STARS

2018

Exploring High Performing Second Grade Students' Reading Achievement and Time Spent on i-Ready with Their Motivation to Read.

Chloe Webb
University of Central Florida

EXPLORING HIGH PERFORMING SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' READING
ACHIEVEMENT AND TIME SPENT ON I-READY WITH THEIR MOTIVATION TO
READ.

by

CHLOE WEBB
M.Ed. Reading Education, 2018

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning and Leadership
in the College of Education and Human Performance
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2018

Major Professors: Vassiliki Zygouris-Coe and Michelle Kelley

ABSTRACT

The motivation to read plays a key role in any student's reading development and success. In the context of 21st century literacies and learning, students engage in reading with print and digital texts and read in traditional and multimodal settings. This situated thesis explored the topic of second grade students' motivation to read through the lens of reading performance and time spent reading and improving their reading skills using i-Ready. Fourteen second grade students in a Central Florida elementary school classroom received the Motivation to Read Profile- Revised (MRP-R) (2013), an established survey, that is designed to gauge elementary school age students' motivation to read. In addition, the researcher selected the top 25% students who showed progress in reading using i-Ready results from Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic 2 and conducted one informal conversation interview about their motivation to read. The MRP-R (2013) data was analyzed using elementary statistics in the areas of reader self-concept and value of reading. The informal conversational interview data was analyzed in terms of themes in the area of value of reading—i.e., other sources/books students like to read, if they like to read electronic sources or print ones, and what they read when they use the Internet. In summary, this study may guide myself as a teacher, and potentially other teachers, to make connections between what students are motivated to read and selecting text(s) for them to read when on i-Ready. The ultimate value of this study lies in guiding teacher instruction and decisions to maximize student motivation to read. The results from this study showed that the group that spent the most time was more positively motivated to read than the remaining second graders. However, the group that showed the most growth was not more or less motivated to read.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr. Vassiliki ("Vicky") Zygouris-Coe. Thank you for your time, encouragement, and constant positivity which allowed me to complete this marathon. I am also grateful for my committee co-chair Dr. Michelle Kelley, and committee member Dr. Taylar Wenzel, for their insight, support, and help they extended in making this work come together.

I would like to express my thanks for my friends in cheering me on, offering me kind words, and helping when they could. Finally, I would like to thank my parents, and sister for their continuous support of this process and all my endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Currently, many educators are devoting planning and instructional time to technology-based programs that teach and reinforce necessary skills to help students succeed academically. The academic areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics are typically targeted by these programs since these areas are heavily assessed by standardized tests. As of June, 2017 over ten percent of the nation's students enrolled in grade K-8 are currently utilizing the i-Ready program, that is 4.4 million students (Curriculum Associates, 2017). In my experience, schools are focusing grade level planning and data meetings on the data that is provided by i-Ready, as well as creating teacher and student incentives for passing lessons and meeting the weekly allotted goals for time spent in the i-Ready program. In some situations, teachers are strongly encouraged to utilize the data collected by the i-Ready diagnostic assessments to inform instruction and form small instructional groups. The i-Ready program is able to provide teachers the information they need to differentiate instruction, close learning gaps, and demonstrate a year's growth using their three diagnostic assessments; beginning of the year, middle of the year, and end of the year (Curriculum Associates, 2017).

Many schools are devoting their time and resources to implementing i-Ready in order to see students grow and succeed. Every day students are striving to make a year's growth, and while it is positive to see students making learning gains, one may be left wondering if the use of this program encourages students to pick up a book and read for their own pleasure? i-Ready's different websites, promotional materials, and instructional resources focus on their ability to fill

in the gaps in students' reading development (Curriculum Associates, 2017), but do not address the program's impact on reading motivation. Effectiveness reporting from i-Ready suggest that students should spend a minimum of 45 minutes per week on i-Ready in order to impact achievement gains, and educators are utilizing many outlets in order to ensure students are reaching their i-Ready goals. Through i-Ready's publications and press releases, they have stated and shown their ability to effectively increase students' reading achievement on their program as well as standardized assessments (Curriculum Associates, 2017; Regional Business News, 2015), but with the implementation of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative led by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) (NGA & CCSSO, 2010), students need more than just the skills required to read and perform at the appropriate levels; they need to be positively motivated to read (Guthrie, & Post, 2014). This relationship between CCSS and motivation proposes an intriguing concept that has not yet been explored; the motivation to read of students who are performing and spending their required amount of time on i-Ready.

