantages in terms of reading. The higher status families usually also had strong English language skills. Recalling Meredith, who came from just such a family, her grandfather required the children to speak only Keres in certain places, but he also had strong English language skills. So when English or Keres was spoken in her family, Meredith had good models. As a result of her bilingualism, Meredith probably entered school with better phonemic awareness skills, cueing her for stronger sound/symbol associations. She received learning support from her family and her family’s status in the community meant she had the attention of community members at school. Meredith reported learning to read before she even entered kindergarten so teachers from outside the community may have enjoyed and promoted her early reading successes too, resulting in a snowball effect of better skills, more reading, and with more reading, better skills—a status amplification of the famous “Matthew Effects” (Stanovich, 1986).

On the other hand, there were also students at Saint Theresa who had gotten off to a slow start in reading and were therefore experiencing the other side of the coin in terms of Matthew Effects—struggling readers avoiding reading, reading less, and struggling more. Some of these students were in classrooms with less effective curriculum and pedagogy for students from communities like theirs; and some were struggling under an additional burden of limited status within the community, meaning, among other things, they might not be targeted for extra help from community teachers or educational assistants. Teachers might also see them as a “problem.”

Students could claim social and cultural capital within the local Pueblo community and/or among the “outsiders” within the school community. So there were students like the highly motivated girl in third grade from a high-status family who was also a favorite among the white teachers, or others, like the fourth

Keres language skills, knowledge of traditional ceremonies, including dances and songs, cultural transmission to children. Social capital entailed access to networks of influence engendered by cultural capital, including participation and leadership in community events and tribal planning and other government activities. Generally, children took the status of the parent with which they were living; however in some cases this was more complicated, since some children were not living with parents. Also, adults might have cultural capital but may have violated community norms (for instance by marrying outside the tribe) resulting in lost social capital. This was the case with parents of at least two students in the study with low community status, one of whom had such a high-status grandfather that the child seemed to believe that with enough work he could gain the grandfather’s approval and improve his own status. The other student had a parent from outside the tribe and he seemed to accept his low status in this community. It was possible this student had higher status in his other parent’s tribe.
grade boy with high reading motivation who had low status in the community but was favored among the white and Hispanic teachers. This young man desperately wanted to learn Keres better so he could one day be a tribal leader and elevate himself in the community but he also seemed to recognize that school brought opportunities for different successes. Bourdieu (1984), Apple (2000), Goddard (2003), and others (Brandt, 2001; Schneider, 1996) have discussed how education can provide upward mobility, but education is also facilitated for students with more social and cultural capital and this certainly seemed true at Saint Theresa.

**Conclusions from Matthew Effects Amplification**

I concluded from these findings that there was a sort of “Bermuda Triangle” of failure at Saint Theresa. Students in this triangle of failure appeared to go missing from teachers’ and administrators’ radar. These students were often in classrooms with pedagogical dissonance, where teachers did not adjust pacing, did not provide clear examples or set high standards for student work. In addition, they were struggling readers with low reading motivation and little status in their community. As a result of their reading struggles, teachers found them difficult to work with, and because of their limited social and cultural capital, they were also ignored by instructional assistants and others from the community working at the school.

These were students for whom reading interventions and better curriculum and pedagogy may not be enough—although better curriculum and pedagogy may be the initial challenge for school leaders. These home/school differences also brought up the issue of the student’s status at home versus at school. Teachers, whether they were connecting with students effectively in terms of curriculum and pedagogy or not, seemed to enjoy students who were motivated to read. Struggling teachers mentioned these motivated readers to me informally or during member checks and held these students up as examples of what they could achieve as teachers when, as one teacher put it, students “just tried.” They also mentioned some of the less motivated readers as examples of the failure that resulted when parents were not supportive. Generally, motivated readers had high status with teachers. I heard teachers compliment and praise them and occasionally hold them up for other students to emulate. Also, some students came from families with high community status and thus had the attention of teachers from the community as well as instructional assistants and other staff (all from the local community). However, at least two of the more motivated
readers did not have high status in the community. Their parents were not among those who organized and led traditional ceremonies or participated in community decision-making, according to at least two community insiders. One of these students, Roland, had substantial family support from his mother and brother. Another, Brent, did not have the family support, but had attended the local Head Start program and claimed he was a precocious reader, which may have garnered teacher attention for him early. Thinking of these and other students in terms of status and reading motivation, I concluded the interviews had identified three quadrants of a status and reading motivation matrix (see Figure 5-1, in Chapter 5) and that the factor that most contributed to high reading motivation (in spite of low status) was a supportive family member or early reading success that then garnered teacher attention and support.

Students with high reading motivation had status either in the community or in school, strong family support, had received effective early reading instruction, or combinations of these factors. Students with low reading motivation had low community status, although it seems possible there were unidentified students with low reading motivation and high community status. In this case, there may be cognitive or other deficits that undercut the support from family and/or community members working at the school.

**Recommendations for Teachers/Parents/Community Leaders/School Leaders**

Though some of these recommendations are clearly aimed at teachers, there is no way to separate school and community responses. Again, both groups need to work to find ways to help students who currently seem to be off everyone’s radar. Students in this triangle of failure (with low status, low reading motivation and achievement, in classrooms with pedagogical dissonance) will need extra support, time, and resources. The resiliency literature suggests these students need to connect with someone, somewhere, if they are to succeed. Effective mentoring relationships (Howard, 2006; Southwick, Morgan, Vythilingham, & Charney, 2006) might be one way to overcome this failure trifecta. Southwick, Morgan, Vythilingam and Charney (2006) have discussed the effectiveness of non-parental kin mentors with struggling students and Brandt (2001) chronicled the historical importance of mentors—or what she called “sponsors”—for developing successful literacy skills, particularly for individuals from underserved communities. If teachers and others at the school and in the community can begin to recognize students who may be struggling with
multiple impediments to reading motivation, they will be in a better position to provide the considerable support these students may need.

Teachers who get to know their students, students’ families, and the community might be better able to identify and help such students. Additionally, supportive relationships with teachers have been connected to student resiliency (Overman, 2004; Howard, 2006; Ashcroft, 2004). Ideally, these students would be identified and assigned long-term mentors at school or in the community who could help them improve their literacy skills and also increase their social and cultural capital. Teachers from outside the community, who may be disadvantaged in terms of increasing students’ cultural and social capital, may need to enlist community members to help in this regard. It may be important for these mentors to consider the fact that some students believed reading English was not necessarily needed for successful integration into the community. Teachers should be aware that when students get older and are distracted by other activities, reading might become something some are willing to forego if they believe they will have a place in Pueblo life without strong reading skills. It may also be helpful to explore this belief further to ascertain whether or not it is correct, and what community leaders say about it. The first step will be to fully understand what is happening in these students’ lives by connecting with them and listening to them.

In addition, the local Head Start program should be explored further. One district official told me it was no longer as effective as it had been at one time. For several of the most motivated readers, this had been an important factor in their early reading successes. Exploring the effectiveness of this program currently and revitalizing it if needed might have important consequences for students at Saint Theresa. It might also help explain some of the recent deficits in students’ SBA scores. As discussed earlier, early reading successes and early and effective interventions will go a long way in short-circuiting the snowball effects that often accompany early reading failure. In addition, the pedagogical dissonance in some classrooms, discussed above at length, should also be remedied.
Future Research

There are a number of new questions that spring from the study’s findings. First, thinking of the revised reading motivation conceptualization for students at Saint Theresa and how the “person” integrates experiences within his/her culture into a “self” that then makes decisions about whether to read and continue reading even when the reading becomes more difficult, it seems clear that additional work is needed on the role of language and culture in the reading motivation process for these students. The findings point to the critical role played by both language and culture and more information about both could strengthen or even revise the study’s conclusions and recommendations.

