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Abstract

ADOLESCENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR AND THEIR ROLE ON INTRINSIC READING MOTIVATION

Amanda M. Gaul

Under the Supervision of Dr. Peggy Marciniec, Associate Professor, UW-Platteville

The purpose of this study was to explore activities and interventions that can help boost reading motivation, as well as examine adolescents’ perceptions of teacher behavior and their role on intrinsic motivation through a self-determination theory perspective. Intrinsic motivation declines as students get older and progress from elementary to secondary school. It replicated the research of De Naeghel, et al. (2014). A group of 55 middle school students from Cuba City Elementary/Middle School completed a questionnaire that assessed their reading teacher according to 1) autonomy-support, 2) implementation of structure, and 3) involvement. The bivariate correlations of students’ intrinsic motivation and three perceptions of teacher behavior were all found to be related. All three categories were positive predictors of students’ intrinsic motivation, with autonomy-support and involvement being more significant than implementation of structure. The results of regression analysis indicated that autonomy is the single best predictor and the other predictors do not add significantly to the explained variance.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

My research will focus on intrinsic reading motivation in middle school students at Cuba City Elementary/Middle School, from the perspective of self-determination theory.

Self-determination theory (SDT) proposes that human beings are inherently proactive and begin life with a high level of internally directed motivation (Zentall & Lee, 2012). Reading motivation relates to having an interest in reading over other activities, reading frequently, and enjoying reading. As students move from elementary school to secondary school, reading motivation declines. Studies have been conducted that show the effectiveness of using interventions as way to boost reading motivation. Tovli (2014) investigated the use of an intervention program among second grade students with disabilities. Students in the intervention group, compared to the control group, had positive experiences with learning which resulted in having a greater joy of reading. Marinak (2013) found that a reading intervention utilizing engaging literacy tasks increased the motivation of students who were part of the intervention, compared to other students who just received regular reading instruction.

Studies also reveal the positive role of teachers in relation to reading motivation. De Naeghel, et al (2014) explored the relationship between adolescent secondary students' perceptions of teacher behavior, regarding autonomy, structure, and involvement, and the students' intrinsic motivation. Students had higher reading motivation when teachers supported student autonomy and were more involved in the learning process.
Statement of the Problem

My research will replicate the research of De Naeghel, et al. (2014) by exploring whether middle school adolescents' perceptions of teacher behavior support intrinsic motivation, from a self-determination theory perspective. I hypothesize that middle school students' perceptions of autonomy-supportive, structured, and involved teacher behavior are positively related to the students' intrinsic reading motivation.

Definition of Terms

**Intrinsic reading motivation** - Students favor books over other activities, read more frequently, and enjoy reading (Tovli, 2014).

**Reading Intervention Programs** - Intensive, systematic exposure to daily structured reading activities (Tovli, 2014).

**Autonomy-supportive behavior** - The amount of freedom a child is given to determine his or her own behavior (Skinner & Belmont, 1993).

**Implementation of structure** - Relates to the context of how to effectively achieve desired outcomes (Skinner & Belmont, 1993).

**Involved behavior** - The quality of the interpersonal relationship with teachers and peers (Skinner & Belmont, 1993).
Limitations of the Research

This action research study will be limited to students in the sixth through eighth grade classes in a rural school district located in southwest Wisconsin. The design of my study is correlational; therefore, I cannot draw causal influences.

Method of Approach

The action research will measure middle school adolescents' perceptions of teacher behavior, regarding autonomy, structure, and involvement, and students' enjoyment of reading, to determine what variables and factors are associated with positive reading behaviors and intrinsic motivation. Students will complete a questionnaire, and then data will be collected and analyzed. I will share the results with the teachers and discuss strategies/interventions according to what was found. The IRB protocol provides further detail and is attached as Appendix A. Project data collection materials are attached as Appendix B.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research Question

Recent studies in educational journals have shown that student reading motivation decreases from early elementary grades into adolescence and high school years. I was interested in understanding what could be done to help students increase and maintain engagement with their texts and in knowing what other factors were associated with reading motivation. The main question in my work addressed whether or not middle school adolescents' perceptions of teacher behavior, regarding autonomy, structure, and involvement, support intrinsic motivation, from a self-determination theory perspective. This knowledge would greatly benefit my job as a reading teacher and help me apply concepts to my own students who are struggling readers.

Discussion of Prior Research

Tovli (2014) examined whether or not a prolonged, systematic intervention program would increase reading motivation in students with learning disabilities, relative to students in a control group who were not exposed to the specific activities the intervention program laid out. The activities were done systematically, 45 minutes a day for 5 days a week, throughout the school year. Each session had fixed parts (daily reading: 15 minutes free reading followed by writing-after-reading) and variable parts (storytelling, dialogue reading, functional reading, etc). At the end of a year, reading motivation was assessed using three measures including book preference (choosing reading over other leisure activities), quantity of reading (number of books read), and quality of reading (analyzing a book they have read). Results indicated that the
students in the research group who were exposed to the intervention had significant increases in all three measures of motivation, compared to their peers in the control group who were not exposed to the program. Tovli's work raised several questions such as: 1) What other activities or interventions exist that can help boost reading motivation and 2) How does the teacher's role affect reading motivation during implementation of the intervention. I directed my future research based on these two questions.

Marinak (2012) investigated, in a quasi-experimental design, the effect of a motivation intervention on intrinsic motivation to read among a group of 5th graders. The 5th graders made up a treatment group and a control group. The teachers designed an intervention where the students in the treatment group could engage in literacy tasks that involved choice, collaboration, challenge, and authenticity, whereas the control group would receive regular reading instruction. The three practices implemented were 1) giving students choice in the teacher read-aloud, 2) utilizing jigsaw, or experts teaching, during informational text reading that allowed students to become an expert on part of a book and then share the information with the rest of the class, and 3) providing book clubs in addition to self-selected silent reading. They measured reading motivation preintervention and postintervention using the Reading Survey piece of the Motivation to Read Profile, or MRP, (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996), which assessed a) self-concept as a reader and b) value of reading. Preintervention data revealed that there was no difference in total reading motivation between the two groups of students. In regards to postintervention data, the total MRP score showed that the treatment classrooms were more motivated to read after the intervention than the control classrooms. When using teachers
as a unit of analysis, there was a significant difference between the experimental and control teachers where the treatment teachers scored higher on the total MRP score. This indicated again that the intervention classrooms were more motivated to read than the control classrooms.

