ASSESSING MOTIVATION TO READ

The Motivation to Read Profile–Revised

Jacquelynn A. Malloy ▪ *Barbara A. Marinak* ▪ *Linda B. Gambrell* ▪ *Susan A. Mazzoni*

Designing effective and engaging instruction means considering the motivational needs of students. The MPR-R is a tool that supports teachers in creating motivating classroom contexts for literacy.

"If they aren't motivated, they won't learn!" So goes the maxim often used by teacher educators to convey the importance of engagement and motivation to learning and achievement with their preservice teachers. For most classroom teachers, recognizing when students are engaged in literacy activities—and perhaps more glaringly, when they are not—is a process that is key to evaluating the potential success of the instruction being offered.

Students who are engaged have their eyes on what they are doing, are ardently attending to the teacher's read-aloud, or are in reflective repose as they read independently. Going deeper beneath these behavioral manifestations of their literacy engagement, students who are motivated to participate in literacy instruction are on task, cognitively and strategically engaged with the material, and perhaps affectively responding to the activity as well, enthusiastically sharing what they've read with their peers.

The research literature provides strong support for the tie between reading motivation and reading achievement (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2005; Pintrich, 2003; Taboada, Tonks, Wigfield, & Guthrie, 2009). Motivation can be described as a willingness to engage in an activity and a willingness to persist in that activity, even when it becomes difficult (Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006). Therefore, the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP; Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996) was designed to guide the teacher in determining students' perceived value of reading and self-concept as readers such that appropriate instructional decisions could be made. The MRP is also widely used in literacy research as a measure of student motivation for reading (Applegate & Applegate, 2010; Marinak & Gambrell, 2010; Quirk, Schwanenflugel, & Webb, 2009; Shaaban, 2006).

Jacquelynn A. Malloy is an assistant professor in the Eugene T. Moore School of Education, Clemson University, South Carolina, USA; e-mail malloy2@clemson.edu.

Barbara A. Marinak is associate professor in the School of Education and Human Services, Mount St. Mary's University, Emmitsburg, Maryland, USA; e-mail marinak@msmary.edu.

Linda B. Gambrell is a distinguished professor in the Eugene T. Moore School of Education, Clemson University, South Carolina, USA; e-mail lgamb@clemson.edu.

Susan A. Mazzoni is an independent literacy consultant in Elkridge, Maryland, USA; e-mail suemazzoni@gmail.com.

RT

More recently, the research focus on achievement motivation has shifted from that of an individual construct to one that can be influenced by classroom contexts and teacher practices (Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006). They observed: "As psychologists have rediscovered, motivated behavior in school results from a combination of student and situational characteristics" (p. 345). Therefore, the purpose of this article is to report on an updated and more reliable revision of the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP-R) and to engage in a discussion of how periodic, classwide administration of the MRP-R can inform practices to support motivating classroom contexts.

Theoretical Framework

The *expectancy-value theory* of motivation (Eccles, 1983) is used to describe the construct of reading motivation for the MRP-R, as with the original MRP. Expectancy-value theory posits that motivation is determined by an

individual's perception that they will be successful in performing a task (*expectancy*) and that they perceive a *value* in accomplishing the task. Perceptions of expectancy are based on Bandura's (1977) work on self-efficacy, which he described as self-judgment of a domain-specific ability to perform a task successfully. Expectancy is therefore thought to arise from the individual's task-specific self-concept. When designing the MRP and the MRP-R, estimations of students' motivation to read are determined by assessing both their *self-concept as readers* and their *value of reading*.

Revising the MRP

As the original MRP was developed in 1996, a revision that would reflect the cultural and linguistic changes that occurred in the ensuing decade was needed. For example, digital reading sources were not considered in the original version but now are explored in the revised conversational interview. Four researchers met to review the original MRP items, which included 10 items designed to measure value of reading and 10 items designed to measure self-concept as a reader, as well as the conversational interview that accompanies the scaled survey.

The MRP was designed to be applicable to grades 2 through 6, practical for classroom use, group administered, and able to reflect value of reading and self-concept as a reader. A four-point scale was chosen to avoid neutral responses and because the breadth of scale was suitable for elementary students (Case & Khanna, 1981; Nitko, 1983). A set of 100 potential items was suggested by a group of researchers and then evaluated for construct validity by the research panel.