Educators, specifically elementary educators, spend large portions of their time teaching reading, whether it is teaching how to read a book (the phonetics, decoding, and encoding), how to read a math problem, or teaching reading strategies and thinking processes specific to other subject areas. With the introduction of the CCSS, reading standards have been altered, and now require students to developmentally progress towards college and career readiness, elevating the literacy expectations of K-12 students. In order to master each of the CCSS, students have to be able to think and work critically beginning in kindergarten and ending in twelfth grade. Students should be learning the CCSS through problem-based and hands-on learning. In English Language Arts (ELA) students would collaborate with their peers and use multiple sources in

order to research and solve real-world problems, this problem-based style provides students with practice using reasoning and applying their knowledge (Barrows, 1980), which is a change from previous standards whose questioning style was simple and focused mostly on recall. The CCSS required more in-depth questioning stems (Eubanks, 2014).   i-Ready has claimed its effectiveness in helping students meet the needs of the CCSS, but these standards require a large amount of reading motivation in order for students to have the interest and stamina to tackle increasingly complex texts. With this knowledge of the elevated expectations of students, motivation to read is imperative for reading success. This would lead educators to wonder if students who show success with CCSS through i-Ready are also exhibiting those higher levels of reading motivation.

In addition to the CCSS, the introduction of technology has drastically changed our classroom environments and therefore reading instruction through the emphasis on digital literacy, adaptive testing, and blended learning (Cook, 2013). Students are spending more time interacting with technology, and we are using programs to help differentiate instructional and fill in any gaps that the student may have in their learning (Curriculum Associates, 2017). i-Ready has stated that its program is effective at both showing student growth and cutting down on assessment time by offering one assessment that is given three times a year (Curriculum Associates, 2017). In Canton, Ohio, a school district found that the i-Ready programs were able to decrease the amount of assessments used throughout the school year. Additionally, they found that as the states average scores of third grade students Fall Reading Assessments declined eight percentage points, the district in Ohio that utilized i-Ready saw an average of six percentage points growth on the Fall Reading Assessments (Regional BusinessNews, 2015). The instructional coaches at my school have shared that i-Ready resembles the Florida Standards

Assessment (FSA) in its diagnostics' structure and style, making it desirable for educators to use. Students on i-Ready practice reading and taking assessments on the computer which is useful in a world full of technology.

Education has been altered by the introduction of technology (Cook, 2013). The International Literacy Association's (ILA) *What's Hot Report* (2017), recognized that digital literacy is among the top 5 hot topics in both the community and the country (ILA, 2017). Technology use for literacy purposes is a topic of national interest and needs to be addressed due to its potential impact on classroom teaching and learning. According to Hiller Spires from North Carolina State University, digital literacy is comprised of three ways to use digital content: finding and ingesting, creating, and sharing digital content (Heitin, 2017). Students who use i-Ready are reading and interacting with different videos, activities, and games in order to learn different literacy skills in the areas of phonological awareness, phonics, high-frequency words, vocabulary, comprehension: literature, and comprehension: informational text (Curriculum Associates , 2017).

As a result of the prevalence of computerized literacy programs, such as i-Ready, that are used as part of reading instruction and reading interventions in elementary classrooms, and also due to new educational standards that call for the incorporation of technology in classrooms, teaching and learning has been evolving. Nevertheless, the basis upon which we teach reading has not changed as the key concepts remain: concepts of print, phonological awareness, phonics, word recognition strategies, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Educators need to take into account that teaching these facets of reading can be more productive when a student has a positive drive to read and interact with text (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). For students to be meaningfully engaged with reading and learning in today's classrooms and adequately prepared

to meet the demands of new educational standards, we need to ensure that reading instruction

motivates students to read (Guthrie & Post, 2014).

Background of the Problem

In the various data-driven publications sent from Curriculum Associates, i.e. press

releases, training guides, and website resources (Curriculum Associates , 2017), the creators of

the i-Ready program primarily focus on providing useful teacher resources and products, proper

implementation, and additional features that are available to purchase. The effect the program

has on whether or not it fosters a love for reading in young students is not included. A student's

motivation to read and success in reading are closely related (Guthrie, 2004), therefore if i-Ready

leads to learning gains and reading success, then one would conclude it should also affect a

student's motivation to read. Previous research has proven that students who are intrinsically

motivated to read are more successful at their academic reading tasks (Becker, McElvany, &

Kortenbruck, 2010). The hope is that the learning gains made in i-Ready should be motivating

our students to learn how to read, thus increasing their intrinsic motivation to read. In my own

experiences, the motivation behind a student succeeding in i-Ready comes from the extrinsic

motivators a teacher tethers to his or her success. Teachers praise students in unique ways for

passing their lessons in i-Ready, gaining points on their i-Ready diagnostic, and completing their

required amount of minutes. According to Curriculum Associates (2017), students are able to

make a year's growth and show sufficient mastery of standards if they are using the program for

a minimum of 45 minutes per week, as well as passing lessons with a minimum of a 70% pass

rate. In many instances, teachers are reinforcing success in lessons, diagnostics, and

instructional usage by creating extrinsic rewards. Some rewards that are used at my school

include ringing a bell for every lesson passed, and displaying stickers in the hallway for every

week that instructional usage minutes are met. Regardless, the drive to succeed in i-Ready is not necessarily tied to students' motivation to read; it seems that their motivation to succeed is more focused on pleasing their teacher and on gaining extrinsic rewards.

