

English Language Learners' Motivation to Engage in Reading

By

Jennifer Lynn Robinson

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Teaching and Learning

May 2010

Copyright by JENNIFER LYNN ROBINSON, 2010
All Rights Reserved

Copyright by JENNIFER LYNN ROBINSON, 2010
All Rights Reserved

Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the dissertation of JENNIFER LYNN ROBINSON find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Mary F. Roe, Ph.D., Chair

Joy Egbert, Ph.D.

Tom Salsbury, Ph.D.

Acknowledgment

An endeavor such as this one often requires the support, guidance, and assistance of many people. First and foremost I must acknowledge and thank Mary Roe for her incredible level of patience and vast amounts of guidance. I am indebted to her probing questions that kept me thinking. Next, the school district, middle school, teacher, parent, and students were invaluable. Without them, I would not have had the voices, which make this piece more powerful, to share. Next, I must acknowledge my husband, Russ. Russ helped to make this possible through the many, many times he took over other duties so that I could study and write. He also read my papers a great deal more than he may want to admit. Without my best friend, Tracey, I would have become lost in the words and would not have found my way out. To have such linguistic patience is a gift. I was also kept in motion with the project by my own children's patience, questions, and admiration of my goals. Diane Hillbrink, a Library Media Specialist, is owed a debt of gratitude for saving my formatting at the last minute! Finally, my family, whether near or far, supported me to the end and were very excited to have a "Dr." in the family. Without all of these supports and invested individuals, this experience would not have been the same. If you have not been acknowledged by name here, know that you were involved simply by being in my life. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for helping me walk down this path in order to prove something to myself.

English Language Learners' Motivation to Engage in Reading

Abstract

by Jennifer Lynn Robinson, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2010

Chair: Mary F. Roe

This paper is a combination of two articles intended to lead the reader through the author's journey of first finding a definition of motivation to engage and then conducting a qualitative study with adolescent English language learners in order to uncover patterns of motivation to engage with reading.

Engagement and motivation are frequently used to describe characteristics needed for success in reading (Czikszenmihaly, 1997; Guthrie & Wigfield, 1999). However, it has been stated that motivation needs to precede engagement in reading (Johnson & Blair, 2003; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). Educators want and need to understand what motivates students to engage with reading since engagement with reading and reading achievement are positively correlated (Guthrie, 2004; Guthrie & Wigfield, 1999; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). Furthermore, the motivation of our English language learners is crucial as we see their enrollments increase in US schools (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006). This paper discusses the concepts of engagement, motivation, motivation to engage, and what we need to do next for English language learners.

In the qualitative study, sixth grade English language learners' (ELLs) motivation to engage in reading was examined in order to explore the following questions: (1) What activities, people, and/or topics will motivate ELLs to engage in reading, and (2) Why is it difficult for ELLs to find motivation to engage in reading in English, especially when they are already able to

read in their native language? To answer these questions, observational and interview data were collected from ELLs from November of 2008 through May of 2009. Analysis of this data revealed three main elements found to motivate ELLs to engage in reading: (1) the assigned task, (2) family and grades, and (3) the teacher and read alouds. This paper will explore the results of this research, as well as apply the findings and illuminate the implications for teaching and motivating English language learners to engage in reading.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
ARTICLE ONE	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MOTIVATION.....	2
Intrinsic Motivation.....	3
Extrinsic Motivation.....	4
3. ENGAGEMENT.....	6
4. MOTIVATION TO ENGAGE.....	9
5. READING ENGAGEMENT AND MOTIVATION OF ELLS.....	9
ARTICLE ONE REFERENCES.....	13
ARTICLE TWO	
1. EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP.....	19
2. METHOD.....	27
3. RESULTS.....	34
4. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	48
ARTICLE TWO REFERENCES.....	52
APPENDIX	
A. PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW.....	62
B. TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE.....	63
C. PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	65

D. READING LOG.....	67
E. MOTIVATION FOR READING QUESTIONNAIRE.....	68
F. OBSERVATION CODES.....	71

LIST OF TABLES

1. WIDA Descriptors for Levels 4 and 5 Language Proficiency.....	72
2. Participant Descriptors.....	73

Dedication

This project is dedicated first and foremost to Russ, Tracey, and my children. I also want to dedicate this project to all of my students with whom I have helped foster the love of reading through the sharing of hot chocolate, art, conversation, or whatever other mode we wanted to use in order to explore books. Know that I help you with reading out of my own love of reading (and you) and all of the adventures and knowledge that comes from it. I hope you can also say that I helped make reading come alive for you.

Motivation to Engage in Reading

Ollman (1993) stated, “Choosing what to read is part of becoming a reader. Real world readers do not wait for teachers to tell them what to read” (p. 648). As a K-12 educator, I find that this quote becomes ever more real as the school year progresses. I have students who love to read and I have students who maintain apathy for reading. The students who love to read will devour books and require multiple trips to the library within any given month. The students who are apathetic toward reading will read the same book for an entire quarter or even an entire semester and still not be able to tell me any main ideas or details. However, for some students, apathy is not the issue. Other challenges prevail in their lives.

Being an English language learner (ELL) compounds an already challenging process of learning to read. For students who must acquire language and reading simultaneously, drumming up motivation to read in English can be a daily challenge (Peregoy & Boyle, 2000). Even when ELLs gain proficiency in the language, it can still be difficult to find the motivation to continue reading in English for anything other than a grade or to complete an assignment (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006; Wang & Pape, 2007; Xu, 1999). Because I teach primarily ELLs, I am always listening for what motivates my students to read in addition to listening for when and why they engage with a certain story.

In order to have a better understanding of what motivates ELLs to engage in reading, I need to distinguish between the terms motivation and engagement. I also need to understand if one can precede the other or if they can happen simultaneously. Therefore, I will lead you through my exploration of what motivation is, what engagement is, and how I came to believe that a student is motivated to engage in reading. I end by proposing a need to uncover ELL patterns of motivation to engage in reading.

Motivation

Although many scholars disagree on a strict definition of motivation, they agree that motivation includes movement whether driven by inner forces, sustained traits, certain behaviors, or established individual beliefs and affects (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Paris and Oka (1986) assert that motivation is the will and skill to learn. Snow and Farr (1983) state that motivation is the purposeful endeavor toward a goal. Keller (1991) adds that motivation refers to the choices made based on experiences, goals, and the amount of effort put forth to accomplish a goal. Pintrich and Schunk (2002) define motivation as a process in which a goal directed behavior is instigated and sustained. Overall, these definitions involve movement, are very similar, and build upon each other. I propose a definition that encompasses all aspects of these definitions: motivation is a behavior that is instigated based on experiences, goals, and the effort necessary to complete an activity. Using this definition as a starting point, I now discuss three agreed upon tenets of motivation that undergird this definition: (1) motivation is a process, (2) it has a beginning or end goal, and (3) the goal involves action. These tenets shed light on the specific nature of motivation. I discuss each in turn.

Since motivation is a process, we cannot observe it directly. However, we can infer motivation from choices made, effort to complete the choices, persistence to complete the choice, and what is said about persisting to complete a certain choice (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Next, motivation begins with a goal. The far ranging goal of the activity may not be clear, but a person will have some immediate idea in mind that leads him or her to complete the activity. For example, a teacher may have assigned a book report for students to complete. However, the teacher has not given clear parameters for completing the book report. Since the student has completed book reports for other teachers, he or she has an idea of what the end product should look like. So, the

goal appears to be semi-clear: to complete a book report. Even though the student may not understand exactly what the teacher wants at the moment, he or she has the background knowledge that will keep him or her motivated to complete the book report. The activity, then, represents the final tenet. This activity will require either physical or mental effort such as rehearsing, organizing, monitoring, decision-making, and/or problem-solving (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

For reading, these tenets might take this path. Being able to construct meaning while reading is a process that an individual is motivated to do (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). However, constructing meaning as a result of being motivated to complete an activity is not just one set of skills, it is a complex set of goals and beliefs that determine a behavior (Feger, 2006). Readers who are able to make meaning of what they are motivated to read are using cognitive strategies. In addition, they use other strategies such as using background knowledge, forming new questions, answering old questions, looking for new information, and continually organizing and reorganizing meaningful material (Guthrie, Wigfield, & Perencevich, 2004).

Using reading strategies is a function of motivation and stems from two types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. These forms of motivation are important as many students who easily learn to read, successfully learn to read, or who struggle to read are motivated based on internal and (or) external motivators (Deci, 1992; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dickinson, 1995; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Guthrie, 2004; Lutz, Guthrie, & Davis, 2006; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation is the drive to complete an activity just to do it (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dickinson 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Intrinsic motivation depends upon a person's feeling about completing a certain activity (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dickinson 1995). How a person feels about an activity can change over time depending on circumstances and resources (Pintrich &

Schunk, 2002). Intrinsically motivated readers will pursue books to read during free time (Ryan & Deci, 2000). However, intrinsically motivated readers do not limit their reading to only pleasure reading. They also seek out challenging material or whatever is needed to fulfill a need at a given moment and, because of this, these readers are typically high achieving readers (Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998).

Intrinsic motivation leads to more effective learning (Deci, 1992; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Guthrie, 2004; Lutz, Guthrie, & Davis, 2006) in situations where the learner feels he or she can be successful or has succeeded in the past (Dickinson, 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). If students feel successful in class, this leads to more intrinsic motivation to continue to complete tasks. This student can proceed with an activity without anxiety about completing the task because he or she has previously completed the same or similar tasks. In other words, this student understands the end goal and the kind of sustained persistence needed to finish the activity (Deci, 1992; Dickinson, 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Extrinsic Motivation

Extrinsic motivation is the drive for the activity to come to an end (Dickinson, 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Extrinsically motivated tasks are usually completed for reasons other than being interested in a task (Dickinson, 1995). Generally a reward is offered as a contingency for completing a task. This reward can vary, but it is used to help a person sustain motivation through completion of a task. Although extrinsic motivators can encourage someone to complete a task, the person may lose motivation to complete the task again if the contingency reward is no longer available (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Even though offering some type of contingency reward to a person who was previously intrinsically motivated to complete a task can actually decrease internal motivation and potentially diminish the effectiveness of completing the task, this

type of motivation is often used (albeit out of necessity) for encouraging students to complete a task in which they do not have the intrinsic motivator (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Oftentimes the lack of intrinsic motivation results from the lack of knowledge or understanding needed to complete a task (Dickinson 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). This is especially true when a teacher is introducing a new concept in a class. For example, in a foreign language class, a teacher may provide a treat (e.g. a piece of candy) for each new vocabulary word a student can identify in the language being learned. According to the information above, as the student begins to feel success and understands the goal of learning the new vocabulary, intrinsic motivation should develop and lead to continued learning (because the student now understands the goal and is learning the skills to complete the task). If success does not occur or leads to intrinsic motivation for learning, the teacher will still supply external motivations such as grades, tests, and feedback as a way to continue to motivate the student to learn new vocabulary. On the other hand, for a student who already maintained intrinsic motivation, that intrinsic motivation may wane as the reward becomes less and less related to learning.

Students who view the vocabulary learning as intrinsically motivating will use tests simply as feedback without a great deal of anxiety. However, those students who continue to need external motivators to learn new concepts will continue or begin to view tests and grades as teacher-controlled and will not pursue learning new concepts as an intrinsically motivated activity (Deci & Ryan 1985; Dickinson, 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Motivation provides a good starting point for educators. It is extremely important to understand what motivates our students to read. We need to know if our students read for a pizza coupon, read to learn, or read to escape into another world. Are they excited when they come to the end of a book because they are done? Or are they excited because they have discovered the end of

the path for the characters in the story? Understanding internal and external motivators of our students affords some insight about why students complete activities such as reading (Marks, 2000; McKool, 2007; Meltzer & Hamann, 2006). However, and linked to motivation, we must also understand why and how they engage. In this time and place, engagement does not simply mean to do an activity, but it means having intense concentration that allows students to fall into another time and place regardless of the external or internal motivators that got them there in the first place. As Wilhem's (2008) students suggest, "You gotta be the book."

Engagement

Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004) state that engagement as a term by itself is messy. "Sometimes it overlaps with other constructs, sometimes it simply substitutes different terminology for the same constructs, and sometimes it incorporates constructs from other literatures in very general rather than precise ways" (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004, p. 84). They continue that even though the term engagement has the advantage of being an umbrella term for many things, it has become everything to everybody. When wanting to understand engagement and narrow down a holistic definition, Csikszentmihalyi (1990: 1997) offers some clarity.