For instance, as boys and girls begin thinking about their roles as men and women in the community, do girls become less compliant and less competitive in school, or are compliance issues reactions to hegemonic school practices? The possibility of older girls resisting teachers to gain personal control should be explored further. If this hypothesis were true, and if girls began to think of themselves as “bad,” non-compliant students, the study’s conclusions suggest there could be negative consequences for learning, reading motivation, and reading development.

Are there fewer opportunities for girls to compete in sports and other activities at school or is this a gender role they begin to accept that then limits their involvement? Do girls’ grades suffer as a result, and does this affect their reading ability over time? At the fifth grade, girls were still interested in accepting challenges. Is this an artifact of a single group or a repeated pattern across cohorts? Comparing cohorts over time would provide much more useful information than the snapshot provided in this study. If this was a repeated pattern, could teachers and parents maximize this strength to overcome some of the other motivational weaknesses older girls exhibited? At the fifth grade, boys may be avoiding challenges, but they are still quite curious, want to be known as “experts,” and they want to keep their grades up. How can teachers and parents use this information to students’ advantage?

Next, what exactly are the links between efficacy and challenge? If students set, then fail to meet a reading challenge, is their efficacy impaired, or do some students doubt their reading skills and therefore fail to set challenges that would help them grow as readers, or both? Also, what does “learned to read” and
“read well” really mean to students? Clearly understanding the criteria for effective reading might help students at Saint Theresa.

From the community’s standpoint, if girls believed they must leave the community to assume strong leadership roles, then staying in the community might mean lowering leadership expectations. One woman from the community explained that women lead men and hold power “behind the scenes.” Will this continue to be enough for girls who see women as independent leaders in the surrounding culture?

Change may also be coming, since two boys and two girls thought a woman as governor might be something the tribe should consider. Some students seemed to be thinking about this situation. As possibilities for change emerge, will tribal leaders try to maintain the status quo and how might that affect students’ attitudes about gender roles, with what effect on academic goals and performance?

If most Saint Theresa students do not see women as leaders, how does this affect their attitudes toward female teachers and administrators? Is this why students are less compliant in fourth and fifth grade where all but one teacher was female? Is this why teachers reported student behavior was out of control under the female principal but was much better under the two male principals? I did not directly question students about whether women have a legitimate right to discipline them. How is discipline handled in students’ families? Since there have been a number of recent marriages between this tribe and a nearby non-Pueblo tribe with matriarchal lineage, different families may have different parenting styles. These are important questions and teachers from the community, as well as students themselves, could help inform teachers and others from outside the community. One question is: would a male administrator from this, or a similar, community be a better choice as principal? If so, how does a school district, located in a culture that believes in equal opportunities for men and women reconcile this value, when violating it might prove beneficial for students at the school? These are the thorny issues school leaders face when they strive to understand what motivates students at Saint Theresa.

Finally, what exactly is the strength and nature of the relationship perceived here between community status and reading motivation? Are there students with high community status and low reading motivation? If so, what contributes to this profile? Could status in the community and at school be measured and compared to reading achievement and motivation? This could add another dimension to our
understanding of reading motivation at Saint Theresa. Obviously, language and culture are implicated in almost every aspect of reading motivation for these students and deserve further study.

**Final Thoughts**

Perspective is one of the most interesting aspects of research. Like subjectivity, each person’s is unique. My original outsider status, as well as the time I spent on site and teaching nearby, meant my perspective shifted over time. The quantitative data remained the same, just like the pieces inside a kaleidoscope, but time and understanding provided that slight shift that kept changing what I was seeing. The interviews were like adding new pieces which made new views possible. But, of course, how I interpreted what I saw was influenced by the astigmatisms of my own culture and language.

I entered the site aware of historical tensions in the state among Native Americans, Hispanics, and Anglos. I wondered, maybe even doubted, if these tensions could touch students’ reading motivation at an individual level. I was wrong. Those tensions seemed to have a great deal to do with how leaders at the school and in the community interacted. Those interactions or lack thereof seemed to be limiting the school’s progress in terms of reading achievement and this, in turn, affected individual students.

Likewise, there appeared to be a lack of awareness on the part of teachers and other school leaders about what motivated students to read or not, or even which students were or were not motivated to read, which was exacerbated by school policies that lurched from one initiative to another without a real understanding of what influenced the data driving the need for policy changes. School leaders and many teachers were not knowledgeable enough about the community and its resources to make the most effective decisions and chose not to bring the community into the decision-making process in a real way, fearing possible political repercussions. Likewise, many teachers did not know, and some did not care, how their students’ language and culture affected, and might support, learning at school.

The tribe’s governor signed on to a letter to the district school board at the end of the 2010 school year requesting the superintendent not be rehired. The letter indicated the community wanted students’ reading scores on the NMSBA to improve. District and school leaders want that as well, so this seems to be
a common ground from which to begin building new policies. Reading motivation and achievement are connected and the results from this study could contribute to better policies. Working from the students’ strengths and from current community resources seems like a good starting point. The first project in this regard might enlist parents and tribal leaders to show students ways in which reading English affects both individual futures and the community.

Gender effects from this study also seem connected to underlying cultural values and beliefs. School and community leaders need to thoroughly explore and understand each others’ beliefs in this regard. This may be the most difficult issue to undertake or it could prove to be easily reconcilable. In either case, it seems critical to discuss how gender might be influencing reading motivation and academic performance at the school.

Finally, the community is likely well aware of students with low status who may be falling through the cracks at school. A conversation between school and community leaders around this issue might alter these students’ lives immeasurably. It certainly seems worth the try.

Again, these are the patterns I saw filtered through my own linguistic and cultural lens. This study is offered so that others may turn the kaleidoscope a different way and see different patterns using their own filters. Hopefully, in the process, ideas will emerge that will lead to improved opportunities for students.
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APPENDIX A

Consent Forms, Assent Forms, and Letter of Introduction to Torreon School Board

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Exploring reading motivation among American Indian students: A mixed methods study

Principal Investigator: Candace Head-Dylla
#6 Ridgerunner Rd.
XXXXX, XX XXXXX
505-287-5019
505-401-4349
cuh148@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Nona Prestine
207D Rackley
University Park, PA 16802
nap11@psu.edu
814-238-8269

1. Purpose of the Study:
This is a study to learn from students why they choose to read and what motivates them to work hard in reading activities, or why they choose not to read and avoid reading activities.

2. Procedures to be followed:
Your child will be asked to answer questions from the Motivation to Read Questionnaire if (s)he is in grades 3-5 or from the Motivations for Reading Scales if (s)he is in grades 1 or 2. The questionnaire will not have your child’s name on it, only a code.

I, Candace Head-Dylla, will read the questions to students in grades 3-5 in a whole-group setting and students will answer the questions as they wish and return the questionnaires to me.

I will be the only person who has a list connecting names and codes. I will not share this list with anyone and it will be kept in a locked, secure location in a password-protected computer. The list is only used in case you or your child decides to participate but later change your mind, and then I will use the list to find your child’s code and remove his/her information from the study.

3. Discomforts and Risks:
There are no discomforts or risks expected in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

4. Benefits:
The benefits to your child include a chance to reflect on why, when, where, (s)he reads and what might make him/her want to read more. These reflections may also eventually affect classroom and school policies in ways that would help your child or other students become more proficient and motivated readers. Teachers and administrators may use the information from the completed study to motivate and provide better reading instruction for students.
5. **Duration/Time:**
Interviews should take about 30 minutes to an hour depending on the child and whether he or she gets tired or bored with the questions. Interviews will be conducted at the school, preferably in the child’s classroom, or at a place in the school that is open and recommended by teachers or principal.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:**
Your child’s participation in this research is confidential. Penn State’s Office for Research Protections, the Social Science Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

After the study is completed and possibly published, the list of names and matching codes will be destroyed.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:**
Please contact me, Candace Head-Dylla, at XXX-401-4349, XXX-287-5019, cuh148@psu.edu with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. Questions about your rights as a research participant may be directed to Penn State University’s Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775. You have the right to ask any questions you may have about this research.