Many teachers agree that the goal of reading instruction is to create lifelong learners, lying underneath each of our reading lessons is a push towards instilling within the students a positive motivation to read (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). With this common goal, and our knowledge of how students reading motivation can positively effect their academic performance in literacy, are there any connections between a student's achievement on the i-Ready program and his or her motivation to read?

Statement of the Problem

Successful i-Ready implementation requires teachers to invest classroom and planning time to reach i-Ready instructional usage goals and interpret the data for the purpose of improving instruction. In many schools, students are also spending significant amounts of time on the i-Ready program. Since there is research evidence on the relationship between reading motivation and reading achievement, on both informal and formal assessments (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015) i-Ready achievement and formal assessment achievement, it is worth investigating any connections between i-Ready achievement and students' motivation to read. As students' progress through i-Ready lessons, teachers are encouraged to check in to see what additional interventions are required to assist children with the mastery of reading standards (Curriculum Associates , 2017). It is important to examine how common reading interventions are used by teachers in the classroom and how such interventions influence students' motivation to read.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory study was to look at second grade students' motivation to read in relationship with their achievement, as well as their time spent on i-Ready. This chapter includes information about the educational significance of the study, research questions, definition of terms, limitations, and delimitations.

Educational Significance of the Study

Students in grades kindergarten through twelfth grade spend time on the computer (45 minutes and more a week), learning i-Ready lessons in phonics, phonemic awareness, comprehension, high frequency words, and vocabulary. i-Ready allows a student to progress through different lessons at their own pace, demonstrating their mastery of reading skills as they work. Working through lessons is supposed to provide students with the tools they need to be successful in reading (Curriculum Associates, 2017), but i-Ready does not mention anything about its aimed goal to increase students' motivation to read. We know that teachers agree on the importance of motivating students to read (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). What is i-Ready's impact on students' motivation to read? In many classrooms where i-Ready is used, students work on various aspects of reading as they spend time going through lessons that address their reading needs. Although students are gaining new reading knowledge and skills, does that knowledge translate into picking up a book to read or being motivated to continue to read? If the high performing and instructional usage students do not have a high motivation to read then perhaps in addition to intervening with i-Ready instruction when a student fails a lesson, we could provide motivational interventions and create methods to connect the i-Ready lessons to children's literature and guide our students to establish a more positive relationship with reading.

Research Questions

This thesis aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the motivation to read of second grade students who have spent high amounts of time on i-Ready?

2. What is the motivation to read of second grade students who have high achievement on i-Ready?

3. Is there a difference, in the motivation to read, of second grade students who spent high amounts of time on i-Ready and the remaining second graders?

4. Is there a difference, in the motivation to read, of second grade students who were high performing on i-Ready and the remaining second graders?

Definitions of Terms

The following terms were operationally defined for the purpose of this study.

Digital Literacy- An individual's finding, consuming, creating, or communicating through digital texts (Heitin, 2017).

i-Ready- An adaptive program that differentiates reading instruction in the style of lessons that follow a developmental plan, individually designed for each students reading needs.

Reading Achievement- Reading achievement as perceived on i-Ready is making 46 points growth in a year or 23 points in half a year (Curriculum Associates, 2017).

Reading Engagement- When a student is actively involved in reading a text.

Reading Motivation or Motivation to Read- The amount which a student is driven to read.

High time spent on i-Ready- When instructional usage is ranked from highest to lowest identifying the top 25% of students utilizing the i-Ready program.

High performing student on i-Ready- When ranked from highest to lowest, the top 25% of students who showed progress on i-Ready.

Limitations

The nature of this study included several limitations. Two limitations include the sample selection and the sample size. The sample size was small and only represented a localized small student population. The i-Ready program is utilized throughout the state of Florida and the across nation in grades K-12; the participating study population only represents a small group in comparison with the whole. Another limitation is that only one motivation survey, the i-Ready Growth Report, and the i-Ready Instructional Usage report were used as data sources. Motivation is a multi-faceted part of reading and my survey did not directly assess each of these areas of motivation. Since I, the researcher, am also the general education teacher who interacts with the participants and the i-Ready program on a regular basis, researcher bias is also a limitation due to my personal connection to the students, the data, and the program implementation. Students' motivation to read may have also been affected by outlying factors. In my experience, i-Ready is implemented for 46 minutes per week in Reading and teachers can either incorporate the program into center rotations, assign students a specific day to complete his or her minutes, or take advantage of the 40-minute block of lab time once per week to allow students to reach their goal. This structure and expectations do not reflect the conditions in every school, district, or the state. All of these methodological limitations prevent the results of this study from being generalized to other related student populations.

Delimitations

Student participants were required to meet the following inclusionary criteria:

1. Students were enrolled in my second grade reading class.

2. Students must have placed in the top 25% of growth between the beginning of the year i-Ready diagnostic and middle of the year i-Ready diagnostic; based on the i-Ready Student Growth Report.