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) defines engagement as an individual's ability to become so deeply involved in an activity that he or she loses track of time and place. He refers to this type of engagement as being in a zone or being in a groove which allows an individual to complete an activity with intense concentration. For example, Wilhelm (2008) tells of a student named Ron who would enter a trancelike state whenever he read a book he wanted to read. Ron reported experiencing the intense world that was in the book and that he would read "every spare moment once he had entered the story world," (p. 73). On the other hand, the term engagement is also used to mean being interested in an activity without necessarily having deep focus or concentration

which allows one to lose track of time. For example, Cole (2003) states that one of her students “was able to experience interest, engagement, flow, and intrinsic motivation” (p. 333). Cole (2003) provides an example of how the term engagement has become an umbrella term that includes being interested in an activity with not necessarily being engaged to the point of losing track of time. She lists engagement and flow as separate terms whereas Csikszentmihalyi (1997) uses them synonymously to demonstrate intense concentration.

Engagement has also been used to define a student’s involvement in the classroom. Lutz, Guthrie and Davis (2006) discuss engagement in the classroom as a product of students’ behavioral, cognitive, affective, and social involvement. As applied to reading, students who engage always look at an appropriate book at an appropriate time, answer questions in class, or even make interesting contributions to the class. For them, engagement mediates learning and achievement. Teachers can optimize this engagement and offer prompts to help students maintain it by giving them an appropriate space to read and providing books at appropriate levels and interest (Guthrie & Cox, 2001; Feger, 2006; Johnson & Blair, 2003; Keller, 1991; Ollman, 1993).

Even though the term engagement has been referred to as messy and overused, there is some consensus that engagement (as intense concentration) is multi-dimensional. Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004) and Lutz, Guthrie, and Davis (2006) state that there are three dimensions to engagement: (1) the emotional, (2) the behavioral, and (3) the cognitive. Emotional engagement, also referred to as affective engagement, involves having a positive affect toward teachers, classmates, and the school (Birch & Ladd, 1997; Connell, Spencer, & Aber, 1994; Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Locke-Davidson, 1996; Steinbuerg, Brown, & Dornbush, 1996). Second, behavioral engagement is the active participation in academic activities as seen through on-task behaviors, participation, relatedness, and autonomy (Connell, 1990; Connell, Spencer, &

Aber, 1994; Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Finn, 1993; Finn & Rock, 1997; Furrer & Skinner, 2003). Finally, engagement can be cognitive. Cognitive engagement encompasses effortful strategy use and deep thinking (Blumenfeld & Meece, 1988; Fredricks, Blumenfeld, Friedel, & Paris, 2002; Helme & Clarke, 2001).

According to Csikszentmihalyi (1997), a paradox of intense engagement (flow or being in the zone) requires that the person must have control over the activity in order to experience flow, but should not consciously try to control the activity or his or her behavior. Csikszentmihalyi (1997) also points out that a certain amount of skill and perseverance is required in engagement (flow), but that experiencing actual flow does not involve just going with the flow. If students go with the flow versus being in the flow, they give themselves over to the classroom situation instead of being in control of the situation. If students engage in an activity, they become completely involved and lose a sense of themselves in addition to losing a sense of time and place.

In order to fall into flow, a balance must exist between the challenge of an activity and the student's capabilities to perform the activity. Flow is a personal process (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002) that represents balance. In addition, students who are truly engaged seek the flow experience for itself and not for anticipated rewards or punishments (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Of importance, a student who engages in an activity has practiced the underlying skills and knowledge so often that they become automated, thus making it easier for the student to experience flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Based on these scholars' views, I define engagement as the personal process of becoming absorbed in an activity to the point of losing track of time. Ron, the student in Wilhelm's (2008) study whom I previously mentioned, affords an example. Ron told Wilhelm during an interview that, "I just can't shake a book when it's got a hold on me. It's hard to think of anything else" (p.

75). Ron would read deep into the night and through the weekend, using every spare moment to read. Ron exhibited engagement.

As Ron's example indicates, reading engagement describes deep attention to reading. That is, reading engagement is the ability to focus and concentrate in a way that allows a reader to lose track of time while reading and allows a person to feel control over what is being read (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). In order to help our K-12 students become engaged readers, we need to know what it is about reading that motivates them to engage in reading.

Motivation to Engage

"Motivation is a critical factor of engagement" (Johnson & Blair, 2003, p. 183). When we make the choice to invest attention in a given task, we have admitted an intention, or created a goal for ourselves (Czikszenmihalyi, 1997). Czikszenmihalyi (1997) states that how long we choose to invest our attention toward a certain goal is a function of motivation. Meltzer and Hamann (2004) state that motivation is generally seen as an antecedent to engagement. In other words, a student may be motivated, either intrinsically or extrinsically, and then be willing to engage in reading. It is the engaged reading, regardless of the root of the motivation, that leads to reading development and achievement (Guthrie & Cox, 2001; Lutz, Guthrie, & Davis, 2006; Meltzer & Hamann, 2006). A teacher may be able to manipulate the environment by supplying a quiet space and helping a student become automatic with reading strategies, but, ultimately, it is the student who must experience the personal process of engagement or flow. When a student likes what he or she is motivated to do, engagement becomes effortless even when the objectives are difficult (Czikszenmihalyi, 1997).

I now further establish the notion that motivation precedes engagement, motivation is a factor of engagement, and that motivation leads to engaged reading (Czikszenmihalyi, 1997;

Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). By promoting this sequential link between reading motivation and engagement, I am now able to begin to pinpoint and discuss emerging patterns of reading engagement that may encourage (or dissuade) reading engagement for certain populations of students. This is particularly important if we look at the reading engagement and achievement needs of ELLs.

Reading Engagement and Motivation of ELLs

Klinger, Artiles, and Barletta (2006) estimate that by the year 2030 approximately 40 percent of our K-12 school population will speak English as a second language. Of this population, 56 percent will have difficulty acquiring reading literacy in English. From understanding this, we can infer that ELLs having difficulty acquiring English reading will have low reading engagement.

Edwards (2007) demonstrates that ELLs who already have challenges in reading while learning English have difficulty engaging in reading where there is not a balance in challenge and capabilities of the ELL (Czikszenmihalyi, 1997). ELLs are confronted with the double duty of learning to read in English while learning complex English concepts for an extended period of time (Malloy, Gilbertson, & Maxfield, 2007; Meltzer & Hamman, 2006). It can take seven or more years to become fluent enough in a language to demonstrate near native fluency (August & Hakuta, 1997; Hakuta, 1986). Continually working on academic reading tasks is very difficult for ELLs (Cummins, 1987) and finding motivation to engage in reading may be even more difficult to drum up (Malloy, Gilbertson, & Maxfield, 2007). However, ELLs motivated to engage in reading continually increase proficiency levels (Krashen 2004; Peregoy & Boyle, 2000). This is important because extended and continued engagement in reading leads to the learning of more vocabulary (Nagy, Anderson, & Herman, 1987), learning the nuances of the English language (Krashen, 2004), and learning generally higher levels of achievement (Allington, 2001). Therefore it is

crucial that we continue to uncover what it is that motivates ELLs to engage in reading (Jimenez, Smith, & Martinez-Leon, 2003).

Uncovering what motivates ELLs to engage in reading can be complex due to the language barriers and the bridging of language that must happen (Alverman, 2002; Krashen, 2004). However, some researchers have started to shed some light on the issue. Ivey and Broaddus (2001) found that ELLs, like their native English speaking peers, are motivated to engage with high-interest material. However, they also found that the reading materials with which the students were willing to engage might not be readily available at the schools. In addition, many books that ELLs are encouraged to read are those used for second language instruction and are not considered high-interest because they focus more on discrete language skills (Ivey & Broaddus, 2007).

So, what is to be done in order to uncover the ELLs' patterns of motivation to engage in reading? One dilemma in the research of engagement in education is the use of a single scale or the average of several scales in an attempt to articulate engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004) continue that more specific methods need to be developed in order to uncover contextual features related to motivation to engage in reading. In addition, they advise that to understand what motivates a student to engage in reading, future research needs to include several features: (1) the use of more diverse participants, (2) classroom features that affect motivation to engage, (3) rich descriptions of classroom contexts, (4) qualitative approaches, and, if possible, (5) the impact of family and culture needs to be included in any discussion of motivation to engage in reading.

If we can begin to understand what motivates our ELLs to engagement with reading, then we can begin to fully comprehend if the strategies and motivators for ELLs are the same or different as our U.S. mainstream students. The issue then becomes whether mainstream and

linguistically and culturally diverse students share the same motivators to engage in reading.

Now what?

Currently, research relating to ELLs' motivation, engagement, reading, and the implications of the individual ideas as well as the combination of the ideas is scarce. Guthrie and Davis (2007) as well as other researchers (Edwards, 2007; Marks, 2000; McKool, 2007; Meltzer & Hamann, 2006; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002) demonstrate that a deficit in motivation to engage in reading leads to low reading achievement, decreased comprehension of academic materials, and the marginalization of the identified reading low-achievers. If these are indicators of what contributes to low performance of our native-speaking students, then it is imperative to explore the implications of this on our non-native English-speaking students. In order to explore the implications, we need to have a more solid base of research that demonstrates what motivates ELLs to engage in reading. Questions like these remain: What motivates an ELL to find a book that will allow him or her to lose track of time while reading? What specific motivational challenges do ELLs face that provide an imbalance in challenge and capability that prevents them from engaging in reading? Do these reasons extend beyond language acquisition issues? What can educators do to help ELLs balance the challenge and capabilities, assuming that they exist, needed to motivate and subsequently engross them in reading? These questions warrant answers in order to provide ELLs with chances to engage in reading in a manner that will promote reading achievement and the motivation that encourages a lifelong engagement with reading.

Classroom educators have the power to assist ELLs in understanding what will motivate them to engage in reading (Meltzer and Hamann, 2004) which, in turn, will encourage academic achievement. Neglecting such power will leave too many ELLs sidelined and inadequately prepared to achieve in higher education. The challenge to understand what will motivate ELLs,

and all adolescents, is great (Wilhelm, 2008). Rising to this challenge will help our ELLs face other obstacles in their lives. And, listening to the voices of the ELLs is essential if we are going to help them understand what motivates them to engage in reading (Nieto, 1994).

As a K-8 educator and an ELL resource teacher, I find it ever more critical to uncover motivation to engage as the stakes for ELLs become greater and the numbers of ELLs continue to grow. I am more than happy to continue repeat visits to the library for additional reading, but I want to expose more of the features that will lead my less motivated ELLs to become motivated to engage in reading. In an effort to uncover the voices of our ELLs, more qualitative research, which includes classroom features and contexts related to engagement, is needed.

References

- Allington, R.L. (2002). You can't learn much from a book you can't read. *Educational Leadership*, 60(3), 16-19.
- Alvermann, D.E. (2002). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(2), 189-208.
- August, D. & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, D.C.: National Academic Press
- Birch, S. & Ladd, G. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and the children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 61-79.
- Blumenfeld, P.C. & Meece J.L. (1988). Task factors, teacher behavior, and students' involvement and use of learning strategies in science. *Elementary School Journal*, 88, 235-250.
- Cole, J.E. (2003). What motivates students to read: Four literacy personalities. *The Reading Teacher*, 56(4), 326-336.
- Connell, J.P. (1990). Context, self, and action: A motivational analysis of self-system processes across the life-span. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp. 62-92). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Connell, J.P., Spencer, M.B., & Aber, J.L. (1994). Educational risk and resilience among African-American youth: Context, self, action, and outcomes in school. *Child Development* 65, 493-506.
- Connell, J.P. & Wellborn, J.G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. Gummar & L.A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (pp. 43-77). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow*. San Francisco: Harper-Collins.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*.

- New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Cummins, J. (1987). Bilingual education and politics. *Education Digest*, 53, 30-33.
- Deci, E.L. (1992). On the nature and functions of motivation theories. *Psychological Science*, 3(3), 167-171.
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System*, 23(2), 165-174.
- Edwards, P.A. (2007). Home literacy environments: What we know and what we need to know. In Michael Pressley, Alison K. Billman, Kristen H. Perry, Kelly E. Reffitt, and Julia Moorhead Reynolds (Eds.) *Shaping literacy achievement* (pp. 42-76). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Feger, M.V. (2006). I want to read: How culturally relevant texts increase student engagement in reading. *Multicultural Education*, 13(3), 18-19.
- Finn, J.D. & Voelkl, K.E. (1993). School characteristics related to student engagement. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 62, 249-268.
- Finn, J.D. & Rock D.A (1997). Academic success among students at risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 221-234.
- Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C., Friedel, J., & Paris, A.H. (2002). *Increasing engagement in urban settings: An analysis of the influence of the social and academic context on student engagement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
- Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C., & Paris, A.H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 59-109.