8. **Voluntary Participation:**
Your decision to allow your child to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. Your child does not have to answer any questions (s)he does not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

“I give permission for my child, ____________________________, to participate in this research.”

_________________________________________  _______________________
Participant (Parent) Signature                  Date

_________________________________________  _______________________
Person Obtaining Consent                       Date

**Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research**
The Pennsylvania State University

**Title of Project:** Exploring reading motivation among American Indian students: A mixed methods study

**Principal Investigator:** Candace Head-Dylla
#6 Ridgerunner Rd.
XXXXXX, XX XXXXX
1. **Purpose of the Study:**
This is a study to learn from students why they choose to read and what motivates them to work hard in reading activities, or why they choose not to read and avoid reading activities.

2. **Procedures to be followed:**
Your child was one of sixteen students chosen following completion of a questionnaire called the Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ 3rd-5th grade) or the Motivations to Read Scales (MRS 1st-2nd grade) that was recently administered to students whose parents gave permission for them to participate.

Your child was chosen based on a combination of the following characteristics:
- Level of motivation
- Gender
- Grade

I (Candace Head-Dylla) will record my conversation with your child using a digital audio recorder. I will have at least three different conversations with your child, and each should last about 30 minutes to an hour. Until transcription, the audio recordings will be stored in a locked room in a secure private room. Only I will have access to the recordings.

I will listen to the recording of your child in a private, secure location. After I type out what your child said, I will erase the recording. Only a code, not your child’s name will be used on the typed manuscript of the interview. Therefore, even if someone sees the written version of what your child said, your child’s name will not be attached to it.

I will be the only person who has a list connecting names and codes. I will not share this list with anyone and it will be kept in a locked, secure location in a password-protected computer. The list is only used in case you or your child decides to participate but later change your mind, and then I will use the list to find your child’s code and remove his/her information from the study.

3. **Discomforts and Risks:**
There are no discomforts or risks expected in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

4. **Benefits:**
The benefits to your child include a chance to reflect on why, when, where, (s)he reads and what might make him/her want to read more. These reflections may also eventually affect classroom and school policies in ways that would help your child or other students become more proficient and motivated readers.
Teachers and administrators may use the information from the completed study to motivate and provide better reading instruction for students.

5. **Duration/Time:**
Interviews should take about 30 minutes to an hour depending on the child and whether he or she gets tired or bored with the questions.

Interviews will be conducted after school in the XXXXXXXXXXXXX Pueblo Library.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:**
Your child’s participation in this research is confidential. Penn State’s Office for Research Protections, the Social Science Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

After the study is completed and possibly published, the list of names and matching codes will be destroyed.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:**
Please contact me, Candace Head-Dylla, at 505-401-4349, 505-287-5019, cuh148@psu.edu with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. Questions about your rights as a research participant may be directed to Penn State University’s Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775.

You have the right to ask any questions you may have about this research.

8. **Voluntary Participation:**
Your decision to allow your child to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. Your child does not have to answer any questions (s)he does not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

“I give permission for my child, ____________________________, to participate in this research.”

______________________________  _________________________
Participant (Parent) Signature     Date

______________________________  _________________________
Person Obtaining Consent          Date
Verbal Assent Form (Questionnaires Grades 3-5)

Hello. My name is Candace Head-Dylla and I am trying to find out what makes students want to read or not read. Your parents said it was okay for you to help with this study.

This is a research study. Research studies include only people who want to take part. If I use any words that you don’t understand please ask me to explain. Please ask questions about anything that is unclear to you.

The purpose of this study is to find out from students what motivates them to read. There will be about 200 other students participating in the study.

Your are being offered the chance to take part in this research because you are a 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th grade student in XXXXXX XXXXXXX School.

First, I will ask you to fill out a reading questionnaire in class. I will read the questions aloud to the entire class and you will choose between four answers. Your name will not be used. The questionnaires will be coded and only I will have the list of codes linked to your name. I will be the only person who could connect your name to the code on your paper. I will not share this list with anyone and it will be kept in a locked, secure location. The list is only used in case you decide to participate now but later change your mind. Then I will use the list to find your code and remove your name and information from the study. After the study is completed and possibly published, the list of names and matching codes will be destroyed. If the information from the study is published, you will not be identified or named. If you would like more information about me, please use the card I am giving you now to call or contact me.

(Card will have the following information):
Candace Head-Dylla
cuh148@psu.edu
#6 Ridgerunner Rd
XXXXX, XX XXXXXXX
XXX-401-4349 (cell)
XXX-287-5019 (home)

In a few weeks, I might also choose you to answer additional questions about why you read, what you like to read, how often you read and other questions related to reading. If you are chosen, you can refuse to participate or can begin to participate but change your mind and stop the interview at any point.

You should not feel uncomfortable at any time while participating in this project. If you do, let me know and you can stop immediately.

You will not get anything for taking part in this research study.

However, your school and your community might learn something about why students read or do not read.

Your name will not be used on any documents other than the master list, which will be kept private.
If you choose to participate, you are free to stop at any time. If you start to participate but change your mind, you may use the card I gave you to write or call me and tell me you do not want your information used.

- Do you want me to explain anything again?
- Do you have any other questions?

**Verbal Assent:**

The following students have verbally indicated that they WILL PARTICIPATE in this study:

1. _________________________   16. _________________________
2. _________________________   17. _________________________
3. _________________________   18. _________________________
4. _________________________   19. _________________________
5. _________________________   20. _________________________
6. _________________________   21. _________________________
7. _________________________   22. _________________________
8. _________________________   23. _________________________
9. _________________________   24. _________________________
10. _________________________  25. _________________________
11. _________________________  26. _________________________
12. _________________________  27. _________________________
13. _________________________  28. _________________________
14. _________________________  29. _________________________
15. _________________________  30. _________________________

**Verbal Assent Form (Questionnaires Grades 1-2)**

Hello. My name is Candace Head-Dylla and I am trying to find out what makes students want to read or not read. Your parents said it was okay for you to help with this study.
This is a research study. Research studies include only people who want to take part. If I use any words that you don’t understand please ask me to explain. Please ask questions about anything that is unclear to you.

The purpose of this study is to find out from students what motivates them to read. There will be about 200 other students participating in the study.

Your are being offered the chance to take part in this research because you are a 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th grade student in XXXXXXXXXX School.

First, I will ask you questions about reading. I will read the questions directly to you and record your answers. Your name will not be used. The questionnaires will be coded and only I will have the list of codes linked to your name. I will be the only person who could connect your name to the code on your paper. I will not share this list with anyone and it will be kept in a locked, secure location. The list is only used in case you decide to participate now but later change your mind. Then I will use the list to find your code and remove your name and information from the study.

After the study is completed and possibly published, the list of names and matching codes will be destroyed. If the information from the study is published, you will not be identified or named. If you would like more information about me, please use the card I am giving you to call or contact me.

(Card will have the following information):

Candace Head-Dylla
cuh148@psu.edu
#6 Ridgerunner Rd
XXXXXX, XXXXXXXX
XXX-401-4349 (cell)
XXX-287-5019 (home)

You should not feel uncomfortable at any time while participating in this project. If you do, let me know and you can stop immediately.

You will not get anything for taking part in this research study.

However, your school and your community might learn something about why students read or do not read.

Your name will not be used on any documents other than the master list, which will be kept private.

If you choose to participate, you are free to stop at any time. If you start to participate but change your mind, you may use the card I gave you to write or call me and tell me you do not want your information used.

• Do you want me to explain anything again?
• Do you have any other questions?
Verbal assent:
____________________________ IS interested in participating in the study

Student’s name

Verbal Assent Form (Interview)

Hello. My name is Candace Head-Dylla and I am trying to find out what makes students want to read or not read. Your parents said it was okay for you to help with this study.

This is a research study. Research studies include only people who want to take part. If I use any words that you don’t understand please ask me to explain. Please ask questions about anything that is unclear to you.

The purpose of this study is to find out from students what motivates them to read. There will be about 200 other students participating in the study.