Further examination of the MRP revealed that there was a significant difference concerning the value of reading aspect between the two groups, as well. Marinak’s findings suggest that activities incorporating choice, authenticity, challenge, and collaboration play a key role in the value of reading. This is very similar to what Tovli (2014) emphasized in “The Joy of Reading” intervention program which provided children with engaging activities that allowed them to grow and have positive experiences with literature. All of these ideas together are associated with positive reading motivation for the students.

Zentall and Lee (2012) investigated the effects of using a motivational intervention on students to improve literacy skills such as fluency and comprehension for students with reading disabilities, ADHD, and no disability. Students were randomly assigned to be a part of the intervention or control group, for each set of students. An examiner gave the Gray Oral Reading Test (GORT), an individually administered standardized reading test, to assess pre and post reading skills. Between tests students in the intervention group experienced a) positive feedback about a specific reading task paired with the challenge to perform better than before, b) a positive label (“clever”), and c) a challenge to perform better than another student. Students in the control group just received instruction on how to accomplish the task with no motivational engagement. After adjusting for pretest differences, results showed that students in the no disability group and the reading difficulties group responded to the motivational condition with
better posttest fluency and reading comprehension scores than those who were in the control group. While the reading comprehension scores for the students in the ADHD group without reading difficulties did not differ significantly for the control and intervention groups, the intervention group's fluency scores were slightly improved. Thus, students with ADHD were less responsive to intervention. Zentall and Lee attempted to understand intrinsic reading motivation and find new ways to nurture it within elementary age students, however, they focused more on what teachers said. They found that motivational deficits can be offset for students with reading difficulties when given positive feedback about their behavior and performance. Having appropriate learning activities available for the students to learn and grow is important, but what teachers say to the students also has positive effects on their learning.

Skinner and Belmont (1993) also examined the effects of teacher behavior on student engagement over the course of a year. They examined the reciprocal relationship between children's engagement and teacher behavior. Teacher behaviors are derived from their effectiveness to provide for the students' basic needs (to be competent, autonomous, and related to other people). Teachers foster children's competence by providing structure (clear expectations, offering help and support), autonomy by providing autonomous support (providing connections between school activities and children's interests), and relatedness by being involved (children's desire to belong and connect to other learners and the teacher). Teachers and students completed questionnaires in the fall and spring to assess teacher involvement, structure, and autonomy support, and finally student engagement. Results indicated that teachers' involvement with individual students had the most impact on children's perceptions of the
teacher. Children's engagement in learning activities is influenced both by their perceptions of
teachers and directly by teachers' actual behaviors. Behavioral engagement is a function of
student perceptions cf teacher structure. Emotional engagement is predicted by teacher
involvement. Teacher perceptions of behavioral and emotional engagement are influenced by
teacher involvement and autonomy support. What is unique in this study is the reciprocal effect:
Student engagement influences teacher behavior. Teachers respond to children who have high
behavioral engagement with more involvement and autonomy support. Teachers also respond to
children who are more passive with neglect and inconsistency. These results indicate that
changing teacher behaviors and understanding the factors that influence teachers and student
engagement should be a top priority in our schools.

De Naeghel, et al. (2014) explored further the relationship between adolescent students'
perceptions of teacher behavior, regarding autonomy, structure, and involvement, and their
intrinsic reading motivation. They also examined if this relationship was different in regards to
students' gender, socioeconomic status, and study track (educational track, technical track, or
vocational track). When considering background characteristics, boys had lower intrinsic
motivation than girls, students with a higher socioeconomic status had more enjoyment and
interest in reading, and students in an educational track of technical or vocational education
enjoy reading significantly less than their peers in an education track. In regards to teacher
behavior, results indicated that students had higher reading motivation when teachers supported
student autonomy and were more involved. Perceived structure of the classroom was also
positively associated with students' enjoyment of reading. Results confirmed the hypothesis that
perceived autonomy-supportive, more structure, and more involved teachers positively influence intrinsic reading motivation. Combining what we know about a child's psychological needs, with giving positive goal-oriented instruction, we can change how students view reading and learning in general.

In a study by Khalkhali (2014), it is stated that students can provide different perspectives on judging teacher effectiveness. The purpose of their study was to use the self-determination theory to see what factors influence the evaluation of their teachers. According to Zentall and Lee (2012), human beings are inherently proactive and begin life with a high level of internally directed motivation. Khalkhali (2014), goes further to state that this theory is all about how students become engaged in their classroom activities that affirm their competencies and are interesting and relevant to the students' lives. There are three kinds of motivation: intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation. With intrinsic motivation, students will engage in activities that are fun and interesting that offer them a chance to learn. On the other hand, students are externally motivated when there is public recognition and awards involved and do not truly see the value of the activity itself. When students are amotivated, they do not feel competent or see the value of the activity. Humans have 3 basic psychological needs: support for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. To enhance intrinsic motivation, these needs should be met. Autonomy relates to finding enjoyment in activities and having choices, Competence relates to mastery of a task, and relatedness is how students can connect with others. Autonomy supportive teachers create classroom environments that are supportive of their needs and accommodating to the students' interests and individual preferences, versus controlling teachers who neglect these needs and do
not allow students to think and feel. Using this information, Khalkhali (2014), investigated the relationships between students’ perceived value of schooling, self-determined motivation and school performance with their evaluation of their teachers. They conducted the study on 365 Iranian college students. Students completed a questionnaire about the following topics: 1) perceived value of schooling, 2) self-determined motivation, and 3) academic performance. A teacher evaluation was completed to assess students evaluation of their teachers. The results showed there was a positive correlation between perceived value of schooling and self-determined to evaluation of teacher, whereas, academic performance did not show significant correlation with evaluation of teacher. The results show that teachers do play an important role in their students’ lives and by creating supportive environments that have interesting classroom activities relevant to students’ lives, they impact student perceptions. When students are controlled and pressured to participate in instructional activities, they are more likely to have negative perspectives about their teacher.