- Furrer, C. & Skinner, C. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 148-162.
- Guthrie, J.T. (2004). Supporting sustained engagement with texts. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*(1), 1-29.
- Guthrie, J.T. & Cox, K. (2001). Classroom conditions for motivation and engagement with reading. *Educational Psychology Review, 13*(3), 283-302.
- Guthrie, J.T. & Wigfield, A. (1999). How motivation fits into a science of reading. *Scientific studies of reading, 3*(3), 199-205.
- Guthrie, J.T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), [*Handbook of reading research*](#) (pp. 403-422). New York: Erlbaum.
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Helme, S. & Clarke, D. (2001). Identifying cognitive engagement in the mathematics classroom. *Mathematics Education Research Journal, 13*, 133-153.
- Ivey, G. & Broaddus, K. (2001). Just plain reading: A survey of what makes students want to read in the middle school classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*, 172-192.
- Ivey, G. & Broaddus, K. (2007). A formative experiment investigating literacy engagement among adolescent Latina/o students just beginning to read, write, and speak English. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(2), 512-545.
- Jimenez, R.T., Smith, P.H., Martinez-Leon, N. (2003). Freedom and form: The language and literacy practices of two Mexican schools. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*(4), 488-508.
- Johnson, D. & Blair, A. (2003). The importance of use of student self-selected literature to reading engagement in an elementary reading curriculum. *Reading Horizons, 43*(3), 181-200.

- Keller, L.J. (1991). Create a creepy, crawly class story. *Learning*, 20, 55-58.
- Klinger, J.K., Artiles, A.J., & Barletta, L.M. (2006). English language learners who struggle with reading: Language acquisition or LD? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(2), 108-127.
- Krashen, S.D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from research*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Lutz, S.L., Guthrie, J.T., & Davis, M.H. (2006). Scaffolding for engagement in elementary school reading instruction. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100(1), 3-20.
- Malloy, K.J., Gibertson, D., & Maxfield, J. (2007). Use of brief experimental analysis for selecting reading interventions for English language learners. *The School Psychology Review*, 36(2), 291-310.
- Marks, H.M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 153-184.
- McKool, S.S. (2007). Factors that influence the decision to read: An investigation of fifth grade students' out-of-school reading habits. *Reading Improvement*, 44(3), 111-131.
- Meltzer, J. & Hamann, E.T. (2004). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content area learning. Part I: Focus on motivation and engagement*. (The Education Alliance at Brown University). Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Meltzer, J. & Hamann, E.T. (2006). Literacy for English language learners and regular students, too. *Education Digest*, 71(8), 32-40.
- Nagy, W.E., Anderson, R.C., & Herman, P. (1987). Learning word meanings from context during normal reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24, 237-270.
- Nieto, S. (1991). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Longman.

- Ollman, H. (1993). Choosing literature wisely: Students speak out. *Journal of Reading*, 36(8), 648-653.
- Paris, S.G. & Oka, E.R. (1986). Self-regulated learning among exceptional children. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 103-108.
- Peregoy, S. F. & Boyle, O. F. (2000). English learners reading English: What we know, what we need to know. *Theory into Practice*, 39(4), 237-247.
- Pintrich, P.R. & Schunk, D.H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and application* (2nd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Snow, R.E. & Farr, M.J. (1983). Cognitive-affective processes in aptitude, learning, and instruction: An introduction. In R.E. Snow and M.J. Farr (Eds.), *Aptitudes, learning, and instruction* (pp. 1-20). Philadelphia, PA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Sweet, A.P., Guthrie, J.T., & Ng, M.M. (1998). Teacher perceptions and student reading motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 210-223.
- Wang, C & Pape, S.J. (2007). A probe into three Chinese boys' self-efficacy beliefs learning English as a second language. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 21(4), 364-377.
- Wilhelm, J.D. (2008). *You gotta be the book: Teaching engaged and reflective reading with adolescents* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Xu, H. (1999). Young Chinese ESL children's home literacy experience. *Reading Horizons*, 40(1), 1-13.

“When our teacher reads it, it’s like, ‘Oh my God!’”:

English Language Learners’ Motivation for Reading Engagement

This study was born out of challenges I encounter daily in working with middle school learners of English as a second language (here referred to simply as English language learners, or ELLs). Encouraging a middle-school student to read can be a daunting task, but when a linguistically and also culturally diverse background is added to the equation, encouraging a middle-schooler to read can become a significantly steeper uphill climb (Strommen & Mates, 2004). As Strommen and Mates (2004) also point out, attitudes toward reading are tied to reading ability. Thus, for a poorly motivated non-native English speaker, not only can the act of simply becoming engaged in reading be difficult, but the road to achieving reading ability can become an even longer stretch. I encounter this situation daily with the ELLs in my own classroom: reading is not only met with an absence of enthusiasm and energy common to middle school students but is regularly dealt an additional wealth of resistance (Cushman & Rogers, 2008). Moreover, this resistance is palpable even among those students who have higher proficiencies in English. However, as an educator, I think of reading as a progressive verb: something that is ongoing that needs to be an engaged, persistent activity. In order to encourage my students to overcome the resistance and engage in progressive reading to achieve in reading, it is critical to understand what it is that motivates ELL students to engage in reading. Understanding why ELLs engage in reading is also important because we know that persistent reading and reading achievement are connected (Cox & Guthrie, 2001).

In an effort to uncover more information about this topic, I embarked on a qualitative study. Overall, I wanted to know what factors, or elements, would provide motivation for ELLs to engage in reading. Based on my ultimate desire to continually evolve as an educator (and

hopefully become a better educator), the following questions motivated me specifically to undertake this study: (1) What activities, what people, and/or what topics will motivate ELLs to engage in reading, and (2) Why is it difficult for ELLs to find motivation to engage in reading in English, especially when they are already able to read in their native language? In this manuscript, I first document research that expounds upon whether existing scholarship offers insight to my questions. Then, I introduce my participants, explain my design and data analysis procedures, present my findings, and offer a discussion of the patterns which this study revealed. I conclude by exploring the implications that these findings may hold for classroom teachers.

Existing Scholarship: Its Contributions to Understanding ELL Engagement

Motivation is generally seen as an antecedent of engagement (Melzter & Hamann, 2004). Thus, to follow through to the path toward full engagement or "flow in reading" (Csikszentmihalyi, 1985), we need to discuss motivation. Meltzer and Hamann (2004) purport that long-term engagement with reading (regardless of the source of motivation that promotes it) leads to reading achievement. It is essential that students find persistence and raptness in reading even when there are other choices of activities or distractions around them. Students who are motivated to engage in reading understand what they are reading, know that they can use all of the strategies they have learned in order to read, and are motivated to engage continuously because they have been successful during previous reading tasks (Guthrie, Wigfield, VonSecker, 2000). If motivation to engage in reading is directly related to reading achievement (Guthrie, Wigfield, & VonSecker, 2000) then we need to further study what exactly is motivating our ELLs to read and what types of goals motivate them to engage in reading.

Motivation to engage in reading not only helps ELLs improve their language skills, but also develops their reading capabilities on many levels and leads to reading achievement. First,

students who engage in reading absorb the conventions of the target language (here, English) more quickly, and begin to use knowledge of the target language more spontaneously and automatically in comparison to ELLs who do not read often (Elly, 1991; Krashen 2004). Second, the size of the target language vocabulary grows faster as well as greater in ELLs who engage in reading (Elly 1991; Huckin & Coady, 1999; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006). Finally, engaged reading continues to increase a student's ability to read more challenging material in the second language (Cummins, 1981). It is essential that we understand what encourages ELLs to engage in reading in order to promote continued success with language acquisition and reading achievement.

Motivation is not a visibly perceptible or quantifiable process, but we can infer an individual's motivation from choices made, effort expended to make a choice, persistence to complete the choice, and what is said about completing the choice (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). The ultimate goal of reading is to obtain meaning. The ability to construct meaning while reading is a process that requires an individual to be motivated to seek meaning. Marie Clay (1991) calls this an "effort after meaning". Simply stated, a reader makes a choice, or the effort, to seek meaning from what is read (Gurthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Making this choice necessitates enacting the cognitive competence needed to use background knowledge, form questions, search for information, summarize, organize new information, and monitor comprehension (Feger, 2006; Gurthrie, Wigfield, & Perencevich, 2004). Even though we cannot not always see what motivates a person to choose, ultimately motivation must come either from within an individual or be based on a contingency of elements from outside the individual.

Motivation conjured to reach any goal is said to be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation to reach a goal implies that a person has an internal drive to complete an activity (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Dickinson 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). This type of drive leads to

more effective learning, especially if the person knows he or she has been successful on the same or similar task in the past (Deci, 1992; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Guthrie, 2004; Lutz, Guthrie, & Davis, 2006). Extrinsic motivation facilitates the drive for an activity to come to an end (Dickinson, 1995; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Additionally, these activities are usually not completed based on interest in the task itself (Dickinson, 1995) but rather are contingent on a reward generally supplied following the completion of the task (e.g., grades, extra credit, stickers). Although the reward may vary, the ultimate objective is to help a person stay motivated to complete an activity (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Ideally, students would draw upon internal motivation for reading. However, more frequently than not, educators through administrators and entire school systems must consider placing contingencies on tasks simply in order to motivate students to complete the task (Edmunds & Tancock, 2003; Johnson, 1999). As reading is a classroom activity that requires an interest in the task and a willingness to complete it, what are the driving forces that will motivate students to read?

Guthrie and Wigfield (1997) define motivation to engage in reading as based on three questions students might ask themselves internally: (1) Can I succeed? (2) Do I want to succeed, and why? and (3) What do I need to do to succeed? Based on these questions, Guthrie and Wigfield developed the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) to gauge which of these categories most apply to an individual student. Each question is dependent upon several constructs. The first question (Can I succeed?) reflects reading efficacy, reading challenge, and reading work avoidance. The second question (Do I want to succeed, and why?) provides information about reading curiosity, involvement, importance of reading, reading for recognition, reading for grades, competition in reading, social reasons for reading, and reading compliance. The final question (What do I need to do to succeed?) describes strategy use, self-regulation, and

help seeking information or answers to questions. The constructs entailed in each of the three questions draw information which Gurthrie and Wigfield (1997) use to substantiate the foundation for explaining a student's motivation to engage in reading.

Existing and current research offers a plentiful list of what motivates students to read, especially for school. Although the majority of the participants for these studies were native English speaking students (or the ELLs were not disaggregated from the other participants), the information is still useful for building a foundation of understanding motivators for reading. The most cited motivator indicates that it is critical for the learner to make connections with what he or she is reading (Albright, 2002; Fairbanks, 2000; Feger, 2006; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; 2007; Lapp & Fisher, 2009; Pticher, Albright, DeLaney, Walker, Seunarinesingh, Mogge, Headley, Ridgeway, Peck, Hunt, & Dunston, 2007; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004; 2006; Ranker, 2007; Scharer, Pinnell, Lyons, & Fountas, 2005; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998; Thomas, 2000; Turner & Paris, 1995). Some elements to describe connections made with reading include: drawing a line between students' lives and the books/stories (Fairbanks, 2000; Feger, 2006; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; 2007; Meltzer & Hamann, 2006; Thomas, 2000), encouraging students to think beyond the classroom (Pitcher, 2007; Scharer, Pinnell, Lyons, & Fountas, 2005; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998), making connections between the teacher and students (Fairbanks, 2000; Turner & Paris, 1995), and making connections to prior knowledge (Albright, 2002; Fairbanks, 2000; Lapp & Fisher, 2009; Pitcher, 2007; Ranker, 2007). While these connections are necessary for some students to find motivation to read, too often students are asked to read material to which they can make no connections (Ivey, 1999; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; 2007). This is not only frustrating for students, but can also subsequently lead to disengagement (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004).

Several researchers have also noted that the actual task itself holds potential to increase motivation (Feger, 2006; Ranker, 2007; Simon, 2008; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998; Turner & Paris, 1995). Specifically, the tasks that students do after they have completed a reading can affect how much they are motivated to read. Those students, who find the tasks offered following the reading task stimulating, are more likely to be motivated to complete the task itself (Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998). Tasks that allow continued exploration of a topic and cultural connections also sustain motivation (Feger, 2006; Ranker, 2007), as do options to draw, write letters to characters, or develop alternate scenes and/or ending to a story (Simon, 2008). Whether a task is open (i.e., permitting one to construct meaning for one's self) or closed (i.e., reporting meaning by answering questions from a text, with limited opportunities for creative response) (Turner & Paris, 1995) can also affect motivation. Open tasks are more likely to spark as well as propagate further motivation. Understanding the specific kinds of tasks to which students better respond could provide an essential tool in helping teachers to structure the classroom for optimal increased motivation for reading.