3. Student participants must be in the top 25% of the i-Ready instructional usage based off the i-Ready Instructional Usage report.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed in this chapter has been organized to focus around research associated with the following topics: (a) Reading Instruction for Early Readers; (b) Motivation to Read; (c) Motivation to Read Profile; (d) Self- Efficacy; (e) Value of Reading; (f) Relationship Between Engaged Reading and Reading Performance; (g) Reading in the 21st Century; and (h) The i-Ready Program.

Reading Instruction for Early Readers

A child begins to develop their comprehensive ability to read at a young age, factors like exposure to text, having books read aloud to them, and conversations with adults have major implications on a child's beginning skills, which leads to their reading development. Children's development of literacy is also dependent on the child's own development, just as children learn to crawl at different stages of their physical development children will each develop oral and written language at their own speed. Variability in student's early literacy development and exposure to reading results in each student having their own set of strengths and weaknesses which require classroom teachers to implement a multitude of varying effective reading strategies into their daily literacy instruction (International Literacy Association [ILA], 2018).

Literacy instruction is a daily balance that shifts in order to encompass the needs of all learners. Instructional time needs to be an appropriate balance between phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, vocabulary, and writing instruction in order for students to successfully read and write. Reaching the goals set forth by the CCSS requires balancing students individual and different needs in the foundational skills as well as giving our students grade-level instruction and standards (Guthrie & Post, 2014). There are three reading models which reading

teachers take and change to fit their desired instructional needs. The Part-to-Whole model

focuses on first acquiring the phonics, and word recognition before going into reading short

stories, while the whole-part-whole model begins with a shared reading, followed by some

semblance of phonics, rhyme, or vocabulary based off the shared reading, and end with a class

discussion of the books plot, or concepts. The final approach is the comprehensive approach to

reading instruction. The students work with reading and writing about social studies, science, or

mathematical concepts. Due to how multifaceted reading is, it makes the decision of which

model is more effective an ambiguous one (DeVries, 2008).

Individual students have different sets of strengths and weaknesses, just as each teacher

has their own opinions and instructional structure in reading instruction. Teaching is not an

exact science due to this variability of both the students and the teacher, in order to create an

effective reading block that hits all the standards and reaches the high curriculum goals, we come

back to the idea of balance. The classroom reading instruction needs to reflect a balance

between the five fundamental components of reading determined by the National Reading Panel

(NRP) that are proven to be connected to students' reading success; the five reading components

are: phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (Shanahan, 2006).

In addition to the five fundamentals to reading success, a student must be motivated to read in

order to effectively complete reading tasks related to new educational standards (Guthrie &

Post, 2014).

Motivation to Read

A consensus among teachers and the International Literacy Association (ILA) is that our

jobs, first and foremost are to instill a love of reading in students of all ages. Specifically now in

the age of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), it is imperative that students are motivated

to read in order to complete literacy tasks that come at such a high command (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). While balancing the rigorous materials, students personal interests, and engagement in reading tasks educators walk a fine line between hitting the complexity level required of the standard, while still making students feel confident in themselves and showing them the enjoyment that can come from reading a book. Reading motivation comes from an individual's drive to engage in or complete reading tasks (Gambrell, 2004). Students will complete literacy tasks when they are motivated to, whether they feel that motivation from intrinsic or extrinsic reasons. Students who engage in reading for the sheer joy of the reading process are reading for intrinsic reasons. Adversely, students who enjoy reading because of the result attained from reading (i.e., receiving a good grade, learning something new about a topic of interest) are extrinsically motivated (Schiefele et al., 2016). Extrinsic rewards do not benefit reading in the long term, a student could be motivated just to get a specific score, and will not continue reading once they have reached their goal or reward (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015).

According to Cambria and Guthrie (2010), a student's motivation consists of three main components; interest, dedication, and confidence. A student would be considered interested in reading if their motivation was intrinsic, or the student chose to read because they simply enjoy picking up a book and reading.   Actively engaged readers are considered interested, and/or intrinsically motivated in a reading task.   The second integral motivator for students to read is their dedication, even if students struggle through a text or reading activity, they can still perform well if they place value on the task. The third key component of reading motivation, as well as achievement, is a student's confidence. These reading motivators are essential for students to actively engage and comprehend a text to the extent of which the CCSS expects students to (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010). Students' motivation to read can be assessed by utilizing

trustworthy surveys; such as the MRP-R (2013), this tool focuses in on students self-concept and value of reading, which fall under the three main components of motivation to read (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013).

It is important to develop the motivation to read in the elementary aged students, this age range is pivotal in creating lifelong readers. When looking at elementary aged students, in general, the tasks and activities that we engage students in affect their long-term feelings towards reading. Specifically looking at kindergarten and first-grade students who are generally motivated to read, because they are learning the pieces that fit together and result in successful comprehensive reading (DeVries, 2008). Throughout early literacy years students are learning phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension and how to combine these five integral pieces of literacy in order to successfully comprehend a text. In the CCSS, the curriculum focuses not only on the ability to comprehend a text, but being able to take that comprehension a step further and critically think about their reading. This level of comprehension requires a level of reading engagement that is dependent upon a student's positive reading motivation (Guthrie and Post, 2014).