Barber and Buehl’s study (2013), examined students’ perceptions of autonomy-enhancing and autonomy-suppressing teacher behaviors as it relates to specific classroom contexts and domains (in this study, the subject was science). They state that this aspect is very important as it helps in determining what practices work at a given time and in specific situations, which can therein inform instruction. They examined how those behaviors relate to students’ motivation for reading and learning. As in Khalkhali’s study (2014), Barber and Buehl (2013) define the self-determination theory as having three psychological needs met: the need for autonomy, along with competence and relatedness. Autonomy relates to behaviors that are necessary for intrinsic
motivation. The degree of autonomy is related to how internal to the individual the motivation for that behavior is. There are several autonomy enhancing and suppressing practices that have been identified and researched. 1) Providing choices—providing cognitive choices and autonomy support lead to deep level thinking and academic engagement, rather than organizational and procedural choices, 2) Fostering relevance involves the teacher setting a purpose for tasks and activities, and 3) Allowing criticism and encouraging independent thinking gives students a voice in the classroom and chance to discuss any dissatisfaction. They are given time to think, reflect and work independently. If there are dissatisfaction, teachers either make the tasks more interesting or go back up to step 2 and find a better explanation to foster relevance. If teachers intrude, they interrupt the flow of learning and how students work. In Barber and Buehl’s study (2013), they examined students’ perceptions of autonomy enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviors in two specific learning contexts in 4th grade (Comparison Group: inquiry science instruction, Intervention Group: literacy engagement in science) and related them to students’ motivation for learning and reading in a specific content domain. One hundred and nineteen 4th grade students participated in this year long study. The students were all mixed of different ethnicities. Fifty students participated in the inquiry science instructional condition and 69 students participated in the literacy engagement in science instructional condition. With the Intervention group, comprehension strategies were incorporated into the instructional model, as well two autonomy supportive practices (fostering relevance and providing meaningful choices) were selected and utilized. The students in the Comparison group, had science taught to them through an inquiry approach. They participated in hands-on activities, had oral discussions, and
used science skills like: observations, recording data, analyzing data, and drawing conclusions. Students in this group were not exposed to the autonomy supportive practices like the other group or given reading motivation supports. After a year, students completed measures to assess their perceptions of their science teachers' behaviors, feelings toward science, engagement in science, and reading motivation. The first three measures were assessed by adapting items, originally developed by Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2002). Reading motivation was assessed using the Motivation Reading Questionnaire. The results showed that for the first measure (perceptions of science teachers' behaviors), students perceived differences between the two instructional conditions. Perceptions of teachers' behavior were also significantly related to students' feelings about science and engagement in science (measure two). Students' perceptions of the autonomy supporting behavior of allowing criticism and independent thinking was related to students' positive feelings about science. Student perceptions of their teacher providing choices was significantly related to positive and negative feeling about science classes. For the third measure, results indicated that student perceptions of specific teacher behaviors are related to their motivation to read. This study shows autonomy supportive behaviors do affect students' emotions, motivation, and engagement in the classroom.

In You, Dang, and Lim's study (2016), they found that although Korean students excelled in math, science, and reading, their self-efficacy (belief in one's ability to complete certain tasks to achieve a specific goal) and intrinsic motivation (reasons for engaging in a behavior) were very low. They wanted to examine this further and see how they could improve these characteristics to help these students academically. They explored two theory theories: 1)
Expectancy-value theory and 2) Self-Determination Theory to understand the relationship between self-efficacy and achievement and intrinsic motivation and achievement. The Expectancy-value theory is about expectations of how students will perform on different tasks and their reasons for performing those tasks. Like other studies I have mentioned, self-determination theory examines intrinsic motivation. Humans have psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) that need to be met and when they are, our behavior is influenced as well as our ability to learn. Through various studies conducted, You, Dang, and Lim (2016) found that another factor that influences students' academic achievements, as well as their intrinsic motivation, is the students' perceptions of their teachers' motivational behavior, which includes the following: 1) Involvement, 2) Structure, and 3) Autonomy support. In this study, 6,227 students were selected to participate in this study and respond to a questionnaire assessing academic achievement, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and students' perceptions of teacher motivational behavior. This study used KELS, a nationally representative data set of Korean middle school students, in three waves of data collection. Items for students' perceptions were developed by the Korea Education Development Institute. Self-efficacy items and intrinsic motivation items originated from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), but adapted by the Korea Educational Development Institute for Korean students. To assess students academic achievement, the Korean Scholastic Achievement Test (KSAT) was used to measure English, Reading, and Mathematics. Once results of the questionnaires were collected, they found that the results showed three important pieces of information. First, students' perceptions of their teachers' motivational behaviors has a significant impact on the students'
self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. Second, a teacher’s motivational behavior indirectly influences students’ academic achievement by boosting their motivation and self-efficacy. Third, students with higher self-efficacy had higher intrinsic motivation. There is a lot the United States educational system and teachers can take from this study. Teachers should continue to motivate students as they go throughout school in each subject area to help them acquire positive self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. Creating a positive classroom environment and building relationships are associated with many positive student outcomes. They also mention how teacher training programs can emphasize methods that motivate students in all subject areas.

In Patall’s study (2013), the author investigated and examined the effects of choice on motivation and performance. Where there are studies that show that benefits of providing choice, there are also studies that show providing choice has no effect or even a negative on motivation, explaining that not all choices are equal for all people and across circumstances. Various factors influence the motivational benefits of choice. The author sought to find the answer to this question: Under what conditions does choosing lead to motivational benefits or detriments? Past studies have found that there are factors that affect choice such as 1) the autonomy-supportive nature of the choice opportunity, 2) the demands of choosing, 3) the number of options or opportunities for choosing, and 4) the cultural background of the participant. The study explored how two types of interest (individual, meaning personal, and situational, or supported by the environment) influences preferences for making choices. Choice is very powerful when a task is perceived as boring and may beneficial to individuals who lack
personal interest for the task, but it is also powerful when the task is perceived as interesting because individuals may be receptive to factors that influence their interest and enjoyment. There may be different implications for the effects of choice depending on an individual’s initial interest or the interestingness of the task.