Another motivator for reading is choice (Fairbanks, 2000; Ivey, 1999; Lapp & Fisher, 2009; Thomas, 2000; Vang, 2006). Some studies point to the influence that a student's choice in high-interest reading materials has on engagement (Fairbanks, 2000; Lapp & Fisher, 2009; Thomas, 2000). Other studies focus on students' choice of tasks which accompany the reading material (Ivey, 1999; Vang 2006). Whether applying to the selection of books or activities linked to them, the element of choice affects motivation significantly.

Read-alouds, literature circles/discussions, visualization, opportunities for success, and teacher enthusiasm have also been suggested to generate motivation in the classroom. Read-alouds are typically not associated with use among adolescents, but middle-school and older

students likewise do enjoy the opportunity to have a book read to them and to see the experience of reading for themselves. Reading aloud offers great opportunities for teachers to model reading and reading strategies (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; Thomas, 2000). Literature circles and discussion groups provide arenas for students to verbally share and reflect upon multiple perspectives about reading material (Thomas, 2000). These groups also offer a place for a more emotional exploration of topics, which in turn activates neuronal networks required to think, retrieve previously learned information, understand, and remember (Scharer, Pinnell, Lyons, Fountas, 2005); visualization is linked with comprehension (Wilhelm, 2008) and, in turn, increases motivation to read further (Thomas, 2000).

Making sure that all students have opportunities for success also matters (Cole, 2003; Meltzer & Hamann, 2006; Tam, Heward, & Heng, 2006). If students are a part of an environment that sets them up for success and provides continuing opportunities to achieve, then they will have authentic reasons for continuing to have motivation (Cole, 2003; Meltzer & Hamann, 2006). Despite teacher enthusiasm being cited most sparsely as a motivator (Strommen & Mates, 2004), the teacher as an element of motivation begs to be more closely examined, especially as several scholars in the area of second language learning specifically call for teachers to change their perceptions of ELLs and their ways of helping ELLs achieve (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004; 2006; Tam, Heward, & Heng, 2006; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998; Teale, 2009). If students are expected to achieve, it is crucial that teachers keep in mind the factors that motivate them to read. Furthermore, students should not only become motivated to read, but become motivated to engage in sustained, persistent reading. Thus, we need to also understand what challenges may stand in the way of motivation to engage.

Finding motivation to engage is not the only challenge which ELLs face. In addition to learning their way around a new school, they have the added burden of having to learn to read in the non-native language (here, English) (Malloy, Gilbertson, & Maxfield, 2007). Of note, it can take more than seven years to acquire enough English to be considered fluent (August & Hakuta, 1997) and finding continuing motivation to read across time can be a difficult task in and of itself (Cummins, 2000; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). The academic demands of reading in English do not always allow for success, further affecting motivation to engage in reading in English (Snow & Biancarosa, 2003). Nonetheless, finding motivation to engage in reading will only improve the quality of language acquisition; it is creating motivation that is critical to sustaining its growth across time.

The reality in education today is that ELLs are being placed into mainstream classrooms without the luxury of first developing English language proficiency (Meltzer & Hamman, 2006; Pappamihel, 2001). Simultaneously, our national educational goals marginalize these adolescents by calling for high literacy without providing support (Langer, 2002; Schleppegrell, Archuga, & Oteiza, 2004). The first step in helping ELLs reach these goals is to recognize that they may have differences in why and how they engage in reading (Freeman & Freeman, 2003). Next, ELLs need help in defining what motivates them to engage in reading (Ivey, 1999). Existing research provides a lengthy list of what can motivate a student to engage in reading. However, it does not completely encompass what may motivate an ELL to become engaged in reading (Gersten & Baker, 2000; Linan-Thompson, Vaughn, Hickman-Davis, & Kouzekanani, 2003; Tam, Heward, & Heng, 2006). Is there one motivator more than another that will encourage an ELL to engage with English reading – in a sustained and persistent manner – that

will translate into increased reading achievement? More attention must be drawn to this matter in order to help ELLs increase reading achievement.

Through research we can continue to understand what motivates all adolescents, including ELL adolescents, to engage in reading (Ivey & Broaddus, 2007; Linan-Thompson, Vaughn, Hickman-Davis, and Kouzekanani, 2003). However, Alvermann (2002), Ivey (1999) and Ivey and Broaddus (2001) call for more qualitative studies of adolescent reading. They explain that qualitative studies with adolescent readers provide a venue for uncovering patterns that lead to understanding adolescent reading, including ELL adolescent reading. In addition, qualitative studies provide a voice for those adolescents who are not typically highlighted in research (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001). In order to continue the discussion and lend a voice to those ELLs learning to read and achieve in reading, I interviewed three adolescent ELLs and observed them over the course of seven months. Combining my interests as a classroom teacher with this identified gap in existing scholarship, the purpose for this study is twofold. First, I am interested in uncovering patterns of ELLs' motivation to engage in reading. Second, I hope to create more opportunities to foster the motivation of ELL students to engage in reading in my classroom and those of other teachers. My ultimate goal as an ELL educator and researcher is to enable sustained engagement in reading, facilitate reading achievement, and perpetuate a motivation to read.

Method

Being a teacher allows me the opportunity to interact daily with my students. I am able to ask questions, evaluate how I teach based on their answers, and then question again. I have found that I am able to gain great insight into what my students are thinking and feeling from just asking them. I wanted to take this one step further. I wanted to ask a series of questions that

would most help me understand what continuously motivates these adolescent ELLs to engage in reading. This would allow me to gain insight into what they are thinking and uncover patterns of which I may not have been aware. A qualitative research design best fit the method of investigating my questions and the classroom available for conducting this study as it involved being involved in the setting, gathering descriptive data, and seeking to uncover patterns of motivation to engage in reading (Maxwell, 1996).

Site Location and Context

As the English language development teacher and also as a participant in the school's culture, I was able to add a research component to my duties without interrupting the normal routine of either the teacher or the students. I selected Hoover Middle School as the site of research for my study (further referred to as HMS; note all names for locations and individuals throughout this study are pseudonyms). HMS is located in the mid-western, Great Lakes portion of the United States between two large metropolitan areas. The city in which it is located had a population of just under 100,000 as of July 2006, having shown an increase of 5% in just the previous five years (U.S. Census Bureau). Of the 22,732 total population of public and charter school students in the 2008-2009 school year, 761 of the students attended HMS, many of whom were ELLs.

Hoover Middle School has two programs designed to assist English language learners succeed in a second-language academic environment. The first program is called the Dual Immersion (DI) program. The students in this program represent an even mix of native English speakers and native Spanish speakers. They typically begin this program in kindergarten or first grade, and receive instruction in both English and Spanish over a course of eight years throughout elementary and middle school. These students are required to take both English and

Spanish proficiency tests each year in order to aid in monitoring both overall program and general student progress. The second program is called the English language development (ELD) program. This program is for students from non-native-speaking backgrounds (i.e., any language other than English) who require support in English language learning throughout their academics, but either did not attend or were withdrawn from the DI program. Depending on the level of support needed, these students receive supplemental English assistance for a period lasting anywhere from a half hour to six hours per week. Services are provided by ELD teachers either directly in a classroom via the push-in model (Peregoy & Boyle, 2000), or students may visit the ELD office directly to receive assistance.

In the 2008-2009 academic year for sixth, seventh, and eighth grade at Hoover Middle School, 54 students were assigned to the English language development (ELD) program and 68 students were assigned to the Dual Immersion Program (DI). HMS compares with other middle schools in its number of ELD students, though other middle schools offer programs such as bilingual classes which are not available at HMS. This school district distinguishes bilingual classes from DI classes, and offers multiple programs for English language learners. From the time students enroll in the district, parents or guardians of students with very low English language proficiency may choose either to have the child stay in their neighborhood school or to travel to a DI, ELD, or other program school. Choices of schools are offered based upon students' learning needs and language proficiency, which is determined according to English placement testing as provided by the Language Assistance Program (LAP).

Participants

I invited three students, their parents, and the students' classroom teacher to participate in this study. I selected these three students in particular based on two criteria: all have already been

in the school system for several years, and all likewise have progressed in English proficiency to obtain Levels 4 and 5 by the sixth grade. [See Table 1 for a description of Levels 4 and 5 (WIDA Consortium, 2009).] Students at levels 4 and 5 are expected to participate and succeed in classroom activities with appropriate scaffolding, without demonstrating significant difficulty across either language skills or academic tasks. They are generally able to express their thoughts and ideas fluently in English, and are reading at (or very close to) grade level. Due to the significance of both informal conversation and formal interview in this study, selection of students at this level of proficiency ensured full participation without a great deal of language interference.

The three ELL participants are all members of the same class at Hoover Middle School. Their courses are divided between two teachers: Mr. Jezik (also a participant in this study) who teaches English and Social Studies, and a second teacher who teaches math and science. The students do not attend all of their courses together, but rather are split among teachers and courses according to different needs. I likewise participated in this study as the English language development resource teacher for this classroom. At the onset of the study I was a language development resource teacher in the classroom several days per week. However, approximately two and a half months before the study ended, classroom rosters were adjusted to accommodate student needs and my participation was reduced to only one to two days per week.

The three ELL students who are the focus of this study are all native Spanish speakers and all came to Hoover Middle School from three different elementary schools. The following sections present more detailed information about each student as well as about their teacher, Mr. Jezik.

Cesar. Cesar is student who has been in the school district since first grade. He started elementary school in a school that has sheltered English classrooms. In these classrooms, students receive instruction in English with additional support offered in language as needed. They are not, however, taught exclusively in Spanish (Peregoy & Boyle, 2000). As of the 2008 school year, Cesar had obtained a proficiency level of 5.6, an appropriate gain as compared to his level of 4.9 in 2007. According to his scores for 2008-2009 on the state achievement test (given only in English), Cesar is advanced in reading and proficient in mathematics (the state test is scaled according to minimal, basic, proficient, or advanced proficiency). He has continually been an A/B student, but seems to be struggling with his grades a bit this year. His parents waived ELD services for Cesar in 2007 after he had received transitional services for several years. Cesar speaks only Spanish at home; as his parents do not speak English well, Cesar and his brother act as translators for them.

Mariel. Mariel moved to the school district in 2006 from New York. Mariel's first placement testing in 2007 revealed a score of 1.5, placing her at a very low level of proficiency. However, a second assessment administered in 2007 placed her at a 4.3, and by 2008 Mariel had achieved a proficiency level of 5.3. According to her state achievement scores, Mariel borders proficient-to-advanced levels in both reading and mathematics. She continually receives A/B grades in school. Her parents waived ELD services when they transferred from New York. Mariel reports that they speak both English and Spanish at home, though Spanish more often than English.

Gianna. Gianna came to the school district from Illinois in second grade. Initially she was in a dual language program for a brief period, but was withdrawn from this program when her family moved back to Puerto Rico. Upon return to the U.S., Gianna's parents waived other ELD

services for her; however, this year they agreed to allow transitional ELD monitoring services for Gianna based on evidence of some increased struggling in class (transitional services allow a student to work with an ELD teacher as needed). Gianna's 2008 English proficiency level is 4.7; according to her state achievement scores, she is proficient in both reading and math. Gianna's family speaks only Spanish at home.

Mr. Jezik. Mr. Jezik is the English and Social Studies teacher for all three ELL participants. Mr. Jezik and I have been co-teaching for two years, and have shared teaching responsibilities for several common students throughout this time. During the data collection process, Mr. Jezik provided me with copies of all materials the students were using in class, as well as of the syllabus and lesson plans for class days when I was not present. He also contributed to the study by offering his insights about the students.

Data Sources

To illuminate emerging patterns arising from the research questions, data were collected from three sources common to qualitative analyses (i.e., interview and observation, review of reading logs, and analysis of student responses on the MRQ). To establish classroom rapport, I was a participant in the classroom as the ELD teacher for all three ELLs. The following section details each data source in turn.

Interview. Interview participants included the three ELLs, a parent of one of the ELLs, and the teacher Mr. Jezik.