Motivation is imperative in our elementary students, students who struggle with reading from the beginning, are shown to continue that struggle throughout their academic career, while strong readers continue to get stronger and grow academically (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997). Motivation to read can stem from a multitude of different places. A survey completed in 2006 with fourth-grade students showed that students' source of motivation comes from their teachers, families (specifically mothers), or themselves (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Teachers play a key role in motivation and can employ different motivational practices in order to stem intrinsically motivated students. One practice that can help foster a positive reading motivation

within students is relevance. We can make a text relevant to students by utilizing texts that relate to their real-life, are relevant to their interests, or creating the interests ourselves. Other intervention types that catch students interest is allowing students choice in their learning, setting up students for their own personal successes, and providing students time to collaborate with their peers (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015).

With the introduction of new educational standards, students are expected to read and comprehend with more depth and a greater understanding. Students are able to achieve these tasks, but it takes teacher goal-setting across multiple reading units, along with the integration of science and social studies content areas (Guthrie & Post, 2014). With the incorporation of rigor and high expectations, for students and teachers, that came into our curriculum with the CCSS, many adjustments have been made, focusing on depth of knowledge question stems and standards mastery. Despite these changes, a majority of teachers still have a common goal for their students, which is to develop an intrinsic motivation for reading.

Motivation to Read Profile- Revised

The Motivation to Read Profile (MRP) was developed in 1995 around the concept that motivation is a central piece to effectively acquiring the required skill sets to read. Unlike surveys that came before it, the 1995 version combined both quantitative and qualitative data in order to further understand the students reading motivation (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1995). According to multiple research studies, motivation to read is tied to a student's academic success (Camrbia & Guthrie, 2010; Gambrell, 1996). The Motivation to Read Profile- Revised (MPR-R) was a revision that was based on the original survey created in 1995 (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013). The MRP was originally developed to gauge students motivation in terms of two main factors; self-concept and value of reading (Gambrell, 1995;

Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013).   The first part of the MRP-R (2013) includes 20

questions, each question has a point value of 1-4, one being the low option (does not like reading

or has low self-perception as a reader) and a four is the high option. The 20 questions are

separated into ten self-concept as a reader questions and ten value of reading questions. By

implementing a four-point Likert scale, both the MRP (1995) and MRP-R (2013) do not allow

for neutrality, students either do or do not agree with the statement pertaining to reading. This

allows administrators of the assessment to get a definitive perception of the students motivation

to read (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1995; Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni,

2013).

Reader Self-Concept

   A major indicator of students' motivation to read is their self-efficacy or self-concept.

This aspect is whether or not readers feel that the reading task is worth completing (Malloy et al.,

2017). One of the biggest indicators of the three motivational factors; interest, confidence, and

dedication, is their confidence in their reading abilities, making the self-concept portion of the

MRP-R (2013) a valuable classroom tool (Cambria & Guthrie, 2010). An example of a self-

concept question is "I read_____" with the following four answer options; "not as well as my

friends", "about the same as my friends", "a little better than my friends", and "a lot better than

my friends" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p.277).

Value of Reading

   Reader perception of the literacy task at hand has an impact on his or her motivation to

read (Malloy et al. 2017). Students' perception or, value, of the reading text or activity will

affect how engaged a student is with a text. The importance of the task weighs heavily on the

amount of effort put forth, therefore affecting the students literacy outcomes. An example of a

value of reading question from the MRP-R (2013) is, "People who read a lot are _____ [*very*

interesting, sort of interesting, sort of boring, very boring"" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, &

Mazzoni, 2013, p. 277).

Relationship Between Engaged Reading and Reading Performance

Reading engagement is the level to which a student is actively interacting with a text or

reading task (Guthrie, 2004). The ability to read with efficiency is contingent upon the drive to

read and perform. Gambrell (1996) defines the engaged reader as possessing four qualities;

motivated, knowledgeable, strategic, and socially interactive. In order to truly be engaged, the

reader must be motivated; whether they are motivated by learning new things or entering into a

world of fiction literature, there needs to be an active driving force behind the reader's task. For

years, researchers and teachers have been fascinated by reading motivation, specifically how it is

tied to reading achievement. Students who have a more positive attitude towards reading are

more likely to score higher on statewide exams than students who have a more negative attitude

towards reading (Martínez et al., 2008).

Of the three motivational factors defined by Gambrell and Morrow (2015), one key factor

is directly linked to students reading success, self-efficacy. A student's mindset regarding

reading ability will affect whether or not they want to read as well as their reading achievement.

Motivation to read is linked to confidence, and confidence is strongly connected to success

(Guthrie & Post, 2014).

When teaching reading comprehension, teachers should first look at the materials at hand

and see how they can truly engage students within that text by utilizing students choice,

challenge, control, collaboration, constructing meaning, and consequences (Reutzel & Cooter,

2011). It is imperative now, with the heightened expectations and reading goals, that teachers examine the reading task and find ways to motivate the student if they want them to be engaged and therefore successful in the reading task (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). There seems to be one theory that continues to hold true, and that is that students who are engaged in reading tend to perform better and have higher levels of reading achievement. Reading achievement can outweigh the typical socioeconomic status barriers that exist today. Reading engagement is an indicator of students' reading success (Guthrie, 2004).