Your are being offered the chance to take part in this research because you are a 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th grade student in XXXXXXXXXXX School.

Earlier this year you were asked to fill out a reading questionnaire in class (or if 1st or 2nd gr. student: you answered a list of questions I asked you about reading). Now you have been chosen to answer additional questions about why you read, what you like to read, how often you read and other questions related to reading. You can refuse to participate or can begin to participate but change your mind and stop the interview at any point.

• The interview is expected to last between 30 minutes to one hour. If you feel uncomfortable at any point, I will stop the interview immediately.
• You can look at what I wrote about what you said just by asking me or calling me and I will be checking in with you after I type up your interview to see if I got it right.

Here is my card so you can call me if you have questions or would like to be taken out of the study.

(Card will have the following information):

Candace Head-Dylla
cuh148@psu.edu
#6 Ridgerunner Rd
XXXXX. XX XXXXX
XXX-401-4349 (cell)
XXX-287-5019 (home)
You should not feel uncomfortable at any time while participating in this project. If you do, let me know and you can stop immediately.

You will not get anything for taking part in this research study.

However, your school and your community might learn something about why students read or do not read.

Your name will not be used on any documents other than the master list, which will be kept private.

If you choose to participate, you are free to stop at any time. If you start to participate but change your mind, you may use the card I gave you to write or call me and tell me you do not want your information used.

- Do you want me to explain anything again?
- Do you have any other questions?

Verbal assent:
____________________ IS interested in participating in the study

Student’s name

Letter of introduction to school district superintendent

August 1, 2008

XXXXXXXX XXXXX, Superintendent
XXX XXXXXX, Associate Superintendent
XXXXX XXXXXXX, School Board President
XXX XXXXXX, School Board Member
XXXXX XXXXXXX, School Board Member
XXXXXXX XXXXXXX, School Board Member
XXX XXXXXXXX, School Board Member
XXXXXXXXXXXX Public Schools
224 N. Camino del Pueblo
XXXXXXXXXXX, XX XXXXX

Dear Superintendent XXXXX-XXXXXX, Associate Superintendent XXXXXXX, and XXX School Board Members:

I am a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Leadership at The Pennsylvania State University. I recently passed my comprehensive examinations, completed my coursework, and am now
interested in conducting research in your district at the XXXXX XXXXXXXX School Elementary School. I would like to hereby introduce myself, describe the proposed research, and offer a list of references you could contact if you have further questions about me or my work.

I am a native XXXXXXXXXX as were my parents, grandparents and great-grandparents. I have worked as a teacher in XXXXXXXXX schools since 1995 and currently hold level III licensure in the state. I have also served as a technical assistance provider for the Center for the Education and Study of Diverse Populations and worked for a year as the Professional Development Director for the XXXXX XXXXXXXX County Schools. I have attached my resume for further information about my experiences with XXXXXXXXXX students.

I have talked at some length with XXXXX XXXXXXXX School Elementary principal, XXXXX XXXXXXXXX, about the possibility of conducting a study on the reading motivation of 1st through 5th grade students at XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX School Elementary. Ms. XXXXXXXX has offered suggestions and we have discussed ways I could conduct the study and also serve her school community by offering my services part-time at no cost to the district to assist with the school’s reading program. We believe this relationship could be mutually beneficial to students and the school’s and district’s planning efforts. In the process, I could collect information for my dissertation. Below is a more complete description of the study I am proposing.

Principal Investigator: Candace Head-Dylla
Education Policy Studies Department/Educational Leadership/Penn State University

1. **Background and Rationale**
   - Gain information about the reading motivation of American Indian students at XXXXXXX XXXXXXXX Elementary School.
   - Explore connections between reading motivation and reading achievement.
   - Learn more about why students from this tribe like to read or do not like to read, and what they believe about themselves as readers.

2. **Key Objectives**
   - Better information for local and state teachers and other education leaders to draw upon when working with students who are American Indian.
   - Explore the reading motivation of students from an understudied group—i.e., American Indian.
   - Outline a process other schools might use or that BPS might use at other grade levels.
   - Enlarge theorists’ understanding of motivation with a cross-cultural perspective.

3. **Study Population**

In the quantitative phase of the study, the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS)/Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) would be administered to students, grades 1-5. After internal consistency reliabilities have assured the viability of both instruments for the population and teacher ratings are considered, overall mean scores would be used to target students for the qualitative portion of the study. Sixteen students would be selected as illustrated in the sampling matrix in Table 3-3 below.
Table 3-3. Sampling matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
<td>1-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
<td>1-L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H is high motivation to read. L is low motivation to read.

4. **Method of Identification of Subjects/Samples/Medical Records**

Using school records, the researcher would create a master list of students' names and grade, gender, standardized reading category, and free/reduced price lunch status linked to a code. This master list would be stored in files in a locked file cabinet in my secured private home. No identifying information would be available for others to view--only codes. Subjects' names would not be linked to the research. For the personal interviews, only students (1st-5th grade) whose parents have given informed consent would be contacted and students age 7 and above would also give their assent. Again, students would be identified by code only. Conversations would be recorded then transcribed and original recordings would be erased after the transcription. At that point there would be no way to connect a particular student with his/her transcribed interview except through the master list.

5. **Consent Process and Documentation**

Parents would provide consent. Students would provide assent. The principal investigator would conduct the assent discussion and explain assent forms to students. Parents would read and sign consent forms but the investigator would be available to parents for questions throughout the study and in a community meeting setting before and after the study begins.

6. **Study Design**

In the first and quantitative phase of the study, the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) would be administered at the school site to all students, grades 3-5. Students in grades 1 and 2 would be assessed using the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS). The MRQ and MRS are designed to assess students’ competence and efficacy beliefs, as well as their personal reasons for reading, and perceptions of the social aspects of reading (Baker & Wigfield, 1999 for the MRQ; Baker & Scher, 2002 for the MRS). Both measures are grounded in expectancy value theory as conceptualized by Eccles (1983) and others (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997).
The second, qualitative phase would be conducted to explore the reading motivation of students showing high motivation and others showing low motivation on the MRQ/MRS. This approach, called extreme/deviant case sampling (Kemper, Stringfield, & Teddlie, 2003), seeks information from outliers in order to learn as much as possible from students who appear exceptional in their motivation, or lack of motivation, for reading. Selected students would be interviewed by the researcher in school sites to be determined in consultation with the school’s teachers and administrators using a semi-structured interview format. This exploratory phase is designed to learn more about reading motivation from the students themselves without forcing them into a conception of motivation devised by others.

8. Summary of Procedures
Once permission to proceed is received from the school district and the university’s internal review board, I would begin by listing each first through fifth grade student’s name on the master list, followed by a code identifying grade, class, and individual. From school records, I would add demographic information, including gender and eligibility for free or reduced price lunches to indicate socioeconomic status. I would also note the student’s ranking on the 2008 state high stakes reading test. The categories are “beginning step,” “nearing proficiency,” “proficient,” and “advanced.”

Next, I would work with school officials and teachers to determine the best times and places for administering the MRQ/MRS. I will devise a schedule for teacher and administrator approval. Hopefully 50 minute blocks of time can be scheduled to assure students do not feel rushed and have the opportunity to ask questions. I would stop in the day before to let students know what would be happening the next day and to obtain assent forms from them. All questions and possible answers would be read aloud to students beginning with the sample question. The MRS would be administered in one-to-one sessions with first and second graders. The MRQ would be administered in whole class sessions. The master list of names, codes, demographic, and achievement information would be locked in a file cabinet in a secure private residence until the end of the study in case someone would like to withdraw.

The quantitative data would be analyzed using SPSS, in consultation with an experienced statistician. A correlation study would be conducted on the quantitative data to determine possible relationships between reading motivation and achievement. After the analysis is completed, I would use the mean scores to categorize students as: high, low, or typical in terms of reading motivation. The samples for the case study would be drawn based on those ratings. I would also ask teachers to rate their students as high, low, or typically motivated as well in order to provide another dimension to the final analysis and to provide a backup sampling pool in case the instruments appear invalid for the population.