A total of 10 formal interviews with the ELLs were conducted: four per group interviews and six per individual interviews (i.e., two per each ELL). Formal interviews were often supplemented with informal discussion and follow-up questions either during class or when the ELLs came to my office for extra assistance.

The students were interviewed every other week during the course of the study between January and May of 2009. All interviews began in January in order to avoid holiday breaks, state standardized testing, and English language development (WIDA) standardized testing. Interviews were generally 30-40 minutes long depending on the scheduling on the day of the interview. Some interviews were conducted one-on-one and others were held with all three ELLs in a group interview.

The students were interviewed using questions taken from the MRQ and revised for qualitative data collection (Appendix A). These questions were used as a foundation for discussion during each interview; some questions were occasionally altered to accommodate ongoing analysis and the emergence of other topics that the students wanted to discuss in the course of the interview.

I conducted one formal interview with the teacher, Mr. Jezik (Appendix B). However, he and I had many informal question-and-answer sessions which sometimes occurred spontaneously (e.g., passing in the hallway during school) or before and/or after classtime. I also interviewed Gianna's mother (Appendix C), but the other parents declined to be interviewed once the study began.

All interviews were recorded and later transcribed.

Observations. Observations began in late November of 2008 and ended in May of 2009. During this time, I visited the ELLs' classroom at least two to three times per week for approximately 50 minutes each, totaling 65 observations. The class schedule did change in March which resulted in a decrease in number of observations from March through May. However, by this point in the study, the data had become saturated and redundant (Glaser &

Straus, 1967). In other words, the students exhibited similar behaviors each time during activities in which they were interested or disinterested.

Reading Log. The ELLs were asked to keep a reading log to record when, what, and where they read (Appendix D). However, completion of logs was intermittent and unreliable. To supplement content lacking in reading logs, I often verbally solicited students' perceptions and obtained similar information during personal interviews.

MRQ. The MRQ (Appendix E) was used as another tool to gauge ELLs' engagement in reading. The interview and observation data were compared to the self-rated MRQ. The students completed the MRQ at the onset of the study using a rating scale ranging from one to four (i.e., one being "most like" the student, and four being the "least like" the student). This information was compared and analyzed to see how the students rated their engagement on the MRQ versus what they said in the interviews and what behaviors were exhibited during class.

Data Analysis

An inductive approach of constant comparative analysis of the data was used to identify emerging factors and to construct themes across the students' motivation patterns (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). Using this method, I derived contextual understandings (Denzin, 1994) to explain what motivates ELLs to engage in reading. First, each observation was coded and the interviews transcribed. The observations and interviews were then compared and assessed for emerging themes. Codes were identified and modified throughout this process (see Appendix F for the final set of codes). Next, factors identified by the ELLs as motivating were analyzed inductively. Finally, a deductive approach was utilized for all subsequent data analysis (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Data were analyzed through the emergence of themes that either served to support or refute existing literature on motivation to

engage; likewise, data were also searched for substantiation that conflicted with or could disprove the themes. Once the data collection was complete, students' self ratings on the MRQ were compared to interview and observational findings. Finally, the reading log was used to support or refute students' statements as to how much they read in or out of school.

Results

English language learners' achievement in reading is directly related to both the degree to which they are motivated to engage in reading and the specific activities selected to accompany a reading (Fitzgerald & Graves, 2004). The results of this study revealed three significant factors which were found to motivate ELLs to engage in reading necessary for school, and also enabled me to define those specific activities or tasks related to a reading which were effective in facilitating and sustaining the learners' motivation. The first factor specifically focuses on task as a significant motivator to engage in reading. ELLs are continually expected to demonstrate reading comprehension; however, inevitably the type and selection of comprehension tasks accompanying the reading was, as in this case, the underlying component which either fueled or extinguished the ELLs' motivation to read and engage in reading. Second, the ELLs named family and importance of grades as a driving force in sustaining motivation to engage in reading while at school. Family cultures, especially those of non-native speakers in a second language environment, play a deciding role in how a learner adjusts to the learning experience both in as well as outside the classroom. Finally, the teacher and read-alouds were the third factor identified as the essential element in learners' engagement in the reading material. The teacher was most often viewed as a catalyst, i.e., one who is able to provide a connection between the objective reading material (and related tasks) and mediate the experience as relevant to the world of the

learner; this experience, in turn, was absorbed most readily by students through teacher use of read-alouds.

Here it is important to note that throughout the course of the interviews and observations, the concept of connection appeared as a significant underlying theme in all factors related to motivation to engage in reading. Throughout the following sections, I will not only detail each of the above mentioned three primary factors found to drive motivation to engage in reading, but also describe those patterns or themes of connection which facilitated and sustained the ELLs' motivation to engage in reading.

Tasks

Classroom activities or tasks can offer a variety of opportunities: to make connections (e.g., personal, emotional, visual; to prior knowledge; to vocabulary; from text-to-self/world/text, etc.); to make individual choices (e.g., which tasks to complete, and how to complete them, etc.); and to create opportunities for success (e.g., bridging reading and comprehension, etc.). All of these components can support internal and external motivations to engage (Albright, 2002; Fairbanks, 2000; Feger, 2006; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; 2007; Lapp & Fisher, 2009; Pticher, Albright, DeLaney, Walker, Seunarinisingh, Mogge, Headley, Ridgeway, Peck, Hunt, & Dunston, 2007; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004; 2006; Ranker, 2007; Scharer, Pinnell, Lyons, & Fountas, 2005; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998; Thomas, 2002; Turner & Paris, 1995). However, in this study, the most prevalent factor in supporting motivation to engage in reading was the actual task and the task type; these determined the degree to which the ELLs were able to establish relevance, or connection, between the material and their engagement in it.

During each interview, the ELLs commented both on the reading-related tasks they completed in class and on their perceptions of the degree to which they engaged in reading.

Previous research abundantly identifies the direct effect that an activity has in determining the amount of time and energy that will be expended to complete a given task (Feger, 2006; Ranker, 2007; Simon, 2008; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998; Turner & Paris, 1995). As Sweet, Guthrie, and Ng (1998) also indicate, experienced teachers are aware that motivation likewise can be increased through the provision of stimulating tasks. Turner and Paris (1995) purport that the most reliable indicator of motivation to engage with reading is not the specific program being used, but the actual daily tasks being used with the reading; furthermore, the task type (i.e., whether tasks are open or closed) also had an effect on motivation to engage.

Throughout the course of the interviews, observations, and results from the MRQ, it was abundantly clear that the ELLs preferred open tasks; open tasks most predominantly facilitated and sustained ELLs' ability to stay motivated and engage in their reading. In an early interview, Gianna commented on her participation in an open task, "The part I liked was one when we had to...when we acted out a part of the book, and my favorite one was Cesar's... I love acting." When I inquired what she disliked about it, Gianna answered, "We didn't have enough time." This dialogue suggests that Gianna enjoyed the acting (task) so much that the only drawback was that it unfortunately actually had to come to an end (engagement).

The continual dichotomy of what ELLs liked versus disliked only further highlighted their preference for open tasks. Comparing the acting experience to the completion of worksheets during class, Cesar explained, "The acting was fun, but the worksheet was boring...cause I had to write a lot." (Gianna and Mariel also agreed that the worksheets were boring.) Gianna expanded: "One of the reasons I think it's boring is because you have to look through the book, find the answer, write it down, go back to the book, make sure you got it right, go back to the book, and read the worksheet." In a later interview, Mariel returned to the acting activity saying,

“...we don’t have to sit for two hours. We get to move around...” Observation notes show that the ELLs demonstrated avoidance behaviors with closed activities (e.g., the worksheet), but did not demonstrate the same avoidance behaviors when asked to complete open tasks (e.g., the acting).

Overall, the students engaged more in open tasks or activities that allowed them to be socially involved, have more than one right answer, and draw upon their creative or imaginative faculties. During another interview, Gianna described a graphic organizer she was completing as part of a book report assignment. She said that she liked the graphic organizer because “I got to list what happened and I got to draw lines and things everywhere...And the graphic organizer helped me with my book report because it got me organized.” She clearly enjoyed completing the task, as not only did she learn and draw meaning from it (i.e., “it helped me with my book report because...”), but she was able express herself creatively and engage in the task (i.e., “I got to draw lines and things everywhere...”). Note that she expresses her engagement or enjoyment in the task as of primary importance, and then comments on the outcome of the task secondarily in terms of academic relevance.

One closed activity that all three students disliked was looking up lists of vocabulary words in dictionaries. However, when required to do so, they specifically did not like tasks where they were not able (or allowed) to use their dictionaries, as it rendered garnering meaning from context much more difficult. An interview exchange with Mariel further explains this stance:

Mariel: “I don’t like that we can’t use dictionaries for the vocabulary words.”

Me: “You can’t?”

Mariel: “No, we can only use the book and can only see what it means in the book.”

Me: “Meaning in context. Why don’t you like that?”

Mariel: “Because it’s really hard. I don’t know some of the words.”

Me: (They were reading was *Devil’s Arithmetic*). “Some of the words are in Dari or Pashtu, which are Middle Eastern languages. I can see how that would be challenging. Do the people in your group understand the vocabulary words more?”

Mariel: “No. We are all in the same boat...it is like 50 vocabulary words.”

Me: “Are you remembering what the vocabulary words are?”

Mariel: “No.”

It appeared that the contextual reading task was not assisting Mariel in her acquisition of comprehension, and the task was not supporting the outcome of facilitating vocabulary acquisition and development of meaning. Mariel clearly states her lack of engagement with the vocabulary, as well as her dismay and discouragement at not comprehending or connecting well with the reading. Disengagement, or lack of connection to the reading and accompanying tasks, may occur when students are asked to complete activities which are apparently unrelated to the reading. When students do not see how activities, or tasks, are related to content, the connection is lost (Ivey, 1999; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; 2007). This type of closed task illuminates how this particular ELL was unable to engage; however she most likely managed to complete it based on an extrinsic reward (e.g., grade, teacher approval, etc.) providing a poor motivator to sustain what engagement she could find.

For English language learners, it is very important that the tasks used in the classroom exploit language use as much as possible. For those tasks where ELLs do not find much engagement, potential language learning is lost (Cummins, 1984). Since it can take up to seven (and possibly as much as 12 years) to acquire academic language proficiency in English, there is

little time to lose in the classroom. Gianna, in particular, struggled with language a great deal when she could not find a connection to the task. Subsequently, as her struggling with the task increased, her ability to use language to verbalize questions or to describe her confusion about the task diminished markedly. This inability to express herself was characterized by increased sighing, getting up from the task and walking around the room, becoming distracted, and continually asking to leave the room to do various other tasks (e.g., go to the restroom/locker). Increasing task difficulty and disengagement followed by declining language acquisition and use is a negative cycle which can slowly erode motivation to engage. Gianna exemplified this cycle by attempting to avoid or delay completion of the activity until its absolute due date. By this time, she had to ask peers or her mother about how to complete the task. Had a scaffolding support been established for language and task connection prior to the activity, this cycle may have flowed in a very different fashion (Wilhelm, 2010).

Finally, post-reading and follow-up tasks can affect motivation to engage in reading (Feger, 2006; Ranker, 2007; Simon, 2008; Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998; Turner & Paris, 1995). All activities that foster connections, regardless of the specific connection, allow students to draw on more motivation to engage; as evidenced in interviews, follow-up tasks served to provide further connection to material which was already comprehended and internalized. Drawing connections is a critical concept to be employed in motivating ELLs to engage in reading, as ELLs require such connections in the process of scaffolding whichever activity is at hand (Fitzgerald & Graves, 2005; Jimenez, 2003; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004).

Family and Grades

Family and grades were closely linked and permeated all aspects of the ELLs' interviews. When the ELLs mentioned grades as a motivator, it was in light of their families, their families'

opinions, and their families' responses to the ELLs' grades. Family cohesiveness can either positively impact or debilitate a student (Gadsden, 2004). According to Gadsden (2004), family connectedness can be proactively used by educators to assist in motivating a student to engage more, or it can be viewed negatively as a conflict or barrier along the path to education. Au (1995) suggests that family culture can force dichotomies in students' lives. For example, students must simultaneously participate in and follow the culture and expectations of the school environment while at the same time they are expected to attend to familial needs and fulfill obligations at home.