The author investigated three different types of studies to study different circumstances of choice. In Study 1, they examined whether individuals would differ in their preference for having choice depending on their initial levels of individual interest. One hundred and fifty-two individuals were asked to think about two scenarios and rate the extent to which they would prefer to have task-related choices to work on a given task. One scenario asked participants to engage in a personally interesting task. The other scenario described a situation where they were asked to engage in a personally boring task. Results showed support that choosing is more desirable under conditions in which the individual has greater individual interest for the task.

In Study 2, twenty-eight college students were randomly assigned to complete 36 trivia and brain teaser questions of various types on all kinds of subjects under one or two choice conditions: choice or no choice. Participants in the choice condition had the opportunity to select three categories that they would receive questions over along with other selections the computer would pick. Participants in the no choice category had topics assigned for the game. There was no real difference in the actual game questions received. Each group had the same task features. After the trivia and brain teaser questions were completed, they reported their perception of having choices, experience of interest, and feelings of competence on a questionnaire. This study measured interest-enjoyment and perceived competence subscales from a version of the
Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Ryan, 1982). The results from the questionnaire showed that choosing provides motivational and performance benefits, especially for those individuals who had high interest going into the task. However, for those individuals who had little initial interest, choosing had no effect on their experience of interest of the game. Providing choice and initial individual interest facilitated participants' perceptions of their competence and their actual performance.

For the last study, they explored whether the effect of choice would vary when the interestingness of the task was manipulated and participants were informed of how interesting or boring people had found the task in the past, while also depending on people's initial individual interest for the activity at hand. Before the study took place, the participants were told the purpose of the study, which was to investigate people's performance on a reading comprehension task. They would receive a reading passage and several questions assessing their comprehension of the passage. They reported how interesting and enjoyable they found reading, and then randomly assigned to a task condition: boring or interesting. Based on what condition they were in, they were told that the articles they would be reading would be either interesting or boring. A post-manipulation measure of interest for the reading task was taken to see if it had influenced participants perceptions of the task going in. Participants were randomly assigned again to one of two conditions: choice or no choice. In the choice condition, participants were asked to make their choices for the task regarding the specific article and the difficulty of the questions. Participants in the no choice condition were assigned these tasks. It is noted that there was no difference in the passages or questions for each task condition. After the task was completed,
they completed a survey in which they reported their perception of having choices, their experience of interest and enjoyment during the task, perceived competence, and their willingness to engage in the task again. Results from this study showed that the choice and task interestingness manipulations were successful. Participants in the choice condition perceived having more choice regarding aspects of the reading comprehension task compared to participants in the no choice condition. Participants in the boring task reported lower interest expectations for the task compared to the interesting task condition.

Looking over all three studies, Patall (2012) found that choice will have different consequences for motivation depending on certain conditions. Giving students choice is most beneficial when the individual feels high interest for the activity which enhances their motivation for the task. These individuals see choosing as desirable as it maximizes their potential to develop their skills, whereas students who lack individual interest see choosing as overwhelming. When considering the interestingness of the task, choosing is beneficial if a task is perceived as uninteresting to people who start out with high individual interest. Choice had little benefit when people had low individual interest for an activity. The author suggests that we think carefully about choice and consider using it after we consider the level of individual interest for a specific person and the characteristics of the tasks we ask students and individuals to participate in.

De Naeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenskiste, and Rosseel’s research (2012) supports the idea that it is important to keep children motivated to read and to promote reading motivation as this declines as children get older. They looked at reading motivation from the perspective of
self-determination theory, which distinguishes between autonomous and and controlled types of motivation. They developed a questionnaire that would measure recreation and academic reading motivation, grounded in SDT (self-determination theory), which is called the Self-Regulation Questionnaire -Reading Motivation. These researchers examined children's reasons or motives for reading in recreational and academic contexts, as well as explored the relationships between reading motivation, reading behavior, and reading performance and reading motivation and self-concept.

Autonomous motivation consists of intrinsic and well-internalized regulation. Intrinsic motivation is the optimal form of motivation. Children engage in an activity for its own enjoyment. Children read because they enjoy it. If children consider reading as personally relevant or identify themselves with the value of reading, this experience freedom when reading (internalized regulation). Controlled motivation consists of two types: external regulation and introjected regulation. External regulation is the least autonomous and children read to get an award or avoid punishment. Introjected regulation is caused by internal pressure and feelings of guilt and shame. External, introjected, and identified regulation are all forms of extrinsic motivation. Autonomous motivation has been more consistently associated with more positive outcomes, whereas controlled motivation leads to superficial learning. De Naeghel et al. (2012) made a couple of hypotheses from their study. First, they hypothesized that autonomous reading motivation would contribute more positively to reading behavior and performance than would controlled reading motivation. Second, they wanted to see whether the hypothesized positive association between reading motivation and reading comprehension can be accounted for by
reading frequency, as well as to see what the relationship was between reading motivation, reading comprehension, and reading engagement. Students’ reading engagement pertained to both behavioral involvement and emotional involvement during learning activities. Another hypothesis was that autonomous reading motivation contributes positively to engagement, whereas controlled motivation is negatively related. They examined whether reading self-concept as well as autonomous and controlled reading motivation contributed independently to reading frequency, reading engagement, and reading comprehension.

In Flanders, Belgium, 1,260 5th grade students from 45 elementary schools participated in this study where instructions and practice items were provided prior to the actual questionnaire and a reading comprehension test by a team of trained researchers. The SRQ-Reading Motivation questionnaire, consisting of 24 questions, was administered twice to measure motivation for recreational reading and motivation for academic reading. For each set, students were expected to respond to items relating to two autonomous types of reading motivation—intrinsic regulation and identified regulation—and two controlled types of reading motivation—introjected and external. To assess the students’ reading performance, students completed a standardized reading comprehension test. To assess leisure-time reading frequency, a student questionnaire was used to measure the frequency of narrative and informational reading activity in leisure time. To assess reading engagement, teachers rated their students over the following items: student attention, effort, verbal participation, persistence, and positive emotion in reading activities. Students’ self-concept (perceived reading competence) was measured by
means of the self-concept subscale of the student questionnaire previously mentioned above that measured leisure-time reading frequency.