Four classroom teachers were asked to perform a trait assessment on the remaining items to determine whether the items would tap self-concept as a

reader or value of reading. The items that received 100% trait agreement were included in the field testing of the original MRP with 330 third through fifth graders from 4 eastern U.S. schools. The scales were found to be reliable (self-concept = .75; value = .82). Validity of the original scales was also confirmed through inter-scale correlations and correlations with reading achievement (Gambrell et al., 1996).

The *reading survey* was designed as a self-report instrument that could be administered to the whole class or a small group, depending on the teacher support required. The four-point ordinal scale includes ranked responses with 10 items for each subscale. Self-concept as a reader is assessed through items such as, "I think I am a _____ reader" and "When I have trouble figuring out a word I don't know, I…". Items that are designed to tap value of reading include "Reading is something I like to do….", and "My friends think reading is…". A *conversational interview* was designed for individual administration such that further exploration of student perceptions of value of reading and self-concept as a reader could occur.

The authors, all either having assisted in the development of the MRP or having experience in using the MRP for classroom practice or research, met to discuss the survey items and conversational interview, the two components of the original assessment. One item was replaced to query student perceptions of out-of-school reading as opposed to future perspectives for reading. Seven of the original items were kept without changes, and 12 items were either revised in the stem portion with an eye to cultural and linguistic changes to provide clarity or in the responses to improve reliability of the scale.

The conversational interview was also revised from a paper version to a

---

Pause and Ponder

- As a classroom teacher, how do you typically determine the reading motivation of your students?

- What have you done to support the reading motivation of your students?

- What benefits might you derive from giving the Motivation to Read Profile–Revised (MRP-R) three times per year (beginning, midpoint, end)?

- What might you learn from the conversational interview that would help you to understand an individual student's motivational needs?

- How might the MRP-R be used with students demonstrating high, average, and low motivation?

digitally accessible version that could be completed using a laptop or tablet. The structure was adjusted to first query self-concept as a reader and then value of reading to more clearly align with the survey items. In addition, questions were added to prompt students to indicate their use of digital texts while maintaining the original focus on reading for entertainment (narrative) and for information (expository). An area at the bottom of the interview form is provided for recording comments and a teacher plan for adjustments in instruction that would be suitable based on the integrated results of the survey and interview.

The structure of the MRP-R is overviewed in Figure 1.

Field Testing the MRP-R

The reading survey was administered to students in three schools in the mid-Atlantic and Southern regions of the United States—one in Virginia, one in Pennsylvania, and one in South Carolina. In all, 118 third graders, 104 fourth graders, and 54 fifth graders received permission to take the MRP-R, resulting in 281 students. Teachers were invited to participate and received packets that outlined the administration procedures and scoring guidelines (Figures 2 and 4) as well as copies of the MRP-R reading survey and conversational interview (Figures 3 and 5) for their students. Student scores were loaded into a spreadsheet and validity and reliability testing was

Figure 1	MRP-R Component Overview
Motivation to Read Profile – Revised	

Reading Survey	**Conversational Interview**

• Group administration
• 15 – 20 minutes
• 20 minutes
• Cued Response
• Two subscales
    ○ Value of Reading
    ○ Self-Concept as a Reader
	• Individual administration
	• 15 – 20 minutes to administer
	• Open-ended free response
	• Two subscales with prompts
	    ○ Value of Reading (8 prompts)
	    ○ Self-Concept as a Reader (5 prompts)

conducted using Mplus statistical software.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability testing using Cronbach's (1951) alpha revealed an $\alpha = .87$ for the full scale, an $\alpha = .85$ for the value subscale, and an $\alpha = .81$ for the self-concept scale. As the scale for the survey items was ordinal, a nonparametric analysis was used to determine validity using a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). An RMSEA estimate of .089 was revealed with a confidence interval of .081–.098. The probability of RMSEA $\leq = .05$ was .000.

Considering the ordinal nature of the survey scale, reliability and validity estimates are judged to be well within acceptable ranges for both classroom use and research purposes. When compared with the original version, the internal consistency of the value scale increased from .82 to .85, and the internal consistency of the self-concept scale increased from .75 to .81. As the scale is administered more widely and the volume of

available data increases, the authors can undertake additional testing that would allow a disaggregation of data by grade and by gender.

Administering the MRP-R

The reading survey can be administered to a whole class or small groups. The conversational interview is to be administered individually.