More than sixteen students would be targeted as possible subjects for the case studies in the qualitative phase. This way, if informed consent is not given by the first sixteen, alternates would be available. Because this is a multiple case study, the initial framework is loose in order to keep it, as Miles and Huberman (1994) described, “receptive to local idiosyncrasies” (p.17). I would begin the semi-structured interviews by asking students about a book they have recently read. Examples of the introduction and questions that could be asked during the interview are attached. This list would be refined in consultation with teachers, administrators and community members, and after the quantitative analysis is completed, since the results of the quantitative phase may
provide ideas for additional questions. The first interview is aimed at building rapport. Subsequent interviews would build off information gained from the student through ongoing transcription, microanalysis (as described by Strauss & Corbin, 1998), and coding of interviews. During the interviewing process, analysis summaries would be discussed with dissertation advisors and local experts for additional views and ideas on follow-up questions or probes that might yield better information.

9. **Outcome Measures**

Quantitative data from the MRS and MRQ would be analyzed using the SPSS statistical package in consultation with an experienced quantitative researcher. Table 4-1 below summarizes the various tests that are anticipated to determine the validity and reliability of results from the sample. If the measures appear valid and reliable, they would be used to target 16-20 students for the qualitative phase. If the measures do not appear valid and reliable, case study choices would be made based on teacher referrals of students who they believe are highly motivated or not motivated to read. A correlation study would be conducted to explore possible relationships between reading motivation and reading achievement. Results of the quantitative analysis would be shared with administrators and teachers for reactions and ideas about interpretation. Teachers could also have input into the selection process for the qualitative phase of the study.

9. **Data analysis (qualitative)**

Students’ stories would be analyzed using procedures recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1998). This process begins with microanalysis of transcripts to “systematically develop categories in terms of their properties and dimensions” (p. 71). In this step, I would look for evidence of factors that may have influenced the student’s beliefs. The next step is conceptualization, followed by additional coding and ongoing comparisons. Through this process, a “theory” or hypothesis may emerge that can be “validated by comparing it to raw data or by presenting it to respondents for their reactions. A theory that is grounded in data should be recognizable to participants” (Strauss & Corbin, p. 161). The latest iteration of NVivo8™ software would be used to organize this work. Throughout the study, I would be checking with students, teachers/administrators, and local experts to make sure I am, as Miles and Huberman put it, “getting it right,” or transcribing accurately, and summarizing and analyzing in ways that make sense in the local context.

10. **Major Risks & Discomforts**

The only risk anticipated would be a possible loss of confidentiality. However, I would be taking every precaution to assure students’ information is kept confidential.

11. **Potential Benefits**

For students:
The questionnaires and interviews give students a chance to reflect on why, when, where, they read and what might make them want to read more. Their reflections may also eventually affect classroom and school policies in ways that would help students become more proficient and motivated readers. Teachers, administrators, parents, and other community leaders and policymakers could use information from the study to inform decisions about ways to motivate students in their community to read more.

For others:
- Useful to local educators, local trainers and curriculum developers
• Educating outside trainers
• Used to increase students’ reading motivation
• Useful to state leaders
• Possibly new conceptions of motivation

13. Privacy and Confidentiality
Subjects’ names would not be linked to the research. In the classroom surveys, students whose parents have given implied consent, and who themselves assent, would be given surveys with codes, and names would be detached after the student checks his/her demographic information for accuracy. A master file of codes and student names would be maintained by the researcher in a locked file cabinet in her secured private home. For the personal interviews, only students whose parents have given informed consent would be contacted and students age 7 and above would also be asked for their assent. Again, students would be identified by code and the master file would be kept in a locked file cabinet in my secured home. Conversations would be recorded then transcribed and original recordings would be erased after the transcription. At that point there would be no way to connect a particular student with his/her transcribed interview except through the master list.

My references include Dr. Dan Marshall, jdm13@psu.edu 570-966-4371, with whom I have conducted coding and analysis for an article currently under review for publication. Dr. Nona Prestine, nap11@psu.edu 814-238-8269, is my dissertation chair. Also on my committee and working with me to develop this proposal is Dr. John Tippeconnic, jwt7@psu.edu 814-863-1626, Dr. Susan Faircloth, scf2@psu.edu 814-777-3290, and Dr. Rayne Sperling, rsd7@psu.edu. Dr. Tippeconnic also grew up in XXXXXXXX and has a number of contacts in the state. Any of these professors could speak with you further about the quality of my work.

I look forward to an opportunity to answer any further questions you might have or to get feedback from you about the study design. My contact information is included below.

Sincerely,

Candace Head-Dylla
cuh148@psu.edu
#6 Ridgerunner Rd.
XXXXX, XX XXXXX
XXX-401-4349
XXX-287-5019
APPENDIX B

Letters of Support from Saint Theresa Governor and School Principal to Parents

Hello Parents,

Because our school has done so well on the --- State Reading Assessment in grades 3-5 for the past few years, our grade 1-5 students were chosen for a research study on reading motivation. The research study has been approved by the school board and Candace Head-Dylla, a doctoral candidate from The Pennsylvania State University, work in the Educational Leadership program at Penn State will conduct the research study. Ms. Head-Dylla spent last year working with Dr. John Tippeconnic and Dr. Susan Faircloth at Penn State’s new Center for the Study of Leadership in American Indian Education and she has considerable experience teaching reading to diverse groups of students. In order to conduct the research study, we must have parent’s permission for their children to ---. In order to do a good analysis, we need most students to participate. I am asking all parents of --- students in grades 1-5 to read the attached information and return the forms with your decision as soon as possible.

If you need more information, Ms. Head-Dylla’s address, phone number, and email are listed below. Or you can contact me at the school. Please help us make this research study as informative as possible by allowing your child to participate.

Sincerely,

[Contact information]

School
Principal
PO Box 459
Phone: (867-4441 Ext. 3659
Fax: (867-7862

November 10, 2008
Dear Parent(s)

Candace Head-Dylla will be interviewing students to find out what motivates them to become independent readers. She will be selecting students in grades 2-5 to interview.

This is a study to learn from our students why they choose to read and what motivates them to work hard in reading activities, or why they choose not to read and avoid reading activities. The idea is to conduct interviews with a small group of students to try to understand what they think about reading and what might help them read more and enjoy reading.

The school supports this project as we are always seeking ways to keep our students motivated to learn. We also appreciate all that you do as parents to help keep your students excited about learning. Thank you for this support.

Information will be shared in a community-wide meeting upon completion of the study.

All interviews will be conducted at the ---- Pueblo Library after school. Each interview will take about 30 minutes to an hour depending on the child and whether he or she gets tired or bored with the questions. We expect to conduct 2-3 interviews with each child. Please return the attached consent forms on or before March 13th, so interviews may begin the week of March 16th.

If you have questions about this study, please contact ---- at the ---- Pueblo Library at ----65-2214 ext 226 or Candace Head-Dylla at ----401-4349, or email her at cuh148@psu.edu.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Principal
Dear Parent(s):

Greetings,

Over the next few months, Candace Head-Dylla, a researcher from Penn State who lives in --- will be conducting the qualitative phase of a reading motivation study for sixteen students, grades 2-5, a --- school.

This is a study to learn from our students why they choose to read and what motivates them to work hard in reading activities, or why they choose not to read and avoid reading activities. The idea is to conduct interviews with a small group of students to try to understand what they think about reading and what might help them read more — and enjoy reading.

The benefits to your child include:
- A chance to reflect on why, when, where she or he reads
- A chance to think about what might make him or her read more
- An opportunity to influence classroom and school policies that could help your child and other children become more proficient and motivated readers

--- tribe leaders, --- School administrators and teachers, and --- parents may use the information from the completed study to motivate and provide instruction for students. Information will be shared in a community-wide meeting upon completion of the study.