Results showed that recreational autonomous and controlled reading motivation as well as self-concept made independent contributions to reading behavior (reading engagement and frequency) and performance. The researchers found that positive reading self-concept is associated with higher leisure-time reading frequency, reading engagement, and better reading comprehension. Recreational autonomous reading motivation was more positively associated with reading frequency, engagement, and comprehension. Controlled reading was not significantly related to reading engagement and had a negative relation with reading comprehension. For both the academic and recreational contexts, there was no indirect relationship between between reading motivation via reading frequency.

From these results, they concluded that that the SRQ-Reading Motivation instrument is very useful as it 1) identifies individual students’ reasons for reading, 2) follows up on how students’ reading motivation evolves throughout the school year, and 3) evaluates reading promotion interventions. The present study highlights the different reasons for reading and explains the reading behavior and performance above and beyond students’ reading self-concept. In terms of interventions to promote reading motivation, it is important to encourage autonomous reasons for reading and enhancing students’ willingness to read. Teachers can offer choices, recognize individual interests, and support students as a means to create a positive reading climate.
Another way to enhance and promote students’ reading motivation is to provide information by way of a teacher professional development workshop. De Naeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, Haerens, and Aelterman’s (2016), quasi-experimental study explored if a professional development workshop offered to upper elementary school teachers to help them adopt a more motivating style during reading activities would ease the decline of students’ autonomous reading motivation, which is a common theme that researchers have discovered with students as they go beyond their elementary school years. In terms of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), research has indicated that autonomy-supportive and a well-structured teaching style fosters autonomous motivation. SDT is also a good framework to understand children’s motives of engaging in an activity. Similar to the De Naeghel et al research (2012), De Naeghel, et al (2016) discussed the differences between autonomous and controlled reading motivation. Autonomous reading motivation is all about engaging in reading activities that are enjoyable and filled with excitement, whereas controlled reading motivation is when children read to meet external demands, but can also result from internal pressure. Research findings suggest that autonomous reading motivation brings about more positive outcomes with students and can be stimulated nurture their innate psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. When students feel autonomous, they find reading materials themselves that are engaging and interesting. Feeling competent means that students feel confident and effective. When students experience relatedness, they feel connected and accepted by others. If teachers can adopt an appropriate teaching style related to autonomy (autonomy supportive), competence (dimension of structure), and relatedness (dimension of involvement), then they will encourage autonomous
motivation. The researchers aimed to study whether a in-service teacher professional development workshop aimed at encouraging teachers to adopt a motivating teaching style would have an impact on students' autonomous reading motivation and if this workshop has a different effect on boys and girls. Twelve teachers out of 38 were selected to participate in the experimental group, while the other 26 teachers were part of the control group. Teachers in the experimental group participated in the workshop on how to provide autonomy support and structure in classroom reading activities, whereas the control group continued their current teaching programs. Pretest, posttest, and retention data was collected from 5th grade students and teachers from Belgium elementary schools using student questionnaires. Pretest data was collected before the workshop, posttest and retention data was collected midyear and prior to the school year ending. The workshop consisted of different sections: a) introduction, b) discussion of the theoretical background, c) overview and interactive application of motivating strategies, and d) application exercise. It was important during this workshop to optimize teachers' motivation and learning to help them feel autonomy supported, competent, and involved so that they could model the same behaviors with their own students. The teachers in the experimental group stated that they did in fact experience support for their own psychological needs. They received some follow up support which consisted of them receiving reminders to implement an autonomy-supportive and structuring motivating style during reading activities and to complete a structured journal where they reflected on their efforts of their motivating style during reading activities and completed a reading activity report which specified the content, goals, and during of their reading activities.
Students' reading motivation was measured by means of the SRQ-Reading Motivation questionnaire. Six hundred and sixty-four students from 27 elementary schools in Belgium participated and took this questionnaire. Students within the experimental group did not report significantly more progress on academic autonomous reading motivation from pretest to posttest as compared to students in the control group. Students in the experimental group did, however, did make significantly more progress from pretest to posttest on recreational autonomous reading motivation (reading during students' leisure time), especially boys. The findings also found that boys and girls in the experimental group differ with respect to their progress on recreational autonomous reading motivation from pretest to posttest, compared to academic autonomous reading motivation. Looking at the control group, boys in the control group showed a significant decrease from pretest to posttest for recreational reading, whereas girls did not report a significant change.

Their findings suggested that their first hypothesis was correct and that investing in teacher professional development focused on autonomy supportive and structuring motivating styles are promising strategies to enhance 5th grade students' autonomous motivation in recreational reading experiences.
Summary

We know that there is evidence for the positive relationship of autonomy-supportive, structured, and involved teacher behavior during reading activities among secondary students (De Naeghel, et al., 2014). What is not known is the effect on middle school students. Most studies have focused on elementary students and others focused on 15-year-olds. I proposed to conduct a study similar to De Naeghel, et al.'s but with different aged participants, middle school students in grades 6-8. My project could help us see patterns in students' intrinsic reading motivation as they progress from elementary school to middle school, and finally to secondary school. It could also help us see if there are any potential patterns of decline in reading motivation from elementary school to middle school.

Hypothesis

I hypothesized that middle school students’ perceptions of autonomy-supportive, structured, and involved teacher behavior positively relate to their intrinsic reading motivation.
CHAPTER III: METHOD

Participants

Research was conducted at Cuba City Elementary/Middle School, which is a rural school district in southwestern Wisconsin. In the school there are approximately 480 students in the 4K-8th grade, with about 140 students being in grades 6-8. Data were collected from 55 middle school students.

Materials and Procedures

Data were collected from 55 middle school students on one day in the 2017-2018 school year in their reading/language arts classroom. Data from one participant were incomplete and were excluded from the analysis. Students completed a questionnaire that measured students' perceptions of their teachers' behavior according to 1) Teacher autonomy support, 2) Teachers' implementation of structure, and 3) Teacher involvement. Students' intrinsic reading motivation was measured according to their own enjoyment or interest in reading. The questionnaire provided to the students used the same items as in De Naeghel, et al.'s (2014) study, whose items corresponded to the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 assessment framework (OECD, 2009). In a multiple choice format, it contained seven statements related to autonomy-supportive behavior, nine statements related to implementation of structure, five statements related to teacher involvement, and 11 statements related to the enjoyment of reading. Students chose one answer according to how they viewed their teachers and then how they viewed reading in their own lives. After the questionnaire was administered and completed by
the students, these results were placed on a data collection form and then analyzed (All materials are included in Appendix B).