Administration and Scoring of the Reading Survey

The reading survey can be administered in whole or in part, depending on the age of the students and time limits. In all, the teacher should allow 20–25 minutes to give the entire survey or 15 minutes if giving 10 items at a time over 2 separate sessions. The teacher can introduce the survey by previewing the importance of knowing what motivates students to read such that appropriate instruction can be provided. Students should be made aware that there are no right or wrong answers and that knowing what they really feel about reading is of greatest importance. The administration guidelines for giving the MRP-R reading survey are provided in Figure 2.

The survey begins with two demographic items (grade and gender) that will help students practice listening to the entire prompt and the possible responses before considering

"The reading survey can be administered to a whole class or small groups. The conversational interview is to be administered individually."

Figure 2   Administration Guidelines for the Reading Survey

Motivation to Read Profile – Revised
Administration Guidelines

Preparation

- ✓ Be sure that you have enough copies of the survey for your class.
- ✓ Decide upon how to seat students so that their privacy is ensured when entering answers onto their forms.
- ✓ Have students clear their desktops except for a sharpened pencil.

Distribute the Survey

- ✓ Distribute copies of the reading survey. Ask students to write their names on the line provided.
- ✓ Ask students to fill in the date on the line provided.
- ✓ Ask students to fill in the teacher's name on the line provided.
- ✓ Please read each item two times aloud, even for higher grade levels. It's important that reading ability is not a complicating factor when responding to the items.

Introduce the purpose of the survey. Say:

I am going to read some sentences to you.
I want to know how you feel about reading.
There are no right or wrong answers.
I really want to know how YOU honestly feel about reading.
Your answers will help me to make reading more interesting for you.
I will read each sentence twice.
Do not mark your answer until I tell you.
You can mark your answer by checking the box that is best for you.
The first time I read the sentence, I want you to think about the best answer for you.
The second time I read the sentence, I want you to fill in the space beside your best answer.
Be sure to mark ONLY ONE answer.
Remember: Do not mark your answer until I tell you.
OK, let's begin.

Administer Sample Items
Use sample items A and B to demonstrate how the numbered items will be administered. Monitor the class for understanding of directions.

Say:

Let's practice listening and then marking with the first two items, A and B. Listen and follow along as I read Item A [point to where Item A is on your copy].
I am in [pause] second grade [pause] third grade [pause] fourth grade [pause] fifth grade [pause)] sixth grade.

Remember – you're thinking, not marking yet. You're just thinking of what is right for you.

Monitor the class for understanding. Then read Sample A again. **Say**:

This time, as I read the sentence, mark the answer that is right for you.
I am in [pause] second grade [pause] third grade [pause] fourth grade [pause] fifth grade [pause] sixth grade.

Check that students have marked their papers correctly and clearly. Demonstrate what a clear marking would look like if necessary.
Read the second sample item the same way. **Say**: *Now let's try Item B:*
I am [pause] a boy [pause] a girl [pause]. Remember – you're thinking and not marking!
This time, when I read the sentence, mark the answer that is best for you.
I am [pause] a boy [pause] a girl.
Any questions? [pause to answer questions]. Ok. Let's go on to item number 1...

Administer the Numbered Items 1 – 20

Read the remainder of the items as above – first for thinking and the second time for marking.
Be sure to be clear about what item number you are on (in case students lose their place).
Move around the classroom as you read the items to monitor understanding.
When all items have been administered, collect the surveys and set them aside for scoring.

their answers. When the teacher rereads the item and prompt, students are instructed to clearly mark the response that is best for them. By reading all items and responses aloud, students of all reading levels are supported in responding to the items, as reading ability is not a confounding variable. The student version of the reading survey is provided in Figure 3.

After the surveys are administered, a score for each subscale, value of reading and self-concept as a reader, is obtained. Adding the two subscale scores derives a *total score* for motivation for reading. Because the response sets are not uniformly listed from least to most motivated, a scoring guide is provided (Figure 4) to aide in determining the appropriate score for each item. The teacher may wish to make a note of items that would be interesting to probe during the conversational interview (particularly low scoring items) by circling the item number.