All interviews will be conducted at the ----- Pueblo Library after school. Each interview will take about 30 minutes to an hour depending on the child and whether he or she gets tired or bored with the questions. We expect to conduct 2-3 interviews with each child. Please return the attached consent forms on or before March 13th, so interviews may begin the week of March 16th.

If you have questions. Contact --- the Pueblo Library at ---465-2214 ext 226 ---- or Candace Head-Dylla at ---401-4349, or email her at ________

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Stamp]
APPENDIX C

Introduction and Possible Interview Probes

Hi, __________ (child’s name). My name is Candace Head-Dylla. You can call me ______ (check for locally appropriate title). Here is a card with my email address and telephone number in case you or your parents would like to give me a call. I’m from Grants. I have two daughters who are now in college and I’m a teacher. Right now I’m also a student and I’m trying to understand what students like you think about reading. Would it be alright to ask you some questions? (assent or refusal). If refusal: Well, thank you ______. If you change your mind let me know.

If assent is given: I thought we’d start by talking about books we’ve been reading. I just read a book about an island with wild horses and this girl and her brother talked their grandpa into letting them buy one of the wild horses and train it. Can you think of a book you’ve read that was interesting to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFORT</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you work hard to be a good reader?</td>
<td>Tell me about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you rather read a book that’s easy or hard or medium?</td>
<td>Is there something you are really good at??????</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you decided you wanted to start reading more, how would you fit it in? Would you have to stop doing something else?</td>
<td>What are the things you do in class that you like the best?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you like to read?</td>
<td>What makes someone a good student?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you read a book lately? Tell me about it.</td>
<td>What do you think about reading?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where do you go to read a good book? Where do you read the most?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What would you do if you had to get a friend to read more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What might make you a better reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What would make reading more interesting for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is your family traditional or not traditional? Very or not so much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At end of interview:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What else should I ask kids about reading?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAISE</strong></td>
<td>Do you like it when your family says you did a good job reading something? Your teacher? Your friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFILIATION/SOCIAL</strong></td>
<td>Do you like to work with other students? What about when you’re reading? Do you talk to others about what you read? Should students help each other with reading? Do you know someone who loves to read? What does s(he) read?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALUE (FTP)</strong></td>
<td>Is reading important? Why? Is it important to read? Tell me about that/why? Do people who like to read do better in school? Do people who read get better jobs when they finish school? Tell me about that/why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTALITY (FTP)</strong></td>
<td>Will you need to be a good reader when you grow up? Tell me about that/why? If you do well in school, can you get a good job when you grow up? What happens to good readers when they get older?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>READING SELF-BELIEFS</strong></td>
<td>Are you good at reading? Why do you think so? Were you good at reading last year? What kinds of things do you do best when you’re reading? How do you think you’ll do in reading next year? Are you getting better at reading? If I asked you to read an Xth-grade (use one year older) book, do you think you could? Why do you think so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIALIZER BELIEFS</strong></td>
<td>What does your family say about reading? Teacher? Friends? Does your family tell you reading is important?Teacher? Friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCREMENTAL V. ENTITY VIEW</strong></td>
<td>To be a really good reader, is it more important to be smart or to work hard or both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRINSIC/EXTRINSIC REWARD</strong></td>
<td>Would you rather read a book about something you were really interested in or a book that someone paid you to read?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL POWER</strong></td>
<td>Have you ever been the leader of a group in reading? What does it mean to be the leader? If you wanted to help someone become a better reader, what would you do? What would you do to help a friend like reading more? What could your friend’s teacher do?Family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETITION</strong></td>
<td>Do you think about how good you are in reading compared to other kids? Does your teacher compare you to other kids? Do you like that? Family?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peshkin (1988) said researchers’ subjectivities influence what they attend to and how studies proceed. Following his advice, I tried to maintain some meta-cognitive awareness of what I was attending to and why. My notes from this activity indicate that while I was waiting for students to return consent forms, while I was observing in classrooms, and picking up general information about the school, students, and teachers, I was also forming opinions. As I learned more, and heard from the teachers themselves, some of these opinions shifted; but knowing I had already started judging made me work harder to write what I saw instead of what I believed might be happening. I also conducted member checks with teachers to see if what I saw was verified by their own words. I believe this effort helped me understand why some classrooms seemed to motivate students to read and others, with similar curriculum, did not. My observations were corroborated by some of the quantitative findings as well.

I did not discern as many “subjectivities” as Peshkin (1988), in his important discussion of this topic. However, my notes revealed I repeatedly focused time and attention on three issues. First, I empathized with the new teachers, remembering the difficulties I faced in my own first year with challenging students and little administrative support. Because my first teaching job was inside a school but funded by a non-profit organization, I received excellent feedback from non-profit supervisors. I sometimes think of the damage I could have done without that support. I wanted the new teachers at Saint Theresa to succeed with students: establish effective classroom management in one case, and improve pedagogy and develop better relationships with students and families in all three cases. Second, no matter how much I was rooting for the teachers who were working hard, I felt impatient when I saw classrooms where students were not engaged in
learning. I was unforgiving of teachers who disrespected or diminished students and their families and community, although I was equally critical of teachers who professed good relationships with the community but did not deliver curriculum. Finally, I felt a sense of panic about students who seemed to have little interest in reading. I connected reading to stratification issues and believed the lack of reading skills and motivation could impair the community’s ability to deal with poverty and related social issues, and could dramatically change the opportunities available to individual students.
APPENDIX E

Letters from Pueblo Governors and Staff calling for Superintendent Termination

I REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE Board on the following topic: Leadership

----- EDUCATION DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:

My name is ---. I am the Education Director for the Pueblo Of ----. The focus of my comments tonight will be on leadership. I have been in education (public education) for 33 years; sadly, as far as the education of Native American students there has not been much progress in terms of academic achievement. The tremendous gap still exists. This is continues to hold true in the ---- Public Schools where there is an enrollment of approx. 1,300 Native American students which comprises about 41% of the total student population. This is a small district with approx. 3,200 students.

I believe leadership is key. We are all here tonight for the same reason - we care about our students and their success. Where we differ is HOW this is to be achieved. We need high quality education in this district. We need highly effective teaching. We need a highly effective leader at the top! Unfortunately, the LFC evaluation reveals there is not highly effective education and leadership taking place. The LFC report might as well be a grade of "F" for the district. There needs to be a change. If you keep doing the same thing and maybe a little or a lot harder the next year, you get the same poor results. What I am for is a highly effective leader who will ensure highly effective teaching is taking place. What I am for is more accountability. What I am for is a true quality education for all our children. "Board members, why is this not happening? Why does the LFC report show otherwise? You have a big responsibility. You need to ask yourselves if this hasn't already happened in the past five years, which is ample opportunity to demonstrate progress in the UP direction, how are improvements and growth going to happen under the current leader. The communities depend on you. You were elected to serve the students and communities not to protect people's jobs. Our children deserve the best."

I want to share with you some dismal data. --- has 294 students in the district. Let's just take our 9th graders. We have 60 attending. For Semester I this school year, 51 of them have a D (s) or F (s) or both. 15 of those have "F"s in 3 classes or more. What would you say is the outlook for these students? What kind of assistance are they getting? What is the plan for them? Isn't this unacceptable in your minds? Perhaps we have tolerated this for so long, as Pueblo people, because we did not know how bad things were for our children. The LFC report is timely. One Senator stated it is "shamefully appalling". We do recognize
that we need to work collaboratively with the district to change what is going on. We do want meaningful involvement and participation, we do want a better, quality education for our children and that just has not happened under the current leadership.

February 26, 2010

Mr. 
President
Board of Education
School District

Dear Mr.:

We firmly believe our Indian children have been severely underserved by Superintendent --- as evidenced by test scores and inaction by the district. As tribal leaders of sovereign nations, we have always been a strong proponents of quality education for all Native American children, but more so for Pueblo children. We believe that education makes many things in life possible. As tribal leaders, we encourage our young to pursue any and all educational opportunities. At the same time, we ask those that oversee and administer schools on or near Pueblo lands to make every effort to provide the very best education possible. Unfortunately, we believe that has not occurred under the leadership of Superintendent ---.