Once the questionnaire was completed and I had the student results, I added up the items of each student perception of behavior (autonomy-support, implementation of structure, and involvement) and found the average. For intrinsic reading motivation, I found the average, after reverse scoring for certain items. Then, I calculated the bivariate correlations between the three student perceptions and intrinsic motivation to determine and assess the relationship between the variables. The three student perceptions, gender, and grade-level were to be regressed on intrinsic motivation. However, due to technological issues that were beyond my control, the electronic questionnaire form did not list the students’ name, so I was unable to properly code and correlate this to the students’ gender and grade level to be able to complete the regression. After careful evaluation, I shared the results with the teachers, and then I discussed strategies and interventions to implement to boost reading motivation in their classrooms, if it was necessary according to what the results showed.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

My research replicated the research of De Naeghel, et al. (2014) by exploring whether middle school adolescents’ perceptions of teacher behavior support intrinsic motivation, from a self-determination theory perspective.

First, I sent out parental consent forms to all the middle school parents explaining what my project was about and asking them if their child, or children, could participate in the study. Next, I contacted the two language arts teachers so that I could come into their classroom for the first 15 minutes of their three language arts blocks to give my questionnaire to those students who I received parental consent forms from (which was 55 students). Then, I gave those students their student assent form, which explained my project in further depth and explained what they would be doing in class. Lastly, those 55 students completed a electronic questionnaire where the students would answer multiple choice questions that measured students' perceptions of their teachers’ behavior according to 1) Teacher autonomy support, 2) Teachers' implementation of structure, and 3) Teacher involvement. Students' intrinsic reading motivation was measured according to their own enjoyment or interest in reading. For some students, the electronic form did not work so they had to complete the questionnaire using paper and pencil. After I had collected the data, I analyzed the data using an SPSS software program. Further explanations of these results can be seen below in the following charts and tables. I hypothesized that middle school students' perceptions of autonomy-supportive, structured, and involved teacher behavior are positively related to the students' intrinsic reading motivation.
Data from one participant were incomplete and were excluded from the analysis.

Descriptive statistics are in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (n = 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All ratings were on a scale of 1 to 4.

The bivariate correlations of students’ intrinsic motivation and three perceptions of teacher behavior were all found to be related. Teachers support of student autonomy was a positive predictor of students’ intrinsic motivation, $r(52) = .28, p = .04$. Teacher involvement with the student and their learning experiences was a positive predictor of students’ intrinsic motivation, $r(52) = .28, p < .05$. Finally, the level of structure within the classroom was positively, but not significantly, related to students’ intrinsic motivation, $r(52) = .23, p = .10$.

However, the three perceptions of teacher behaviors were strongly correlated with one another ($ps = .001$). Consequently, a stepwise regression was conducted with teacher autonomy, involvement, and structure as predictors of students’ intrinsic motivation. Only autonomy was entered into the regression, $F(1, 52) = 4.42, p = .04$. The regression coefficients are provided in
Table 2. The regression indicates that autonomy is the single best predictor and the other predictors do not add significantly to the explained variance.

Table 2. Summary of Stepwise Regression Predicting Students’ Intrinsic Motivation (n = 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .09$ for Step 1.

As stated previously, the three student perceptions, gender, and grade-level were to be regressed on intrinsic motivation. However, due to technological issues that were beyond my control, the electronic questionnaire form did not list the students’ names, so I was unable to properly code and correlate this to the students’ gender and grade level to be able to complete the regression.

To summarize the results, using a bivariate correlation, students’ intrinsic motivation and the three perceptions of teacher behavior were all found to be related. Autonomy, involvement, and implementation of structure were positive predictors of intrinsic motivation, with autonomy and involvement being more significant than implementation of structure. A stepwise regression showed that autonomy is the single best predictor of students’ intrinsic motivation.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

When I began my project, I had two questions that I wanted to research and explore: 1) What activities or interventions exist that can help boost reading motivation? 2) How does the teacher’s role affect reading motivation during implementation of the intervention? The studies I have read indicated that conducting engaging literacy activities in the classroom (providing choice, implementing specific reading programs, using book clubs, etc.) and creating supportive environments support intrinsic motivation. Teachers play an important role in their students’ lives and learning. Teacher behaviors in the classroom do affect students’ engagement and motivation.

Before conducting my own individual study, I hypothesized that middle school students’ perceptions of autonomy-supportive, structured, and involved teacher behavior positively relate to their intrinsic reading motivation. Looking back at the results, my hypothesis was correct as the bivariate correlations of students’ intrinsic motivation and three perceptions of teacher behavior were all found to be related. When a stepwise regression was conducted, the results indicated that autonomy is the single best predictor of students’ intrinsic motivation. The questionnaire showed us that there are 3 separate, distinct subscales but the results show us that autonomy, implementation of structure, and involvement are all related and have positive relationships to one another.

If the study was replicated, researchers should think about giving the questionnaire to the students using paper and pencil and skip putting it into an electronic form, as some important
data can get lost, which is exactly what happened with this study. It is a little more reliable and technological issues can be avoided altogether.

The present study only gave us a small glimpse of adolescents’ perceptions of teacher behavior and their role on intrinsic reading motivation, because it was only conducted during one day of the 2017-2018 school year. It would be interesting to see what the results of the questionnaire would be if it were given in different parts of the United States with bigger groups of adolescent students. Through a longitudinal research design, researchers could also focus on a group of students as they progress from elementary to secondary school to see how their intrinsic reading motivation changes as they get older and examine specific factors that influence those changes. Further research is needed so that we can continue to enhance our children’s motivation and help them maintain a love of reading for their entire lives.
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Amanda Fleegle
Sponsor: Peggy Marciniec
Department of School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

RE: IRB Protocol #2016-17-82

Project Title: Adolescents' perceptions of teacher behavior and their role on intrinsic reading motivation

Approval Date: 5/26/2017
Expiration Date: 5/25/2018

Your project has been approved by the University of Wisconsin-Platteville IRB via a Full Board Review. This approval is subject to the following conditions, otherwise approval may be suspended:

1. No participants may be involved in the study prior to the IRB approval date listed above or after the expiration date.
2. All unanticipated or serious adverse events must be reported to the IRB.
3. All modifications to procedures, participant selection, and instruments used (surveys, consent forms, etc) must be reported to the IRB chair prior to their use. Extensive modifications may require full board approval.
4. If the project will continue beyond the expiration date, then the researcher must file for a continuation with the IRB at least 14 days prior to the expiration date. If the IRB approval for this project expires before approval for continuation is given, then a new protocol must be filled out and submitted. Federal guidelines allow for no exceptions to this rule. Any data collected after the expiration date cannot be used in the study.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB chair at the address below. Include your protocol # on all correspondence.