Administration of the Conversational Interview

The conversational interview is designed to guide the teacher in conducting informal conversations with students about their perceptions of reading. A copy is provided in Figure 5. These responses are helpful in understanding a student's survey results as well as to aid in individualizing programs to enhance motivation for reading. The conversational interview can also be administered in whole or in part, as there are separate sections for self-concept as a reader and value of reading. Each section requires about five minutes. The interview includes topical questions with follow-up prompts, such as the following: "What kinds of books do you

Figure 3   Reading Survey

MOTIVATION TO READ PROFILE - R

Name:_____Date:_____

Teacher: _____

A. I am in _____.

- ❒ 2nd grade
- ❒ 3rd grade
- ❒ 4th grade
- ❒ 5th grade
- ❒ 6th grade

B. I am a _____.

- ❒ boy
- ❒ girl

1. My friends think I am _____.

- ❒ a very good reader
- ❒ a good reader
- ❒ an OK reader
- ❒ a poor reader

2. Reading a book is something I like to do.

- ❒ never
- ❒ almost never
- ❒ sometimes
- ❒ often

3. When I come to a word I don't know, I can _____.

- ❒ almost always figure it out
- ❒ sometimes figure it out
- ❒ almost never figure it out
- ❒ never figure it out

4. My friends think reading is _____.

- ❒ really fun
- ❒ fun
- ❒ OK to do
- ❒ no fun at all

5. I read _____.

- ❒ not as well as my friends
- ❒ about the same as my friends
- ❒ a little better than my friends
- ❒ a lot better than my friends

6. I tell my friends about good books I read.

- ❒ I never do this
- ❒ I almost never do this
- ❒ I do this some of the time
- ❒ I do this a lot

7. When I am reading by myself, I understand_____.

- ❒ everything I read
- ❒ almost everything I read
- ❒ almost none of what I read
- ❒ none of what I read

8. People who read a lot are _____.

- ❒ very interesting
- ❒ sort of interesting
- ❒ sort of boring
- ❒ very boring

9. I am _____.

- ❒ a poor reader
- ❒ an OK reader
- ❒ a good reader
- ❒ a very good reader

like to read?" "Do you read different things at home than at school?" "What kind of reader are you?"

Research and Classroom Implications

The scientific importance of the MRP-R is that it permits an updated and more reliable estimate of two theoretically based subconstructs of motivation for research purposes in grades 2 through 6. Teachers will benefit from having a reliable measure for assessing these important components of motivation for reading. The classwide results can be entered into a spreadsheet, and an item-wise tabulation of averaged scores per item can be used to suggest changes in classroom practices that would support growth in value of reading or to nurture self-concepts as a reader. Additionally, the scores for individual students can be used to determine personalized plans for supporting students in developing increased motivation for reading and therefore increased reading achievement.

Organizing Responses

Using a spreadsheet, such as Excel, create headings for each item by number and list students' names in the first column (see Figure 6). Using the scoring guidelines to determine the score for each item, write the score in the margin beside the item number on the student copy of the reading survey and then input the scores into the spreadsheet. Adding the odd-numbered items together will give you a self-concept

"The scores for individual students can be used to determine personalized plans."

Figure 3   Reading Survey *Continued*

10. I think libraries are _____.

❐   a really great place to spend time
❐   a great place to spend time
❐   a boring place to spend time
❐   a really boring place to spend time

11. I worry about what other kids think about my reading _____.

❐   a lot
❐   sometimes
❐   almost never
❐   never

12. I think becoming a good reader is_____.

❐   not very important
❐   sort of important
❐   important
❐   very important

13. When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read,_____.

❐   I can never think of an answer
❐   I almost never think of an answer
❐   I sometimes think of an answer
❐   I can always think of an answer

14. I think spending time reading is _____.

❐   really boring
❐   boring
❐   great
❐   really great

15. Reading is_____.

❐   very easy for me
❐   kind of easy for me
❐   kind of hard for me
❐   very hard for me

16. When my teacher reads books out loud, I think it is _____.

❐   really great
❐   great
❐   boring
❐   really boring

17. When I am in a group talking about books I have read, _____.

❐   I hate to talk about my ideas
❐   I don't like to talk about my ideas.
❐   I like to talk about my ideas
❐   I love to talk about my ideas

18. When I have free time, I spend_____.

❐   none of my time reading
❐   very little of my time reading
❐   some of my time reading
❐   a lot of my time reading

19. When I read out loud, I am a _____.

❐   poor reader
❐   OK reader
❐   good reader
❐   very good reader

20. When someone gives me a book for a present, _____.

❐   I am very happy
❐   I am happy
❐   I am unhappy
❐   I am very unhappy

score (out of 40), and adding the even-numbered items will give you a value score (out of 40). You can create a formula in Excel that will add the subscores automatically as you enter the scores. Similarly, a total score is determined by adding the two subscores together.