As Pueblo Governors and based on our sovereign authority, we believe we have every right to make demands of public supported entities like the School District. Therefore this letter is to respectfully inform you that we have No Confidence in --- School District Superintendent --- and do not support the renewal of her contract. We do so for the following reasons:

1. The unacceptable and continued failure of a high percentage of our students as evidenced by the past and present grades for the past 5 school years.
2. The unacceptable results for American Indian students according to the --- Standards Based Assessment. The figures indicate below proficient scores for American Indian Students and are the lowest of any subgroup in reading and math for all grade levels tested.
3. The audit results outlined in the recent LFC report presented to the --- District School Board at its December 2009 meeting.

Therefore, we would ask that you and other key decision makers make every effort to hire qualified people for top administrative positions at schools located on or near Pueblo lands. We believe that our Pueblo children will benefit from individuals who are committed to providing the very best education possible, but also from a Superintendent, who is knowledgeable about and committed to assisting Indian children in attaining and surpassing academic standards, including AYP.
Therefore, we expect major modifications to the District's education programs and ensure that our Indian children receive all the necessary educational services on a fair and equitable basis with non-Indian children served --- School District. We also expect full consultation and involvement of tribal officials and the parents of our Indian children in the planning and equitable basis with non-Indian children served by --- School District. We also expect full consultation and involvement of tribal officials and the parents of our Indian children in the planning and development of education programs and activities as per #7 under 222.94 of the Title 34 federal regulations. In addition, we expect full compliance with all requirements under federal and state law, including Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the --- Indian Education Act – State Tribal Collaboration Act and regulations promulgated pursuant to these acts, including 34 C.F.R. 222.94 (a)(1).

We wish want to maintain a collaborative relationship with the district and its personnel. We are available to meet with you and your board to address our concerns. Thank you.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Cc: Governor, Pueblo
Governor, Pueblo
Governor, Pueblo
Governor, Pueblo
Governor, Pueblo
Vice President, School District
School Board
School Board
School Board
Superintendent, School District
Secretary, Public Education Department
Chairman of the Legislative Finance Committee
Director for Program Evaluation, Legislative Finance
Classroom Observations

Classroom differences

I was in first and second grade classrooms often, since the questionnaires for these students were completed in one-to-one sessions. However, in many of the 3rd through 5th grade classrooms, I only made one formal observation besides the times I may have served as substitute teacher. Otherwise, I popped into classrooms once or twice a week trying to collect parent consent forms or working out scheduling issues. I made notes throughout the day about what I saw in classrooms. So comments here about teachers are impressions based on multiple contacts and follow-up interviews, but not systematic, structured observations.

The school employed three first-grade teachers; all female, one from the local community, the other two Anglo. All three were experienced teachers. There were three second-grade teachers; all female, one from the community, one from a nearby Pueblo but married to a man from the local community, and one Anglo teacher. This, too, was an experienced group. The two third-grade teachers were also female; one Native American, not from the community but from a nearby Pueblo, and one Anglo. The Native American teacher was a veteran, the Anglo teacher had only been teaching a few years but seemed like a veteran and was older than most new teachers. In fourth grade, there was an Anglo woman who grew up in a neighboring community and was a first-year teacher, another Anglo woman who had been at the school for a number of years, and a Hispanic woman, also a new teacher and new to the school. In fifth grade, there was a veteran Hispanic male teacher and a Hispanic woman, new to teaching.
Of these first through fifth grade teachers, there were two female Anglo teachers who seemed particularly effective in providing a challenging, relevant and connected curriculum to students. By challenging, I mean the content seemed well aligned with state standards for that grade level. By relevant and connected, I mean subjects were not taught in isolation; rather links were made around themes or topics from one subject to the next and authentic learning experiences were enacted. One of these teachers had good classroom management skills; the other, although an older, experienced teacher, seemed to struggle with classroom management. She employed many typical middle class strategies, such as timeout, names on the board, withholding recess, providing incentives for good behavior, etc. but she was constantly trying to gain control of student behavior by having students put their hands on their desks, lay their heads down, or somehow stop what she seemed to view as the chaos in the room. This teacher also aligned art and music projects with science and social studies curriculum so that students were reading, writing, singing, and creating around interesting themes. Things went very well once the students became engaged in the work, but the transitions seemed to disturb her, even though she was a seasoned teacher. In contrast, the teacher with good classroom management skills appeared to shape student behavior through relationships—a strategy other effective teachers from the local community employed. The Anglo teacher with relevant, connected curriculum and effective classroom management was definitely an authority figure in the classroom but also exuded warmth and caring as well as strong personal connections to students. She employed wait time—a much longer wait time than most Anglo teachers seemed comfortable with—did not try to micromanage student behavior, and seemed more tolerant of a higher level of noise and activity than the other Anglo teachers. Her curriculum included a number of enriching elements (letters to pen pals in Ireland, independent learning stations, student-generated patterns using math grids, etc.) and she was developing what looked to be a very effective system for differentiating
instruction during reading and math by establishing learning centers and rotating students to her station, where she could work with small groups. There were authentic assignments developed from curriculum goals, and students critiqued classroom activities and evaluated their own work. 

The other teacher with relevant, connected curriculum but less effective classroom management seemed to be trying to use activities to keep students busy with what she wanted—a form of control. It seemed to me, this constant movement seemed to translate, for some students, into doing without thinking. Another teacher told me this teacher expressed disappointment with her students’ results on one of the school’s reading assessments. I would have been surprised to hear her students were succeeding well, since they had little time to process information.

The other Anglo teachers seemed to be a mixed group. One demanded and got good behavior from students but not without a fair amount of raising her voice and a number of somewhat sarcastic remarks. This teacher’s redeeming quality was that she expected and received high quality work from students. She also had a long, close relationship with her classroom educational assistant, who was from the community. Another Anglo teacher also made disparaging comments and this one yelled at children as well, but did not gain student cooperation and compounded the problem by also having low student expectations. Of these two teachers, the one whose students behaved also seemed able to deliver a strong skills curriculum, particularly in reading. The other teacher struggled with curriculum as well.

There were two other Anglo teachers and they offered curriculum that seemed tied to textbooks and reproducible worksheets, with few opportunities for critical thinking. One of these teachers allowed students to ask her questions to the point that it seemed she was doing the work for the students. This teacher told me her students had to be constantly “spoon-fed.” The other was a new teacher and seemed overwhelmed. I observed the new teacher’s classroom one morning and noted a great deal of off-task student behavior. Her ability to gain and keep
students’ attention seemed tentative. When she wanted the student’s attention for instruction, it took her some time to get it and seemed as though she was pleading rather than expecting students to listen. She did have an effective way of getting her own homeroom to attend, using team points and first-in-line privileges to gain cooperation. Unfortunately, she did not seem to have any such strategies for her math and reading classes, which included students from the other classrooms. Her math and reading instruction was workbook-driven, and work which most of the students could have finished in a much shorter period of time, but stretched out to make the worksheet last the entire hour. A few really did seem to be struggling with some of the concepts. Some were asking for help. Others were just not doing the work. Surprisingly, I saw few copying from other students or asking them for help, which would have been easy considering the seating arrangement in groups of four, facing each other. She did not yet seem able to challenge students or differentiate instruction and in conversations with her and other teachers, I found there was little support for the new teachers, in spite of the fact that each had an assigned “mentor.” Expectations for these “mentors” were low and there seemed to be no formal plan for how they would offer support. One new teacher told me in January her mentor had never been to her classroom to talk to her or observe instruction.