Sincerely,

Dr. Barb Barnet
Institutional Review Board Chair
Professor, Mathematics Department
Gardner 451
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
(608) 342-1942 barnetb@uwplatt.edu
APPENDIX B: PROJECT MATERIALS

Include a copy of your research materials (e.g., consent forms, questionnaires). See below.

1. Principal Consent Form for Research
2. Parental Consent Form for Participation of Human Participants in Research
3. Parental Consent Form for Participation of Human Participants in Research (Spanish version)
4. Student Assent Form for Participation in Research
5. Intrinsic Reading Motivation Questionnaire
Principal Consent Form for Research

TO: Rhonda Loeffelholz

FROM: Amanda Fleege

RE: Request for Permission to Conduct Research at Cuba City Elementary/Middle School

DATE: May 2017

In the completion of my master's degree at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville, I am required to conduct an action/research project. I am asking permission to collect data at our school. The IRB proposal describes my study, identifies who I would like to participate, and requests your approval. Once the study is completed, I will share a summary of the results with you.

Attached is a copy of my research protocol/proposal. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me or my faculty sponsor.

Thank you,

Amanda Fleege, Researcher

Dr. Peggy Marciniec, Associate Professor
Coordinator of Reading Programs
School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
marciniec@uwplatt.edu

I give consent for Amanda Fleege to conduct her research on adolescents' perceptions of teacher behavior and their role on intrinsic reading motivation at Cuba City Elementary/Middle School.

X Yes, I give consent.

__________________________
Rhonda Loeffelholz
(Printed Name)

__________________________
Principa1
(Signature)
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PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PLATTEVILLE & CUBA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

1. Purpose: The purpose of this research is to explore how students’ perceptions of teacher behavior relate to reading motivation of middle school students at Cuba City.

2. Procedure: Your child will be asked to complete a brief questionnaire. PARTICIPATION IS VOLUNTARY AND HE/SHE WILL BE ASKED TO GIVE HIS/HER ASSENT. YOUR CHILD’S NAME WILL NOT BE RECORDED ON THE RESEARCH MATERIALS AND IT WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN OUR DATA SET OR IN ANY REPORTS ABOUT THE PROJECT.

3. Time Required: Participation is expected to take approximately 15 minutes, on one day of the 2017-2018 school year during class.

4. Risks: No short-term or long-term risks are foreseen. The only “cost” to the participants will be the time and effort required to participate in the study.

5. Benefits: Understanding what factors are associated with intrinsic reading motivation is of value to our school and helping our students continue to pursue the love of reading.

6. Your Rights as the Parent of a Student Participant: The information gathered in this study will be confidential. Data or summarized results will not be released in any way that could identify you or your child. If your child would like to withdraw from the study at any time, he/she may do so without penalty or repercussions. The information collected from your child up to that point would be destroyed. You may request a summary of the results. If you have any questions afterward, please ask:

   Amanda Gaul, Graduate Student in Education  or  Rhonda Leeffelholz
   University of Wisconsin-Platteville          Cuba City Elementary/Middle School Principal
   Title 1 Reading Teacher                     608-744-2174
   Phone Number: 608-338-0591                  rhonda.leeffelholz@cubacityk12.wi.us
   Email: amugaul@gmail.com
   Faculty Sponsor  Dr. Peggy Marciniec, Associate Professor

7. If you have any questions about your child’s treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write:
   Barb Barnett, Chair of the UW-Platteville IRB
   (608) 342-1942 OR barneb@uwplatt.edu

   I have read the above information and (check one):
   ___ DO give consent for my child to participate in the research.
   ___ DO NOT give consent for my child to participate in the research.

   Please print your child’s name (First, Middle, Last):______________________________

   Please print your full name (First, Middle, Last):______________________________

   Please sign:_________________________________________Date:_____________________

Then return this completed form to Mrs. Gaul by Tuesday December 5th
PADRE/ TUTOR FORMULARIO DE CONSENTIMIENTO PARA LA PARTICIPACIÓN DE LAS PERSONAS EN LA INVESTIGACIÓN

UNIVERSIDAD DE WISCONSIN-PLATTEVILLE Y EL DISTRITO ESCOLAR DE CUBA CITY

1. Objetivo: El objetivo de esta investigación es explorar cómo las percepciones de comportamiento de los profesores de los estudiantes se relacionan con la lectura de la motivación de la escuela media estudiantes en Cuba City.

2. Procedimiento: Se le pedirá a su hijo a completar un breve cuestionario. La participación es voluntaria y que él / ella se le pedirá a día su / su consentimiento. NOMBRE DE SU HIJO NO se grabará en la investigación de materiales y no va a ser incluido en nuestra CONJUNTO DE DATOS O en ningún informe sobre el proyecto.

3. Tiempo requerido: se espera la participación de tomar aproximadamente 15 minutos, en un solo día del año escolar 2017-2018 durante la clase.

4. Riesgos: No se prevé a corto plazo o largo plazo riesgos. El único “costo” para los participantes será el tiempo y el esfuerzo necesarios para participar en el estudio.

5. Beneficios: Comprensión de los factores que se asocian con la motivación intrínseca de lectura es de valor para nuestra escuela y ayudar a nuestros estudiantes continuas poniendo el mejor por la lectura.