Practices and support at home, as well as parental understanding of school practices, can affect a student's motivation to engage at school (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzales, 1992; Tam, Heward, & Heng, 2006; Tyler, Boykin, & Walton, 2006). For example, Cesar experiences ongoing challenges with his home life and family's support which interfere with his school life and learning experience. As Schmidt (1988) found with non-native speakers living in a second language environment, Cesar is subjected to different expectations for behavior in both his home and school environments. As a member of both cultures, he in fact serves as the interpreter between his parents and teachers at school. Cesar had good grades through elementary school, but has struggled with grades in sixth grade. Although he says that his parents become angry when he gets bad grades, they have difficulty bridging the language barrier to become more deeply involved in understanding the exact requirements of the school and its grading system (Wong-Fillmore, 1991). As Salinas-Sosa (1997) and Xu (1999) report, non-English speaking parents have difficulty being involved with homework or academic-related assignments. Cesar's parents try to be a critical motivator in his academic involvement and achievement (Goldenberg, 1987), but unfortunately they have a language and cultural barrier which impedes their

knowledge of academics in English as it relates to helping Cesar with school (Salinas-Sosa, 1997). Whatever the difficulties, Cesar is becoming a transformative figure in his own home (Au, 1995; Gadsden, 2005). He does see the value of his education, understands the challenges his parents face, and is able to rally motivation to engage.

All three students reported grades as a significant motivator on the MRQ, and likewise discussed it a great deal during the interviews. Cesar, Mariel, and Gianna wanted to know their grades as soon as possible after completion of a task, activity, or test. Although their teacher was efficient at returning grades quickly, time for return could last anywhere from one to three days. Though anxious to see the final outcomes, the students did state they thought this was a reasonable time frame given the number of papers the teacher needed to grade. During a conversation, Cesar and I discussed grades:

“Cesar (to another student): ...but how will you know if you’re failing?”

Me: So you want to know [your grade] because you might be failing, and you don’t want to know because you might be failing?

Cesar: No, I’m just saying you could be failing, but you won’t know because you won’t see your grades.

Me: Is that the advantage?

Cesar: If you’re failing, yes.”

Through this and similar conversations, Cesar found his grades to be of great importance and always wanted to know his grades before his parents knew. He did report that his parents became upset when they saw a grade or progress report that reflected low grades. He would be grounded or receive other undesirable punishments for low grades. In another conversation, he appeared to be pleased that he was improving his grade:

Me: “Was the worksheet important to you?”

Cesar: “Yeah.”

Me: “Why?”

Cesar: “To boost my grade up in English.”

Me: “You still have a low grade?”

Cesar: “Yeah.”

Me: “Have you gotten up to a D yet?”

Cesar: “No, it’s closer to a D.”

It was apparent through the interviews that he knew what he needed to do (i.e., complete the worksheets) to raise his grade. Observation confirmed that Cesar was motivated to complete his work in order to raise his grades. On days when he knew progress reports were to be posted, Cesar would engage undeterred in order to complete the work needed to raise his grade.

Mr. Jezik also had confidence in Cesar’s ability to raise his grade, and perceived Cesar as motivated to keep his grades up. He reported that Cesar has the creativity needed to complete the tasks, but “just needs to focus on them.” Mr. Jezik also stated that Cesar is not the “type of kid to do as little work as possible in class, just to get by,” and that he feels Cesar has a great deal of pressure from home to succeed and do better.

In further addressing connections between home and school, Edwards (2007) and Cairney (2007) state that when the roles of the family and of the school are similar, students may demonstrate greater success in school. Gianna and Mariel’s parents understand that literacy is a part of the cultural practice of the school and are better able to adjust home life according to their childrens’ needs at school. The families of these two students were heavily involved in their progress and were able to overcome some barriers that Cesar’s family was not. Mariel and

Gianna were emphatic that they wanted to receive good grades, a topic reiterated frequently throughout the interviews. For them, motivation to receive good grades was not only based on their own wants, but also on the pressure from their parents and siblings to receive good grades. In an early interview, Mariel said, “I get good grades because my sister’s always pushing me, because she’s in college right now. So, I can be like her, an example for the family and stuff, and also because my parents give me the big talk.” Gianna likewise stated,

“...I got grounded because I had bad grades, and I have to wait until the next report card, that way I’m ungrounded. My big sister, she’s 20. She flunked some grade and she told me, ‘You know what? You know what? You need to get your act together because look at me. Take example from me. Look where I ended up. I can’t get a good job ‘cause I don’t have enough education.’ And, they want me to do well. That’s why I have to do all the work.”

To help in staying on the path to getting good grades, Mariel and Gianna rely on either their parents or other types of support at home which are similar to the support structures offered at school (Edwards, 2007). In addition, Mariel and Gianna’s families are willing to become involved in their childrens’ educational experience and are willing to contact the teachers, even if it requires the presence of translators. To bridge her involvement with Gianna’s progress at school, Gianna’s mother also tries to encourage Gianna’s reading outside of school. She states:

“I know reading is important...for vocabulary, imagination, because that was that way for me and my dad. My dad got to New York very young and he learned his English through reading. And, he always said that same thing.....I try for her to read and if she does I praise her or give her applause.”

Tam, Heward, and Heng (2006) and Tyler, Boykin, and Walton (2006) agree that it is important for parents to understand what reading practices are encouraged at school and to reinforce and mirror those practices at home. As at school, Gianna's mother continuously pushes her daughter to read (for school and for pleasure) in an effort to help Gianna build vocabulary, develop reading comprehension, and achieve language fluency.

Overall, family culture lends great impact on how students view and respond to school and learning (Cairney, 1997; Edwards, 2007). Interviews and in-class observations of the ELLs' work habits clearly demonstrated that when the ELLs realized they might receive a bad grade which they would have to then explain to their parents, they were motivated to engage in what they needed to do specifically in order to raise their grades. Similarly, advice or encouragement from parents and siblings were significant motivators driving their performance in school.

Teacher and Read-Alouds

As Wilhelm (2008) found with his own participants, there were times when Mariel, Cesar, and Gianna were observed to fall into a trancelike state during reading. This trancelike state occurred primarily when their teacher was reading the material aloud to them (i.e., "read-alouds"). Read-alouds appeared to help the ELLs most to "fall into" a story (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; Thomas, 2000). When reading independently, Gianna reported never finding true engagement, and Mariela said she would only occasionally find true engagement. For Cesar, engagement during read-alouds depended on the story and whether he could find a character with whom to connect (Fairbanks, 2000; Feger, 2006). Regardless, each of these three students claimed that they "love when the teacher reads to the class."

ELLs affirmed that read-alouds enabled them to fall more deeply into the story, as well as to lose themselves in the story without the added pressure of simultaneously attending to the

surface (letters that combine to make words) and deep (meaning behind the words) structures of the words (Krashen, 2004; Peregoy & Boyle, 2000). Throughout interviews, the ELLs reported that they could concentrate more on the story when they could listen to the teacher read, due in part because non-linguistic cues such as the teacher's verbal inflections, movements, and facial expressions offered rich meaning as to what was happening in the story. In an early interview Mariela described her response to the teacher during read-alouds: "[Mr. Jezik] makes it fun. Not like some other teachers that just sit there and talk and talk." Gianna added, "He makes class fun." When pushed to expand the ways in which the teacher "makes class fun," Gianna added, "I like it when [Mr. Jezik] reads because he makes it fun and interesting. He gives it expression." During one group interview, I followed up by asking, "What if it were another one of your teachers reading the book?" All three ELLs agreed that it would not be as exciting or engaging if anyone else were reading the books aloud, because they doubted other teachers' abilities to present the material with as much enthusiasm and involvement as when Mr. Jezik read. Gianna stated:

"I like when people read to me. Like Mr. Jezik, he gives it a good take. So, if we're reading something and he says, 'suddenly a boom' he gives it a good expression. That's what I like. It's not just sitting down with a book just going, just listening. I like it when it's like, 'Oh my God!'"

Cesar stated most simply that his teacher "makes [the story] awesome."

What distinguishes Mr. Jezik's read-alouds from those of other teachers is his ability to captivate the learners with the reading through his use of expression: he acts out what he is reading, makes abundant use of facial expression, and varies his voice quality and intonation. All of these elements provide a rich context-embedded environment for learners to gain further

understanding from the reading. For example, reading novels independently is overwhelming to Gianna, and throughout interviews she repeatedly stated that she “does not like to read.” During read-alouds, however, she would appear rapt with attention toward her teacher, lose track of time, and “fall into” and be able to visualize the story (Fu, 2003; Palmer, Shackelford, Miller, & Leclere, 2007; Wilhelm, 2008). Cummins (1984) and Krashen (2004) would support that Mr. Jezik is providing the comprehensible input (Krashen, 2004) and the context embeddedness (Cummins, 1984) required for learners to participate in cognitively demanding situations (e.g., reading novels for English class; Cummins, 1984). Baker (2006) adds that pointing to objects as well as using eye movement, head nods and shakes, hand gestures, and varying intonation during verbal communication in the classroom all provide learners with non-verbal clues and cues as to how to interpret a message; this, in turn, facilitates learners’ connection with the reading content and promotes engagement in reading.

Read-alouds alone did not motivate the learners to engage in the reading, rather it was the continuous efforts on behalf of the teacher to draw the learners to fall into the reading and ensure that the classroom climate supported complete engagement in reading (Meltzer & Hamann, 2006). Throughout each interview, it was apparent that learners were able to engage with the reading when they had a teacher who was able to provide context to help them understand the material. Despite her higher language proficiency, Gianna had a difficult time focusing on any reading and reported that she did not have a visual of what she was reading when reading alone. She often became bored and disinterested in reading. Gianna’s mother and her teacher both acknowledged that Gianna would often take interest in a book, but would not complete it if she had to read it independently. Nonetheless, throughout the course of the school year, Gianna was able finish reading eight books in their entirety. Gianna attributes her achievement to the help of

Mr. Jezik, who acted as a guide and motivated her to truly engage by reading parts of the book aloud to her and allowing extra time to complete activities and readings. The other learners commented on how the teacher was able to facilitate their ability to “see” the story. Mariel reported that she could visualize what she was reading most of the time, but had difficulty with some books that made her concentrate too much, such as when reading complex higher-level novels. Cesar said that he could sometimes visualize what he was reading, but he had to be able to connect with a character in the book. However, all three concurred that when their teacher read the books to them, they were able to better visualize, understand, and complete activities based on their comprehension and captivation in what was being read.

It is essential to help ELLs move past the surface structures of reading and help them find ways to truly engage in the deep structure, or the meaning of what they are reading. In this case, both the experience of read-alouds as well as the support of the teacher giving context to the story allowed these ELLs to fully “fall into” what was being read and experience reading as a progressive verb: an ongoing action. Independently, the teacher and read-alouds do not ensure ELLs’ gains in reading achievement, they are clearly shown here to lead to learners’ increased motivation to engage in reading. Having identified some of the factors which support ELLs’ motivation and engagement in reading, the issues relevant to facilitating ELLs’ success in reading necessitate discussion as to their implications for teachers, learners, and learning environments.

Discussion and Implications

From the outset of this study, I sought to explore the following questions: (1) What activities, what people, and/or what topics will motivate ELLs to engage in reading, and (2) Why is it difficult for ELLs to find motivation to engage in reading in English, especially when they

are already able to read in their native language? Through interviews, observations, and review of reports from reading logs, the ELLs in this study offered their perceptions and shed light on this issue. Based on review of their input, ELLs demonstrated that they rely on motivators to engage in reading which are similar to those of native-English-speaking adolescents. This is promising news for educators who seek to motivate all students to engage in reading. However, comparable motivations may not equate to comparable populations, and thus, those factors required to motivate an ELL to engage in reading should be identified separately from those common to the general adolescent reading population.

Throughout the course of this study, many issues were found to be common among students attempting to learn a second language and trying to succeed in school. Some of these issues need to be addressed before, during, and after instruction, in order for students to begin to find motivation to engage. First and foremost was the common theme of family involvement and ability (or lack thereof) to connect with the non-native culture. As was demonstrated in Cesar's family, it is very difficult for some ELL parents to make connections with school without having to rely on their ELL child as a filter/translator (Schmidt, 1998; Wong-Fillmore, 1991). This type of interfamily dependence can obviously create a multitude of problems both at school and at home, but unfortunately in terms of the student it most readily lends itself to the individual's isolation (Wong-Fillmore, 1991). Finding ways to communicate with parents is of utmost importance for educators. This can be done through translators (other than the ELL), translation of material through school-provided translation programs, use of bilingual parent letters in course materials, or through more face-to-face contact as parents gain more confidence in approaching the school and its teachers (Arzubiaga, Rueda, & Monzo, 2002).