The key factor to long-term reading success is intrinsic motivation (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). When it comes to reading, practice makes perfect could not be more prevalent. The more a student practices reading, and responding the better they will be at it, therefore a student that is motivated to read will be more engaged with the reading task. When they are more engaged they are able to connect with the text in the upper-level ways that the CCSS expect them to. In addition, when a student is intrinsically motivated to read, they choose to read for pleasure, implementing and refining their reading skills, building on their reading foundations and knowledge, which in turn creates a stronger reader.

Reading in the 21st Century

As technology is more readily available and a day-to-day part of society, classrooms are transforming from paper and pencil to technology-based. This shift is creating a visible change in our reading instruction due to the need for students to be technologically savvy and digitally literate. Digital literacy can be viewed as three different formats: finding and consuming, creating, and communicating. Consuming digital content is done in a multitude of ways. Interaction with digital literacy takes place when an individual just simply reads a book online. A step further, the next involvement level of digital literacy is when the piece of writing has

hyperlinks or other interactive links, so while reading the reader is reading they are able to interact with external links, videos, audio clips, and interactive images. A facet of the consumption of digital literacy is being able to find information online (Heitin, 2017).

Digital literacy includes more than just reading on a screen, students have to be able to interact with the technology at hand within a text and be able to go to different online sources in order to successfully work with a digital piece of literature. A key aspect of digital literacy that is required for future success in our digital world is the interactive component. Reading online is more than reading words on a screen, the reader must be able to utilize additional links i.e., videos, audio, and links to new articles. While reading online students also have to gauge the legitimacy of the source, deciding whether it is reliable or not. This skill combined with the links along the pages to additional articles, videos, audio clips, and media require additional steps for the students to properly utilize. (Valtin et al., 2016). That interactive component of online reading adds an extra level of comprehension, with the vastness of the internet students must be able to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate sources, as well as find additional legitimate sources (Reutzel & Cooter, 2011).

The prevalence of technology in today's classroom excites educators due to its' ability to allow for student-centered instruction. Technological devices with access to the internet provide classrooms with the ability to enact some of the most powerful learning models and practices; student choice, student-centered instruction, differentiation, just to name a few. The digital age offers a wealth of opportunities for classroom teachers to engage their students in the digital world and turn into digitally literate individuals (The Alliance, 2012). By creating a digitally rich classroom, teachers have a plethora of options for allowing students to work in a variety of

different means. The flexibility of the internet provides a place where teaching can be easily

differentiated by both student tasks and learning goals.

A blended learning model integrates different technologies into the classroom. The i-

Ready program is a key component in many classrooms blended models. When it comes to the

multifaceted digital literacy, i-Ready provides students with the opportunity to interact with a

text on a computer, and a program that requires a series of interactive lessons.

The i-Ready Program

The i-Ready program can be successfully implemented through a school's incorporation

of i-Ready's diagnostic assessments and both the combination of online and teacher-led

instruction. i-Ready prides itself on the ability to reduce students time spent on assessment i-

Ready diagnostics provide teachers with data in all the major areas of reading, from one

assessment teachers can see how their students are performing across the spectrum in reading. It

takes the major components of classroom assessment, and puts them all into the diagnostics. In

each i-Ready Diagnostic (taken at the beginning, middle, and end of the year) teachers receive a

report broken down into phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension;

informational, and comprehension; literature in addition to providing a Lexile measure for each

student. In order for students to be successful at i-Ready online instruction, teachers should

discuss student's scores with each of them, as well as make students reach 45 minutes of weekly

instruction. Teachers should intervene weekly when students are failing their online instruction.

i-Ready gives students two chances to pass a particular lesson, then it is the teacher's

responsibility to re-teach that specific skill to the student. Effective teacher-led instruction

suggests checking data weekly, reviewing diagnostic reports, and interventions based on Tools

for Instruction and Online Teacher Toolbox *(*Curriculum Associates, 2017).

In their teaching training book, i-Ready sets an immediate goal of providing teachers who implement i-Ready into their classrooms with less assessment and more instructional time in the classroom. i-Ready professes its ability to combine a multitude of assessments into one online assessment, the diagnostics which are administered three times a year. Diagnostics are advertised to only take approximately 45 minutes each time they are administered (Curriculum Associates,, 2017). i-Ready prides itself on its ability to help students close the gap in reading, identifying their weaker areas of reading, and focusing their lessons on those areas.

In the i-Ready training booklet that is handed out to all teachers at the beginning of the school year, it states that the students will be engaged in their lessons if they are invested in their own growth and learning (Curriculum Associates, 2017).

In 2017 i-Ready won the Stellar Service Award for their support and professional development that they offer for their teachers, administrators, and coaches (Waldron, 2017).