6. Sus derechos como padre de un estudiante participante: La información recopilada en este estudio serán confidenciales. Datos o resumidos los resultados no serán liberados de cualquier manera que pueda identificarle a usted o su hijo. Si su hijo le gustaría retirarse del estudio en cualquier momento, él / ella puede hacerlo sin penalización o repercusiones. La información recopilada de su hijo hasta que punto sería destruida. Usted puede solicitar un resumen de los resultados. Si tiene alguna pregunta después, por favor pregunte:

   Amanda Gaul, estudiante graduado en Educación o Rhonda Loeffelholz
   Universidad de Wisconsin-Platteville Administrador Cuba City Elementary/Middle School
   Título 1 Profesora de lectura 608-744-2174
   Número de teléfono: 608-330-0591 Rhonda.Loeffelholz@Cubacity.k12.wi.us
   Email: amanda.gaul@hotmail.com
   Facultad Patrocinador: Dr. Peggy Marciniec, Profesor Asociado

7. Si usted tiene alguna pregunta sobre el tratamiento de su hijo como participante en este estudio, por favor llame o escriba:
   Barb Barnes, presidente de la Universidad de Wisconsin-Platteville IRB (608) 342-1942 O barnesb@uwplatt.edu

He leído el por encima de la información y (marque uno):

___ Doy mi consentimiento para que mi hijo participe en la investigación.

___ No doy mi consentimiento para que mi hijo participe en la investigación.

Por favor escriba el nombre de su hijo (nombre, segundo nombre, apellido):

Por favor escriba su nombre completo (primer nombre, segundo nombre, apellido):

Por favor firme: __________________________ Fecha: __________________________

Por favor devuelva este formulario completado A.M. Gaul por: Lunes el 11 de diciembre.
STUDENT ASSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-PLATTEVILLE &
CUBA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

1. Dear Student,

We want to provide the best education possible to you and to future students. Therefore, we are conducting this research project. You are invited to participate in our questionnaire on reading motivation. The purpose of this research is to explore how student perceptions of teacher behavior relates to the reading motivation of middle school students at Cuba City. You are being asked to participate in this questionnaire because you, as a student at Cuba City, know what works for you.

Whether you participate in this questionnaire or not will have absolutely no impact on your grades. The information gathered in this survey will be used to help make Cuba City a better, more welcoming place for you and your classmates.

Your parents have already given permission for you to participate in our research project and we are hoping that you will agree to participate. Your voluntary completion of the questionnaire constitutes your agreement (assent) to participate. Thank you for helping us to better help you.

If you do not agree to participate, please tell me or Rhonda Loeffelholz as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Amanda Gaul, Graduate Student in Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Title I Reading Teacher
Phone Number 608-330-0591
Email: amg2565@uwplatt.edu
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Peggy Martiniec, Associate Professor

Rhonda Loeffelholz
Cuba City Elementary/Middle School Principal
608-744-2174
rhonda.loeffelholz@cubacity.k12.wi.us

If you have any questions about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write either of us or contact:

Barb Barnet
Chair of the UW-Platteville IRB
(608) 342-1945
barnetb@uwplatt.edu
Intrinsic Reading Motivation Questionnaire

1. Code: *

2. My teacher asks students to explain the meaning of a text *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Never or hardly ever
   - In some lessons
   - In most lessons
   - In all lessons

3. My teacher asks questions that challenge students to get a better understanding of a text *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Never or hardly ever
   - In some lessons
   - In most lessons
   - In all lessons

4. My teacher gives students enough time to think about their answers *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Never or hardly ever
   - In some lessons
   - In most lessons
   - In all lessons

5. My teacher recommends a book or author to read *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Never or hardly ever
   - In some lessons
   - In most lessons
   - In all lessons
6. My teacher encourages students to express their opinion about a text:
Mark only one oval.

- Never or hardly ever
- In some lessons
- In most lessons
- In all lessons

7. My teacher helps students relate the stories they read to their lives:
Mark only one oval.

- Never or hardly ever
- In some lessons
- In most lessons
- In all lessons

8. My teacher shows students how the information in texts builds on what they already know:
Mark only one oval.

- Never or hardly ever
- In some lessons
- In most lessons
- In all lessons

9. My teacher explains beforehand what is expected of the students:
Mark only one oval.

- Never or hardly ever
- In some lessons
- In most lessons
- In all lessons

10. My teacher checks that students are concentrating while working on the reading assignment:
Mark only one oval.

- Never or hardly ever
- In some lessons
- In most lessons
- In all lessons

11. My teacher discusses students' work after they have finished the reading assignment:
Mark only one oval.

- Never or hardly ever
- In some lessons
- In most lessons
- In all lessons
12. By teacher tells students in advance how their work is going to be judged.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Never or hardly ever
☐ In some lessons
☐ In most lessons
☐ In all lessons

13. By teacher asks whether every student has understood how to complete the reading assignment.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Never or hardly ever
☐ In some lessons
☐ In most lessons
☐ In all lessons

14. By teacher marks students' work.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Never or hardly ever
☐ In some lessons
☐ In most lessons
☐ In all lessons

15. By teacher gives students the chance to ask questions about the reading assignment.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Never or hardly ever
☐ In some lessons
☐ In most lessons
☐ In all lessons

16. By teacher poses questions that motivate students to participate actively.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Never or hardly ever
☐ In some lessons
☐ In most lessons
☐ In all lessons

17. By teacher tells students how well they did on the reading assignment immediately after.

Mark only one oval.

☐ Never or hardly ever
☐ In some lessons
☐ In most lessons
☐ In all lessons
18. I get along well with most of my teachers *
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

19. Most of my teachers are interested in my well-being *
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

20. Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say *
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

21. If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers *
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

22. Most of my teachers treat me fairly *
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

23. I read only if I have to *
Mark only one oval.

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
24. Reading is one of my favorite hobbies

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

25. I like talking about books with other people

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

26. I find it hard to finish books

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

27. I feel happy if I receive a book as a present

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

28. For me, reading is a waste of time

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

29. I enjoy going to a bookstore or a library

Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree
20. I read only to get information that I need *
   Mark only one oval:
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly agree

21. I cannot sit still and read for more than a few minutes *
   Mark only one oval:
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly agree

22. I like to express my opinions about books I have read *
   Mark only one oval:
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly agree

23. I like to exchange books with my friends *
   Mark only one oval:
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly agree