Scaffolding ELLs' motivation to engage in reading through defining specific words in a vocabulary list can be daunting even for ELLs at higher proficiency levels. As compared to their native-English-speaking counterparts, ELLs are less able to use context to find meanings of unfamiliar words as they lack a complete command of academic English, which further inhibits the motivation to complete a given task (Cummins, 1984; Stoller & Grabe, 1995). Ideally, direct instruction of vocabulary, paired with incidental learning enriched by multiple opportunities to encounter the words, increases the authenticity of the task and therefore the motivation to learn the words (Huckin, Haynes, & Coady, 1995). In addition, direct instruction of strategies to infer meanings of unfamiliar words (e.g., cognates, morphological information, etc.) from context is known to increase vocabulary comprehension (Garcia & Nagy, 1993; Jimenez, Garcia & Pearson, 1996).

More so than native speakers, ELLs can experience difficulty in attending to surface and deep structure simultaneously when required to read material independently for school (Brown & Fisher, 2006; Chamot, 1995). Teachers and read-alouds provide a medium for ELLs to understand and establish a connection with information that might be difficult to read and comprehend on their own (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; Thomas, 2000). Gianna repeatedly stated that it was much easier to understand what was being read if Mr. Jezik read it aloud. In order to increase ELLs' understanding of a story, a teacher must conscientiously activate learners' schema and provide vocabulary needed to comprehend the reading. This may be accomplished not only through the use of read-alouds but also through implementation of other expressive, open tasks such as graphic organizers, time lines, analogies, guiding questions, and leveled readers/anchor books (Brown, 2007; Dochy, Segers, & Buehl, 1999; Peregoy & Boyle, 2004).

The issue of writing was raised as a counter-example to the activities in which the ELLs found engagement. Cesar and Gianna especially found writing challenging and went to great lengths to avoid the process entirely. Writing can be especially difficult for ELLs because it is a task which is not always scaffolded and whose contexts are not always readily available (Cummins, 1984). Many teachers are often surprised to find that ELLs who speak English very well often write very poorly (Edmonds, 2009). In order to scaffold for successful writing, ELLs need explicit instruction in text structure, vocabulary, and syntax. In addition, events like writing workshops and writing conferences can provide ELLs with models of what successful writing looks like (Swain, 1997).

Although this research involved a very small group of students, the patterns uncovered demonstrate that ELLs – even those who do not like to read! – can find motivation to engage in reading. The factors described suggest that providing context through read-alouds that involve intonation and drama assist an ELL in moving past the surface structure of the language. Taking away the cognitively demanding surface structure (Cummins, 1984) of the language provides an avenue for students to begin to fall into the deeper meaning of the reading. Wilhelm (2008) found that those students who were truly engaged in reading were able to respond to the reading in ways that were intensely visual, empathetic, and emotional. He found that helping students engage more deeply led those students who do not typically engage in reading to experience it in a completely different light. To this end, an ELL's experience with reading in the classroom appears to have a significant impact on their motivation to engage in reading in class.

The patterns of motivation to engage for the ELLs in this study are not much unlike the patterns for native English speaking adolescent students. The ELLs were able to find motivation to engage in reading based on the tasks needed to be completed, the encouragement of their

families to receive good grades, and through their teacher's read-alouds and in-class support. In addition, as these ELLs were able to make connections to their motivation to read, they were able to engage with their reading. The combination of these factors provided motivation to engage in reading while simultaneously fostering their English language development. By understanding and helping ELLs, their teachers, and parents understand how and why they are motivated to engage in reading, we as educators can help these learners increase their reading achievement and succeed in their development of English language proficiency.

References

- Albright, L.K. (2002). Bringing the ice maiden to life: Engaging adolescents in learning through picture book read-alouds in content areas. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 45(5), 418-428.
- Alvermann, D.E. (2002). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(2), 189-208.
- Arzubiaga, A., Rueda, R., Monzo, L. (2002). Family matters related to the reading engagement of Latino children. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1(4), 231-243.
- Au, K. (1995). Multicultural perspectives on literacy research. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27, 85-100.
- August, D. & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Brown, C.L. (2007). Strategies for making social studies texts more comprehensible for English language learners. *Social Studies*, 98(5), 185-188.
- Brown, J. & Fisher, P. (2006). Balanced literacy: One middle school's experience. *Principal Leadership*, 7(1), 38-40.
- Cairney, T.H. (1997). Acknowledging diversity in home literacy practices: Moving towards a partnership with parents. *Early Child Development and Care*, 127-128, 61-73. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service N. 418 395)
- Chamot, A.U. (1995). Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach: CALLA in Arlington, Virginia. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(3), 379-394.

- Clay, M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cole, J.E. (2003). What motivates students to read? Four literacy personalities. *The Reading Teacher*, 56(4), 326-336.
- Cox, K.E. & Guthrie, J.T. (2001). Motivational and cognitive contributions to students' amount of reading. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26, 116-131.
- Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, 163(1), 16-30.
- Cummins, J. (2000). Academic language learning, transformative pedagogy, and information technology: Towards a critical balance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(3), 537-548.
- Cushman, K. & Rogers, L. (2008). *Fires in the middle school bathroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1985). Emergent motivation and the evolution of the self. In D.L. Kleiber & M.L. Maehr (Eds.), *Motivation in Adulthood* (pp. 93-113). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Deci, E.L. (1992). On the nature and functions of motivation theories. *Psychological Science*, 3(3), 167-171.
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New York: Thousand Oaks.
- Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System*, 23(2), 165-174.

- Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Buel, M.M. (1999). The relation between assessment practices and outcomes of studies: The case of research on prior knowledge. *Review of Educational Research, 69*(2), 145-186.
- Edmonds, L.M. (2009). Challenges and solutions for ELLs: Teaching strategies for English Language Learners' success in science. *Science Teacher, 76*(3), 30-33.
- Edmunds, K.M. & Tancock, B.M. (2003). Incentives: The effects of the reading motivation of fourth-grade students. *Reading Research and Instruction, 42*(2). 17-38.
- Edwards, P.A. (2007). Home literacy environments: What we know and what we need to know. In Michael Pressley, Alison K. Billman, Kristen H. Perry, Kelly E. Reffitt, and Julia Moorhead Reynolds (Eds.) *Shaping literacy achievement* (pp. 42-76). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Elley, W.B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning, 41*, 375-411.
- Fairbanks, C. (2000). Fostering adolescents' literacy engagement: Kids business and critical inquiry. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*(1), 35-50.
- Feger, M.V. (2006). "I want to read!" How culturally relevant texts increase student engagement in reading. *Multicultural Education, 13*(3), 18-19.
- Fitzgerald, J. & Graves, M.F. (2004). Reading support for all: Scaffolded reading experiences help English language learners master both reading and content. *Educational Leadership, 62*(4), 68-71.
- Freeman, Y. & Freeman, D. (2003). Struggling English language learners: Keys for academic success. *TESOL Journal 12*,(3), 5-10.
- Fu, D. (2003). *An island of teaching: ESL in Chinatown*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Gadsden, V.L. (2004). Family literacy and culture. In B.H. Wasik (Ed.), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 401-425). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Garcia, G.E. & Nagy, W.E. (1993). Latino students' concept of cognates. In D.J. Leu & C.K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Examining central issues in literacy research, theory, and practice* (pp. 367-374). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.
- Gersten, R. & Baker, S. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices for English language learners. *Exceptional Children*, 66(4), 454-470.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goldenberg, C.N. (1987). Low income Hispanic parents' contributions to their first grade children's word-recognition skills. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 149-179.
- Guthrie, J.T. (2004). Supporting sustained engagement with texts. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(1), 1-29.
- Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (Eds). (1997). Reading engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Guthrie, J.T. & Wigfield, A. (1999). How motivation fits into a science of reading. *Scientific studies of reading*, 3(3), 199-205.
- Guthrie, J.T. & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil & P.B. Mosenthal (Eds). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3). Mahwah, MJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., Perencevich, K.C. (2004). Motivating reading comprehension: Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., VonSecker, C. (2000). Effects of integrated instruction on motivation and

- strategy use in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(2), 231-241.
- Huckin, T. & Coady, J. (1999). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21(2), 181-193.
- Huckin, T., Haynes, M., & Coady, J. (1995). *Second language reading and vocabulary learning*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Ivey, G. (1999). A multicase study in the middle school: Complexities among young adolescent readers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(2), 172-192.
- Ivey, G. & Broaddus, K. (2001). 'Just plain reading': A survey of what makes students want to read in the middle school classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(4), 350-377.
- Ivey, G. & Broaddus, K. (2007). A formative experiment investigating literacy engagement among adolescent Latina/o students just beginning to read, write, and speak English. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(4), 512-545).
- Jimenez, R.T. (2003). Freedom and form: The language and literacy practices of two Mexican schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(4), 486-508.
- Jimenez, R., Garcia, G.E., & Pearson, P.D. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latino/a students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31, 90-112.
- Johnson, D. (1999). Creating fat kids who don't like to read. *Book Report*, 18(2).
- Kenosha Unified School District (2008). Report on official enrollment and class sizes for school year 2008-2009.
- http://www.kusd.edu/media/pdf/educational_accountability/enrollment.pdf. Retrieved March 20, 2009.

- Klinger, J.K., Artiles, A.J., & Barletta, L.M. (2006). English language learners who struggle with reading: Language acquisition or LD? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39*(2), 108-128.
- Krashen, S.D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Lapp, D. & Fisher, D. (2009). It's all about the book: Motivating teens to read. *Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy, 52*(7), 556-561.
- Langer, J. (2001). Beating the odds: Teaching middle and high school students to read and write well. *American Education Research Journal, 38*(4), 837-880.
- LeCompte, M.D. & Priessle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Linan-Thompson, S., Vaughn, S., Hickman-Davis, P., & Kouzekanani, K. (2003). Effectiveness of supplemental reading instruction for second-grade English language learners with reading difficulties. *The Elementary School Journal, 103*(3), 221-234.
- Lutz, S.L., Guthrie, J.T., & Davis, M.H. (2006). Scaffolding for engagement in elementary school reading instruction. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(1), 3-20.
- Malloy, K.J., Gibertson, D., & Maxfield, J. (2007). Use of brief experimental analysis for selecting reading interventions for English language learners. *The School Psychology Review, 36*(2), 291-310.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Meltzer, J. & Hamann, E.T. (2004). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content area learning. Part I: Focus on motivation and engagement*. (The Education Alliance at Brown University). Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional

Educational Laboratory.

Meltzer, J. & Hamann, E.T. (2006). Literacy for English learners and regular students, too.

Education Digest, 71(8), 32-40.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San

Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., Gonzales, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a

qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-142.

Palmer, B.C., Shackford, V.S., Miller, S.C., Leclere, J.T. (2007). Bridging two worlds: Reading comprehension, figurative language instruction, and the English language learner.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 50(4), 258-267.

Pappamihel, N.E. (2001). Moving from the ESL classroom into the mainstream: an investigation of English language anxiety in Mexican girls. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(1/2), 31-38.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Peregoy, S. F. & Boyle, O. F. (2000). English learners reading English: What we know, what we need to know. *Theory into Practice*, 39(4), 237-247.

Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study.

Reading in a Foreign Language, 5, 271-275.

Pintrich, P.R. & Schunk, D.H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and application* (2nd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Pitcher, S.M., Albright, L.K., Delaney, C.J., Walker, N.T., Seunarinisingh, K., Mogge, S., Headley, K.N., Ridgeway, V.G., Peck, S., Hunt, R., & Dunston, P.J. (2007). Assessing adolescents' motivation to read. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(5), 378-396.
- Ranker, J. (2007). Using comic books as read alouds: Insights on reading from an English as a second language classroom. *Reading Teacher*, 61(4), 296-305.
- Salinas-Sosa, A. (1997). Involving Hispanic parents in educational activities through collaborative relationships. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(2), 103-111.
- Scharer, P.L., Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C., & Fountas, I. (2005). Becoming an engaged reader. *Educational Leadership*, 63(2), 24-29.
- Schmidt, P.R. (1998). *Cultural conflict and struggle: Literacy learning in a kindergarten program*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Schleppegrell, M.J., Achugar, M., & Oteiza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 67-93.
- Simon, L. (2008). "I wouldn't choose it, but I don't regret reading it": Scaffolding students' engagement with complex texts. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 134-143.
- Snow, C.E. & Biancarosa, G. (2003). Adolescent literacy and the achievement gap: What do we know and where do we go from here? *Proceedings of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, USA*, 1-36.