A helpful practice, once all scores are entered, is to highlight in yellow any items that receive a low score (such as a 1 or a 2) to see what can be learned from those items. For example, if a student reports a 1 for item 16 ("When my teacher reads books out loud, I think it is [*boring*]"), you might want to explore the types of books that the student finds interesting during the conversational interview. If several students respond similarly, you may choose to implement a practice by which you preview several books for potential read-alouds and then have students vote on choices. It is also interesting to look at items for which boys and girls respond differently as a group.

Looking across the spreadsheet at individual student responses gives you an idea of items to explore on the conversational interview for each student, while observing trends in low scores classwide (by column) would give you an indication of whole-class needs. For example, noting a group of students who respond with a 1 to item 3 ("When I come to a word I don't know, I can [*never figure it out*]"), a reading group can be designed to work on word-attack skills.

Using the MRP-R to Inform Instruction

Considering the body of research that connects and supports the relationship between motivation and reading proficiency (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2005; Pintrich, 2003; Taboada, Tonks, Wigfield, & Guthrie, 2009), taking the motivational temperature of your class, and identifying the motivational makeup of individual students in your

Figure 4 Scoring Guidelines for the Reading Survey

MRP-R Scoring Guidelines

In order to increase the reliability of student responses, the items are variably scaled. Some items have the responses listed in order from *least motivated* to *most motivated* (scored 1-4) and others have responses that are listed in order from *most motivated* to *least motivated* (scored 4-1).

To support you in scoring items correctly for input into the spreadsheet and for calculating the *Self-Concept* subscale and the *Value* subscale, please use the following table to guide you.

Compare the student's response (first through fourth response selected) with the item numbers below to determine the score for that item.

Item Number	1st response	2nd response	3rd response	4th response
1 SC	4	3	2	1
2 V	1	2	3	4
3 SC	4	3	2	1
4 V	4	3	2	1
5 SC	1	2	3	4
6 V	1	2	3	4
7 SC	4	3	2	1
8 V	4	3	2	1
9 SC	1	2	3	4
10 V	4	3	2	1
11 SC	1	2	3	4
12 V	1	2	3	4
13 SC	1	2	3	4
14 V	1	2	3	4
15 SC	4	3	2	1
16 V	4	3	2	1
17 SC	1	2	3	4
18 V	1	2	3	4
19 SC	1	2	3	4
20 V	4	3	2	1

class are key elements in developing instruction that meets the needs of all of your students. Just as an informal reading inventory or benchmark assessment gives you a read on the pulse of what your students can do or already know, a quick check of their motivation at the beginning and midpoint of the school year may guide you in tailoring instruction that will support student motivation and engagement in literacy learning.

Supporting Self-Concept as a Reader.
Self-concept as a reader arises from students' task-specific perceptions of being able to successfully negotiate the various aspects and processes of reading, such as decoding new words, using comprehension strategies effectively, and expressing their thoughts about what they have read. As Solheim (2011) suggested, "[t]he level of self-efficacy affects how much students understand of the texts they read but probably also the degree to which they are able to demonstrate what they have actually understood" (p. 22). A student who has a healthy self-concept as a reader is more likely to approach the reading tasks with enthusiasm and interest, to engage in strategic reading practices, and to be interested in sharing what he or she has read (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2005; Pressley, 2002). Therefore, understanding a student's self-concept as a reader prepares the teacher to provide the support required for engaged reading.

The odd-numbered items in the reading survey indicate the students' perceptions of themselves as readers and provide information regarding the aspects of reading that may prove troublesome for some. Item 3, for example, asks students to decide how easily they can figure out new words, and items 7 and 13 tap into perceptions of reading comprehension. Low scores for these items might suggest that individual or small-group follow-up is important to further isolate the difficulties experienced in decoding or comprehension strategy use that might lead to these perceptions of low self-efficacy for these tasks. Further exploration during the conversational interview might also be helpful in developing specific teaching plans for supporting these students.

Item 17 states, "When I am in a group talking about books I have read, I [*hate*; *don't like*; *like*; or *love*] to talk about my ideas." Some students feel they

"Understanding a student's self-concept as a reader prepares the teacher to provide the support required for engaged reading."