Conclusion

This chapter presented research on the topics of motivation to read, the relationship between engaged reading and reading performance, reading in the 21st century, and i-Ready. It also touched on aspects of digital literacy.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, the methodological approach, data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques relevant to this study are detailed. These procedures were chosen as a result of the design of the study with regard to the research questions to be answered. This study looked at the relationship between second graders' reading motivation and their time spent in i-Ready and their achievement on i-Ready.

The areas described in this chapter include the following: (a) Purpose of Study; (b) Research Questions; (c) Research Design; (d) Setting, Participants, and Sampling Procedure; (e) Sources of Data Collection and Procedures; (f) Procedures and Timeline; (g) Data Analysis; (h) Methodological Limitations and, (i) Chapter Summary.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this exploratory study was to look at second grade students' motivation to read in relationship with their achievement, as well as their time spent on i-Ready.

Research Questions

This thesis aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the motivation to read of second grade students who have spent high amounts of time on i-Ready?

2. What is the motivation to read of second grade students who have high achievement on i-Ready?

3. Is there a difference, in the motivation to read, of second grade students who spent high amounts of time on i-Ready and the remaining second graders?

4. Is there a difference, in the motivation to read, of second grade students who were high performing on i-Ready and the remaining second graders?

Research Design

This exploratory study used a mixed-methods research design (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). This mixed-methods research design included the following quantitative data: Motivation to Read Profile-Revised survey responses, i-Ready growth in points, and i-Ready time spent in minutes. It also included qualitative data derived from the (MRP-R) conversational interview (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013). The data collected from the survey was first studied by its quantitative aspect, then by the interview portion (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

Setting

This study took place in a second grade classroom at an elementary school in Central Florida. The school has 977 total students from Pre-K to fifth grade. The school is considered a "cluster" school and has a wide range of socioeconomic statuses represented since it pulls from a multitude of neighborhoods in the surrounding area. The 977 students that attend the school are demographically identified as 37.2% White, 31.3% Hispanic, and 20.6% African American. Approximately 60.6% of the school is on free and reduced lunch.

Second grade at the school has eight general education classes totaling one hundred sixty students; 5% are ELL (English Language Learners), 9% are tier 2 in reading, and 11% are tier 3 in reading. Tier 2 students are identified as performing below grade level in reading and receive additional support in their areas of weakness, typically a few days per week. Tier 3 is

performing below grade-level, has not responded to the tier 2 support, and now receives daily interventions to close learning gaps.

Participants

Fourteen second grade students in a single classroom in Central Florida participated in this study. The class had 18 total students, four chose not to participate. Students ranged in age from seven to eight years old. Fourteen percent of the participants were English Language Learners (ELL), 7% were labeled as having a Specific Learning Disability (SLD), 29% were labeled as Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and received Speech/Language services. Fifteen percent of the participants were receiving intensive tier 3 reading interventions and 5% of the class were receiving intensive tier 2 reading interventions. The participants consisted of eight girls (57%) and six boys (43%). Represented by the participants were the following ethnicities: five white (36%), two African-American (14%), four Hispanic (29%), one Asian or Pacific Islander (7%), and two Multi-racial (14%). Of the fourteen participants, eight (57%) qualify for the free and reduced lunch program.

High performing participants were identified utilizing the i-Ready Growth Report, and selected based upon the upper quartile for the entire class, which had eighteen students. These five students were selected and the participants represented the following demographics; 1 white (20%), 2 African-American (40%), 1 Hispanic (20%), and 1 Asian or Pacific Islander (20%). Of the participants, 20% received Speech/Language services (1 participant), 20% were SLD (1 participant), and 20% were ELL (1 participant). Sixty percent of the selected participants qualified for the free and reduced lunch program (3 participants).

Participants who were identified as spending high amounts of time on i-Ready were selected based off the upper quartile of the Instructional Usage report pulled on February 19.

This report showed the instructional usage of the eighteen students in the class between January 22 and February 18. The five participants who spent the most amount of time on i-Ready based off this report represented the following statistics: 2 Hispanic (40%), 1 African-American (20%), 1 white (20%), and 1 Multi-racial (20%). Twenty percent of the student population received speech services (1 participant). Forty percent qualified for the free and reduced lunch program (2 participants).

When pulling the two target quartiles, two participants were present in both the high achieving and high time spent groups. The remaining six were present exclusively in either i-Ready report. In total, eight students completed the conversational interview portion of the MRP-R.

Sampling Procedure

Participants were selected to participate in this study using both a purposive and convenience sampling method. Purposive sampling utilizes particular subjects from the population, who are selected due to their relevance in providing information about a topic (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). The sampling for this study is purposive because only subjects in a particular second grade class in Central Florida were selected to participate in this study. The second type of sampling was convenience sampling. Convenience sampling was chosen because it is a type of non-probability or non-random sampling; members of the target population had to meet certain practical criteria. These sampling methods were chosen to examine the relationship between students' reading motivation and time spent, as well as achievement, on i-Ready. Fourteen of the 18 students from the second grade class participated in this study. The students who performed in the top twenty-five percent of growth for the 18 students in the second grade class between i-Ready Diagnostic 1 (August 2017) and Diagnostic 2 (January 2018) were used to

represent students who achieved on i-Ready. The top twenty-five percent of students from the

eighteen students in the second grade class who spent high amounts of time on i-Ready between

January 22 and February 18 were used to represent the group that spent high amounts of time on

i-Ready Reading. Based upon i-Ready reports, two students were present in both high time and

achievement, resulting in eight students completing the conversational interview in total.