Two of the three Hispanic teachers’ classrooms were characterized by very little talking—in one, almost complete silence. The other was rife with unfriendly exchanges between teacher and students. When I was in the two quiet classrooms (one virtually silent), students were working on assignments, mostly workbook pages or textbook assignments. This was the first year of teaching for both teachers. The teachers were at their desks and students could come to them for individual help. In the almost-silent classroom, the radio played quietly at certain times and students had “behavior” tickets they could collect from any student they saw breaking a classroom rule. So, every now and then a student would put her/his hand out to another student
who was talking or playing with a toy and that student would hand over a ticket. There was no fighting about the system and violators seemed content to give up their tickets, some then watching vigilantly to catch another offender and redeem the lost ticket. Apparently, tickets were exchanged at some point for individual rewards.

In the combative classroom, the teacher and students engaged in what could best be described as bickering—resembling the exchanges of an old, but not-too-happily married couple. There was not outright rebellion, but a seeming lack of respect on both sides. The curriculum in two of the classrooms with Hispanic teachers seemed demanding, but not connected to themes and not differentiated. Over time, in one of the quiet classrooms with a female Hispanic teacher, I began to notice strong personal connections between teacher and students, in spite of the fact this was her first year teaching. This teacher was also very concerned about student absences and seemed to be working hard to become more effective with students. She realized she was struggling and told me she wanted to become more effective with students.

Teachers who were American Indian, including those from the local community, appeared to manage their classrooms through personal relationships with students. They knew something about the students and their families and often used this knowledge to elicit homework, appropriate behavior, or otherwise gain cooperation from students. Their classrooms were characterized by more teacher-student dialogue in general, and much greater use of questioning to manage unwanted or disruptive behaviors. Most of these classrooms were noisier with more movement than those of most Anglo and Hispanic teachers. The exception to this was one teacher who was American Indian but not from the local community. Her classroom was quiet, with students almost always working; and it was more structured, with well-defined rewards and consequences for certain behaviors. However, this teacher also knew about the
students’ community, spoke the students’ Native language and drew on this knowledge during instruction.

Although the teachers who were American Indian seemed to employ more effective classroom management techniques, resulting in better student cooperation, this did not mean that each one delivered better curriculum. In one classroom, the teacher focused on topics she liked and seemed to avoid others or resorted to workbook pages with little differentiation of instruction. Fortunately, this teacher enjoyed writing, and students spent much of their reading block writing in journals. They worked together asking each other for word spellings and reading their writing to one another. Another American Indian teacher was particularly effective at weaving advanced English vocabulary into her informal conversations and during teaching, even though she stayed close to the textbook lessons. In speaking with her, she said this was not intentional, but it appeared to be effective with students as I noticed them trying to use some of the vocabulary words the teacher had used in their personal writing. Another teacher who was American Indian sought out district trainings and other professional development activities and worked diligently to apply what she gained from them to the lessons that were already working well in her classroom, including differentiated instruction. This teacher also enriched her classroom with local cultural knowledge and Keres language use, a strategy practiced to some extent by all teachers who spoke Keres, which included all the Native American elementary teachers.

In all, teachers from each of the three ethnic groups seemed to exhibit a range of ability in terms of delivering challenging, effective instruction. However, the classroom management skills of the American Indian teachers seemed clearly superior to those of the other teachers, except for the Anglo teacher who also built her management techniques around relationships and community knowledge.
I should point out that I did not structure my teacher observations around ethnicity. In fact, until the end of the study, I thought of teachers in terms of grade—the *first grade teachers*, the *fifth grade teachers*, etc. It was only after I coded my conversations with them and began thinking in terms of classroom and behavior management, curriculum, and pedagogy that I began to see other groupings. For a while, the Anglo teacher whose classroom was more like the teachers from the community, as well as the Native American teacher whose classroom was not typical of other teachers from the community confounded the patterns.
APPENDIX G

The Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) and the Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS)

**The Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ):** (Baker and Wigfield, 1999)

Code: [First number indicates grade; second number is classroom; third number is the student’s number; fourth number indicates first or second assessment. For example: k-1-1-1 would be a kindergarten student in classroom identified as classroom 1, student number 1, in the first assessment]

[Would you say your family is traditional or not traditional? Very =4, somewhat =3? Not very =2, not at all =1? Added to MRQ for present study]

___Like you: ___a lot ___ a little

___Not like you: ___a lot ___ a little

*Competence and efficacy beliefs*

Efficacy (4 items)

3. I know that I will do well in reading next year

9. I am a good reader

15. I learn more from reading than most students in the class

50. In comparison to my other school subjects I am best at reading

Challenge (5 items)

2. I like hard, challenging books
7. I like it when the questions in the book make me think
26. I usually learn difficult things by reading
44. If the project is interesting, I can read difficult material
48. If a book is interesting I don’t care how hard it is to read

Work Avoidance (4 items)
23. I don’t like reading something when the words are too difficult
27. I don’t like vocabulary questions
28. Complicated stories are not fun to read
52. I don’t like it when there are too many people in the story

Goals for reading

Curiosity (6 items)
5. If the teacher discusses something interesting I might read more about it
8. I read about my hobbies to learn more about them
13. I read to learn new information about topics that interest me
16. I like to read about new things
35. If I am reading about an interesting topic I sometimes lose track of time
45. I enjoy reading books about people in different countries

Involvement (6 items)
10. I read stories about fantasy and make believe
24. I make pictures in my mind when I read
30. I feel like I make friends with people in good books
33. I like mysteries
41. I enjoy a long, involved story or fiction book
46. I read a lot of adventure stories
Importance (2 items)

53. It is very important to me to be a good reader

54. In comparison to other activities I do, it is very important to me to be a good reader

Recognition (5 items)

14. My friends sometimes tell me I am a good reader

17. I like hearing the teacher say I read well

29. I am happy when someone recognizes my reading

31. My parents often tell me what a good job I am doing in reading

36. I like to get compliments for my reading

Grades (4 items)

19. I look forward to finding out my reading grade

37. Grades are a good way to see how well you are doing in reading

39. I read to improve my grades

40. My parents ask me about my reading grade

Competition (6 items)

12. I like being the only one who knows an answer in something we read

18.* I like being the best at reading

22.* It is important for me to see my name on a list of good readers

43. I try to get more answers right than my friends

49. I like to finish my reading before other students

51. I am willing to work hard to read better than my friends

Social purposes of reading

Social (7 items)

1. I visit the library often with my family
11. I often read to my brother or my sister
20. I sometimes read to my parents
21. My friends and I like to trade things to read
34. I talk to my friends about what I am reading
38. I like to help my friends with their schoolwork in reading
42. I like to tell my family about what I am reading

Compliance (5 items)
4.* I do as little schoolwork as possible in reading
6.* I read because I have to
25. I always do my reading work exactly as the teacher wants it
32. Finishing every reading assignment is very important to me
47. I always try to finish my reading on time

Asterisks indicate the items were not used in scale construction by Baker and Wigfield (1999).

Have you read a book for fun in the last week? Give title or author

How often do you read a book for fun?

1 = almost never, 2 = about once a month, 3 = about once a week, 4 = almost every day

Motivations for Reading Scale (MRS) Baker, Scher, 2002

Enjoyment
1. I like to read.
2. I like to be read to.
3. I like to look at books by myself.
4. I get bored when the teacher reads stories.
5. I think reading is a good way to spend time.
6. I like to get books for presents.

7. I think reading is boring/fun.

Value

1. I think books can be used to find answers to questions.

2. I think I will need to know how to read to do well in school.

3. I think people can learn new things from books.

4. I think people can find things out from magazines and newspapers.

Perceived Competence

1. I think I will do well in reading next year.

2. Reading is easy/hard for me.

3. I think I will be a good reader.

Library-related

1. I like to get books from the library.

2. I like to go to the school library.

   One-to-one administration. The child chooses one of two stuffed animals they are more like. So, for instance Bingo says: *I think people can learn new things from books,* and Checkers says: *I DON’T think people can learn new things from books.* (To child) *Are you more like Checkers or Bingo?* After the child chooses, then. *Are you a lot like Checkers/Bingo, or a little like Checkers/Bingo?* This becomes a 4-point scale.
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