Figure 5   Conversational Interview

Motivation to Read Profile-Revised:
Conversational Interview

Student Name: Date:

Reading Survey Scores: SC = _____/40   V = _____/40   Total = _____/80

Self-Concept as a Reader		
	1. What kind of reader are you?	
	2. What's the easiest thing about reading?	
	3. What's hard about reading?	
	4. What do you have to do to become a better reader?	
	5. How could teachers help you become a better reader?	

Comments:

Plan:

Value of Reading		
	1. What kinds of books do you like to read? • Tell me about them (topics/genres/information and/or narrative?)	
	2. Do you read different things at home than at school?	
	3. What kinds of things *other than books* do you read at home? (pause for students to respond) • eBooks (Kindle, Nook, iPad, etc) • Computer/laptop/iPad, etc • Internet (what do you do online?) • Communication? (e.g. email, IM, Blog, Twitter, Facebook, post, chat)	
	4. How do you find out about books you might like to read?	
	5. What books do you want to read now?	
	6. What could teachers do to make reading more enjoyable?	
	7. Is it important to learn to read well?	
	8. What kind of reading will you do when you're an adult?	

Comments:

Plan:

succeed in developing a general understanding of a story or a topic but feel less than adequate in expressing these interpretations. Low scores on this item, particularly if seen in several students, might indicate a need to provide more explicit instruction and modeling in how to talk about and respond to text. As collaboration about texts has been found to be a motivating element of instruction (Christie, Tolmie, Thurston, Howe, & Topping, 2009; Reznitskaya, 2012), supporting students in talking about shared texts bolsters their motivation.

Students may perceive their ability to read silently as very different from their ability to read aloud. Item 19 provides a window to student perceptions of reading aloud, and low scores here might suggest some need for development of oral reading fluency, such as Readers Theatre, or practicing a piece for recording a VoiceThread or Podcast book recommendation.

Value of Reading. The idea of reading as something that is valued, either an activity or as a goal, stems from the work of Eccles (1983) in developing the expectancy-value theory of motivation. The value of participating in a reading task is related to how personally interesting it is, how important the task is deemed to be, and how the successful completion of the task serves future needs. Therefore, if students feel that reading is interesting because they enjoy being absorbed or informed by text (reading as an activity), or think that becoming a good reader will help them in their future careers (reading as a goal), they will more likely engage and persist in the reading task presented. Students who are interested in reading for these intrinsic, or personal, reasons will likely be more open to instruction and development (Pressley, 2002).

Figure 6 Example of Excel Spreadsheet for Reading Survey

Name	1 C	2 V	3 C	4 V	5 C	6 V	7 C	8 V	9 C	10 V	11 C	12 V	13 C	14 V	15 C	16 V	17 C	18 V	19 C	20 V	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total
Art	4	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	4	2	2	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	2	3	32	32	64
Bri	3	2	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	3	3	4	3	27	20	47
Cho	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	35	38	73
Josh	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	36	36	72
Juan	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	23	18	41
Kit	4	3	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	1	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	34	29	63
Class	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	27	25	51

Note. Low-scoring items (1s and 2s) are highlighted; additionally, 1s are bolded.

The even-numbered items on the reading survey target students' perceptions of value of reading. Some of the items query a student's thoughts about individual or recreational reading (items 2, 14, 18, and 20), and others look at reading as a social practice (items 4, 6, 10, and16). Students who indicate low scores on the "reading as an individual practice" items may benefit from an independent reading program that guides students in finding personally interesting books at a "just-right" reading level. Often, students find reading to be a dissatisfying activity when they cannot find books on topics they enjoy at a level that they can independently read. Again, following up low responses on the survey with targeted questions in the conversational interview regarding reading interests and preferences can position the teacher to modify practices or provide suitable texts to support individual reading.

Similarly, the items that explore reading as a social practice (text discussions, social views of reading and readers, libraries as resources) may guide teachers in adjusting or modifying classroom practices to influence the value students place on reading as a socially mediated practice. For example, if several students in the class respond to item 10, "I think libraries are_____," with *"a really boring place to spend time,"* then the teacher should carefully consider ways that students use the library. Creating authentic purposes for using the library, such as for individual research, creating an individualized text set of books and materials on a topic of personal interest, and instituting collective practices such as reviewing books for potential classroom library acquisition or student-led book clubs, would create a value for the library as a personal and community resource.