- Stroller, F. & Grabe, W. (1995). Implications for L2 vocabulary acquisition and instruction from L1 vocabulary research. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes, & J. Coady (Eds.), *Second language reading and vocabulary learning* (pp. 98-122). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Strommen, L.T. & Mates, B.F. (2004). Learning to love reading: Interviews with older children and teens. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(3). 188-200.
- Swain, M. (1997). Science apprenticeship: Reading, writing, and talking our way into scientific literacy. Presentation at the NSTA Conference on Science Education, Detroit, MI.
- Sweet, A.P., Guthrie, J.T., & Ng, M.M. (1998). Teacher perception and student reading motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 210-223.
- Tam, K.Y., Heward, W.L., & Heng, M.A. (2006). A reading instruction intervention program for English-language learners who are struggling readers. *The Journal of Special Education*, 48(2), 79-93.
- Teale, W.H. (2009). Students learning English and their literacy instruction in urban schools. *Reading Teacher*, 62(8), 699-703.
- Thomas, C. (2000). From engagement to celebration: A framework for passionate reading. *Voices from the Middle*, 8(2), 17-25.
- Turner, J. & Paris, S.G. (1995). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 48(8), 662-673.
- Tyler, K.M., Boykin, A.W., & Walton, T.R. (2006). Cultural considerations in teachers' perceptions of student classroom behavior and achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 998-1005.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55/5539225.html>. Retrieved October 10, 2009.

- Vang, C.T. (2006). New pedagogical approaches for teaching elementary science to limited English proficient students. *Multicultural Education*, 13(3), 37-41.
- WIDA Consortium (2009). The can do descriptors for WIDA's levels of English language proficiency. http://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_Dos.pdf. Retrieved February 1, 2009.
- Wilhelm, J.D. (2008). *You gotta be the book: Teaching engaged and reflective reading with adolescents* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilhelm, J. and Smith, M. (2010). *Fresh takes on teaching literacy elements: How to teach what really matters about character, setting, point of view, and theme*. New York: Scholastic, Inc.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing a first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 69(22), 323-347.
- Xu, H. (1999). Young Chinese ESL children's home literacy experience. *Reading Horizons*, 409(1). 1-13.

Appendix A

Participant Follow-up Interview

Tell me about the reading activity in class today.

What did you like/dislike about [the reading activity]?

Do you feel that you knew as much about [the reading activity] as the other students in the class?

Why/Why not?

Did you find that [the reading activity] was challenging? Why/Why not?

If not, why did you continue doing [the reading activity]?

When you were completing [the reading activity], were you trying to do better than your classmates? Why/Why not?

When you were completing [the reading activity], were you trying to discuss the information with your classmates? Why/Why not?

After completing [the reading activity] do you want to find out more information about the topic? Why/Why not?

Did your teacher give you any help/advice during [the reading activity]? Was this help/advice helpful and/or important?

What were your friends doing during [the reading activity]?

Did you receive a grade on [the reading activity]? Do you like knowing your grade on [the literacy event]? Why/Why not?

Did you finish [the reading activity] before your classmates? Do you prefer to finish before or after your friends? Why/Why not?

Appendix B

Teacher Questionnaire

What are the main literacy events in your classroom?

How do you feel your students will do in reading next year?

Do you consider _____ a good reader? Why or Why not?

Do you feel that _____ learns more form reading than most students in the class?

Will _____ read hard challenging books if they are interesting or if the project they are related to are interesting?

What sorts of books makes _____ think?

How does _____ demonstrate that he/she likes to think about a book that is being read?

Do you find that _____ learns difficult things by reading? Why or Why not?

Will _____ still read a book if it is interesting regardless of how hard it is to read?

Does _____ seek out more to read if the class has discussed an interesting topic?

Why do you think that is?

Which subjects seem to be his/her favorite to read about?

Do you find that _____ reads to learn about new information, hobbies, or other new things? Has he/she mentioned what new information/hobbies/other new things he/she has been reading about?

How often does _____ read about people from different countries.

Which types of books does _____ like to read?

Has _____ discussed using mental pictures while reading? How has he/she described it?

Has _____ ever mentioned making friends with people in good books?

Does _____ express the importance of being a good reader? How often? Why do you think that is?

What types of feedback do you offer for reading?

What types of feedback do peers offer each other in class? Out of class?

Has _____ shared with you the type of feedback he/she received from his/her parents?

How do you view grades in reading?

Do your students generally look forward to finding out about his/her reading grade?

Why do you want students to read?

How often do your students visit the library?

How do you encourage your students to practice reading?

Do you find that your students attempt to outdo each other in reading?

What, if any, rewards are offered in class for reading?

Do you use any type of competition in class for reading? Please explain.

Do you find that your students do as little schoolwork as possible? Tell me more.

Do you feel that your students do work because it is required?

How do students complete reading assignments? On time? As if it is very important?

What types of activities do you use for reading?

What is your response if a student says that a story is too complicated, no fun, or there are too many characters in the story?

Appendix C

Parent Questionnaire

What are the main literacy events at home?

How do you feel your child will do in reading next year?

Do you consider _____ a good reader? Why or Why not?

Do you feel that _____ learns more form reading than most students in the class?

Will _____ read hard challenging books if they are interesting or if the project they are related to are interesting?

What sorts of books makes _____ think?

How does _____ demonstrate that he/she likes to think about a book that is being read?

Do you find that _____ learns difficult things by reading? Why or Why not?

Will _____ still read a book if it is interesting regardless of how hard it is to read?

Does _____ seek out more to read if the class has discussed an interesting topic?

Why do you think that is?

Which subjects seem to be his/her favorite to read about?

Do you find that _____ reads to learn about new information, hobbies, or other new things? Has he/she mentioned what new information/hobbies/other new things he/she has been reading about?

How often does _____ read about people from different countries.

Which types of books does _____ like to read?

Has _____ discussed using mental pictures while reading? How has he/she described it?

Has _____ ever mentioned making friends with people in good books?

Does _____ express the importance of being a good reader? How often? Why do you think that is?

What types of feedback do you offer for reading?

What types of feedback do classmates offer each other in class? Out of class?

Has _____ shared with you the type of feedback he/she received from his/her teacher?

How do you view grades in reading?

Does your child generally look forward to finding out about his/her reading grade?

Why do you want your child to read?

How often does your child visit the library?

How do you encourage your child to practice reading?

Do you find that your child attempts to outdo classmates in reading?

What, if any, rewards are offered for reading?

Do you use any type of competition at home for reading? Please explain.

Do you find that your child does as little schoolwork as possible? Tell me more.

Do you feel that your child does work because it is required?

How does your child complete reading assignments? On time? As if it is very important?

What types of activities do you use for reading?

What is your response if your child says that a story is too complicated, no fun, or there are too many characters in the story?

Appendix D

Reading Log for Mrs. Robinson

Date	Title of Book	Pages or Chapters Read	Where were you when you read?

Appendix E

Motivation for Reading Questionnaire

1=Like me

4= Not like me

I visit the library often with my family	1	2	3	4
I like hard, challenging books	1	2	3	4
I know that I will do well in reading next year	1	2	3	4
I do as little schoolwork as possible in reading	1	2	3	4
If the teacher discusses something interesting I might read more about it	1	2	3	4
I read because I have to	1	2	3	4
I like it when the questions in books make me think	1	2	3	4
I read about my hobbies to learn more about them	1	2	3	4
I am a good reader	1	2	3	4
I read stories about fantasy and make-believe	1	2	3	4
I often read to my brother or my sister	1	2	3	4
I like being the only one who knows an answer in something we read	1	2	3	4
I read to learn new information about topics that interest me	1	2	3	4
My friends sometimes tell me I am a good reader	1	2	3	4
I learn more from reading than most students in the class	1	2	3	4
I like to read about new things	1	2	3	4
I like hearing the teacher say I read well	1	2	3	4
I like being the best at reading	1	2	3	4
I look forward to finding out my reading grade	1	2	3	4

I sometimes read to my parents	1	2	3	4
My friends and I like to trade things to read	1	2	3	4
It is important for me to see my name on a list of good readers	1	2	3	4
I don't like reading something when the words are too difficult	1	2	3	4
I make pictures in my mind when I read	1	2	3	4
I always do my reading work exactly as the teacher wants it	1	2	3	4
I usually learn difficult things by reading	1	2	3	4
I don't like vocabulary questions	1	2	3	4
Complicated stories are no fun to read	1	2	3	4
I am happy when someone recognizes my reading	1	2	3	4
I feel like I make friends with people in good books	1	2	3	4
My parents often tell me what a good job I am doing in reading	1	2	3	4
Finishing every reading assignment is very important to me	1	2	3	4
I like mysteries	1	2	3	4
I talk to my friends about what I am reading	1	2	3	4
If I am reading about an interesting topic, I sometimes lose track of time	1	2	3	4
I like to get compliments for my reading	1	2	3	4
Grades are a good way to see how well you are doing in reading	1	2	3	4
I like to help my friends with their schoolwork in reading	1	2	3	4
I read to improve my grade	1	2	3	4
My parents ask me about my reading grade	1	2	3	4
I enjoy a long, involved story or fiction book	1	2	3	4

I like to tell my family about what I am reading	1	2	3	4
I try to get more answers right than my friends	1	2	3	4
If the project is interesting, I can read difficult material	1	2	3	4
I enjoy reading books about people in different countries	1	2	3	4
I read a lot of adventure stories	1	2	3	4
I always try to finish my reading on time	1	2	3	4
If a book is interesting I don't care how hard it is to read	1	2	3	4
I like to finish my reading before other students	1	2	3	4
In comparison to my other school subjects I am best at reading	1	2	3	4
I am willing to work hard to read better than my friends	1	2	3	4
I don't like it when there are too many people in the story	1	2	3	4
It is very important to me to be a good reader	1	2	3	4
In comparison to other activities I do, it is very important to me to be a good reader	1	2	3	4

Appendix F

Observation Codes

Task: T	Behaviors: B	Volunteer: V
On-task: OT	Walking around: Walk	Eng: English Class
Off-task: Off	Off-task talking: Off T	Social Studies: SS
Group work: GW	Off-task other activity: Off O	Homework: HW
Individual work: IW	Other work in class: Off W	Presentation: Pres
Teacher read aloud :TRA	Silent Reading: SR	Open Task: OTO
Student read aloud: SRA	Take turn reading: TR	Closed Task: CTO
Question: Q	Directions/Instruction: DI	Answering: A
Writing: Write	Participation: PO	

Interview Codes

Competition: Com	Reading efficacy: RE	Read Aloud: RAI
Social: Soc	Challenge: Chal	Task: TI
Grades: Gr	Curiosity: Cur	Open Task: OTI
Compliance: Cmp	Involvement: Inv	Closed Task: CTI
Work avoidance: WA	Recognition: Rec	Participation: PI
Teacher: Teach	Friends: Friend	Spanish: Sp
Reading outside of school: ReadOut	Homework: HWI	Writing: WriteI
Reading in school: ReadIn	Group Work: GWI	
	Questions: QI	
	Family: Fam	

Table 1

WIDA Descriptors for Levels 4 and 5 Language Proficiency

Domain	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Level 4	<p>Compare/contrast functions, relationships from oral information.</p> <p>Analyze and apply oral information.</p> <p>Identify cause and effect from oral discourse.</p>	<p>Discuss stories, issues, concepts.</p> <p>Give speeches, oral reports, offer creative solutions to issues, problems.</p>	<p>Interpret information or data</p> <p>Find details that support main ideas</p> <p>Identify word families, figures of speech.</p>	<p>Summarize information from graphics or notes.</p> <p>Edit and revise writing.</p> <p>Create original ideas or detailed responses</p>
Level 5	<p>Draw conclusion from oral information.</p> <p>Construct models based on oral discourse.</p> <p>Make connections from oral discourse.</p>	<p>Engage in debates.</p> <p>Explain phenomena, give examples and justify responses.</p> <p>Express and defend points of view.</p>	<p>Conduct research to find information from multiple sources.</p> <p>Draw conclusions from explicit and implicit text.</p>	<p>Apply information to new contexts.</p> <p>React to multiple genres and discourses.</p> <p>Author multiple forms/genres of writing.</p>

Table 2

Participant Descriptors

Participants	Age	Proficiency Level	Parents Highest Level in School	Place of Birth	State Reading Test Score	ELD Services
Cesar	12	5.6	Unknown	United States	Advanced	Until 5 th grade
Gianna	12	4.7	Associates, pursuing her B.A. in Education	Puerto Rico	Proficient	Waived in elementary school, but parents approved monitoring English services for 6 th grade.
Mariel	12	5.3	High School	Mexico	Proficient	Waived in elementary school