Reading can also be valued as an achievement goal that is important to a student's future perspective. In this sense, becoming a good reader is valued because it can lead to a career or professional interest. Items 8 and 12, in particular, indicate a student's perception that becoming a good reader is valuable to their future goals. A student who is interested in extreme weather professions, such as tornado chasing or hurricane predicting, may develop an increased value for the goal of becoming a good reader by being exposed to meteorological reports. The conversational interview is a valuable tool for discovering a student's personal and professional interests such that targeted reading activities can be developed that would support interest in reading as an activity as well as a valued achievement goal.

Motivation Assessment as a Classroom Practice

Assessing the individual and collective views of students regarding their value of reading and self-concept as readers is a classroom practice that supports effective teaching, group planning, and individual instruction. Ideally, the MRP-R can be administered at the beginning of the year for the teacher to take the initial pulse of the class and to influence both whole-group topics and small-group needs. The MRP-R can be given again at midyear break to check for changes in motivation and to determine the efficacy of practices put in place after the initial administration. A final check at the end of the academic year provides feedback regarding program modifications and individual student interventions that may inform potential adaptations in the following school year. In all, the classroom teacher can develop an expanded view of student, group, and classwide student needs with very little investment of time, even with three administrations of the MRP-R per year.

Understanding the clear ties between motivation and achievement, and given the highly variable

"In all, the classroom teacher can develop an expanded view of student, group, and classwide student needs with very little investment of time."

ability levels, interests, and learning backgrounds of students, the effective classroom teacher integrates all available knowledge of students to design engaging and comprehensive instruction. The MRP-R is a tool available to teachers that will guide them in developing instructional practices that

support students in becoming engaged and strategic readers for both personal and academic literacy needs.

TAKE ACTION!

1. Create a file that contains the reading survey spreadsheets and conversational interviews of your students (either digital or hardcopy). The conversational interview has a place to enter the reading survey scores and also room for comments and planning. Refer to this information when developing new units of study and also when determining flexible reading groups so that students' motivational needs can be considered.

2. Use the planning section of the conversational interview form to note specific changes in grouping, topics, texts, or practices that you implement. At the next administration of the MRP-R, refer back to your notes and record any changes in motivation. This will help you to evaluate the effectiveness of your modifications.

REFERENCES

Applegate, A.J., & Applegate, M.D. (2010). A study of thoughtful literacy and the motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 64*(4), 226–234.

Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(4), 452–477.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York, NY: General Learning.

Case, R., & Khanna, F. (1981). The missing links: Stages in children's progression from sensorimotor to logical thought. In K.W. Fischer (Ed.), *New directions for child development* (Vol. 12, pp. 21–32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Christie, D., Tolmie, A., Thurston, A., Howe, C., & Topping, K. (2009). Supporting group work in Scottish primary classrooms: Improving the quality of collaborative dialogue. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 39*(1), 141–156.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297–334.

Eccles, J.S. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behavior. In J.T. Spencer (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motivation* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco, CA: W.H. Freeman.

Gambrell, L.B., Palmer, B.M., Codling, R.M., & Mazzoni, S.A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 49*(7), 518–533.

Guthrie, J.T., & Wigfield, A. (2005). Roles of motivation and engagement in reading comprehension assessment. In S.G. Paris, & S.A. Stahl (Eds.), *Children's reading comprehension and assessment* (pp. 187–213). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marinak, B.A., & Gambrell, L.B. (2010). Reading motivation: Exploring the gender gap. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49*(2), 129–141.

Nitko, A.J. (1983). *Educational tests and measurement: An introduction*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Pintrich, P.R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(4), 667–686.

Pressley, M. (2002). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced reading* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.

Quirk, M., Schwanenflugel, P.J., & Webb, M. (2009). A short-term longitudinal study of the relationship between motivation to read and reading fluency skill in second grade. *Journal of Literacy Research, 41*(2), 196–227.

Reznitskaya, A. (2012). Dialogic teaching: Rethinking language use during literature discussions. *The Reading Teacher, 65*(7), 446–456.

Shaaban, K. (2006). An initial study of the effects of cooperative learning on reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and motivation to read. *Reading Psychology, 27*(5), 377–403.

Solheim, O.J. (2011). The impact of reading self-efficacy and task value on reading comprehension scores in different item formats. *Reading Psychology, 32*(1), 1–27.

Taboada, A., Tonks, S.M., Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J.T. (2009). Effects of motivational and cognitive variables on reading comprehension. *Reading and Writing, 22*(1), 85–106.

Urdan, T., & Schoenfelder, E. (2006). Classroom effects on student motivation: Goal structures, social relationships, and competence beliefs. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 331–349.