<div align="center">

Sources of Data Collections and Procedures

</div>

The following three instruments were used in this study: (1) the i-Ready Growth Report

see Appendix C (between Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic; (2), i-Ready Instructional Usage Report

see Appendix D (pulled on February 19th to get time spent over a four week span, from January

22 to February 18), and (3) Motivation to Read Profile-Revised (MRP-R) see Appendix B

(Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013).

The MRP-R, see Appendix B, strives to give educators an idea of their student's attitude

towards reading. The MRP-R is an effective tool for measuring student's motivation to read. It

includes a conversational interview which allows for further understanding of student results,

and specifically includes a question about other ways that students read outside of a book. The

survey focuses on areas of motivation that are pivotal in a student's reading success: self-concept

and value. A student's self-concept, or confidence, is one of the key motivators behind reading

success and is therefore a strong indicator of his or her level of motivation (Cambria & Guthrie,

2010). Value of reading, or interest in reading, is their view of reading. Knowledge of a

student's value of reading, is an insightful piece to their overall reading motivation because the

amount to which a student values reading is tied to their successful completion of a reading task

(Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013). Participating students (14) took the multiple

choice portion of the MRP-R. The students who showed the most growth between i-Ready

diagnostic 1 and diagnostic 2 (top 25% of the 18 students, n=5), and the students who spent the most instructional time on i-Ready (top 25% of the 18 students, n=5) continued to the conversational interview. The conversational interview includes two parts: self-concept and value. The conversational interview was designed to scaffold an informal conversation about a student's motivation to read; the interview is divided into five Self-Concept as a Reader and eight Value of Reading. The self-concept section begins with the question, "What kind of reader are you?" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 280), and guides the interview through questions about easiest and hardest things about reading, and ends with the students reflecting on how they could become a better reader. The value of reading question portion began by asking "What kind of books do you read?" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 280), and prompts students to explain what their reading is like at home in terms of technology and other forms of reading besides books. This portion of the interview also asks students about identifying books they might like to read, books they want to read now, and ways teachers can make reading more enjoyable. The final two questions are, "Is it important to learn to read well?" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 280) and "What kind of reading will you do when you're an adult?" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 280). The MRP-R (2013) assessments reliability tested at an alpha level of .87 for the total score, .85 for value, and .81 for the self-concept scale (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013). This revised version of the MRP-R (2013), see Appendix B, showed an increase in reliability in the scores for value and self-concept. The survey was originally administered to students in three schools in different regions of the United States. There were a total of two hundred eighty-one participants from grades three, four, and five (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013).

The i-Ready Growth Report, see Appendix C, was designed to show educators, coaches, and administrators the amount of knowledge that students gain between Diagnostic assessments. The top 25% of i-Ready achievers based off the eighteen students were selected by the growth that they displayed between diagnostic 1, taken between August 14th and August 31st, 2017, and diagnostic 2 taken between January 8th and January 31st, 2018. The top 25% were selected by pulling the i-Ready Growth Report. This report shows the students' score on Diagnostic 1 and compares it to their score on Diagnostic 2. It ranks the scores by most growth to least growth. One year's growth for a second grade student in i-Ready is defined as 46 points between Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic 3, so by this point in the year students are expected to have shown 23 points of growth between Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic 2 (Curriculum Associates, 2017).

The participants that represented time spent on i-Ready were selected based on the class Instructional Usage Report, see Appendix D, pulled from the i-Ready website. This report provides information on how many minutes the students spent on reading tasks during the current week, (a week in i-Ready begins on Monday and ends on Sunday), the last week, and the average for the past four weeks. I selected the top 25% of instructional usage students based on the average time spent from January 22 to February 18 to represent the students with the most time on task in i-Ready.

Procedures/Timeline

In August of the 2017-2018 school year, students took their first i-Ready diagnostic assessment. They completed their second diagnostic assessment in January 2018. I used the Growth Report that compared these two diagnostic reports in order to select my top performing 25% in i-Ready. Subsequently, I pulled the Instructional Usage Report on February 19th to see how much time on task the students spent on average; then I pulled the top 25% active students

based on the eighteen students in the class. In February 2018, the fourteen participating students completed the Motivation to Read Profile-Revised (MRP-R) (2013) survey. Each participant took the survey independently, however the instructions, questions, and answer choices were read aloud to them. The three high achieving, three high instructional usage, and two students present in both groups then completed the interview portion of the survey. The informal conversational interview was administered one-on-one with those specific students.

In February 2018, the participating students completed Motivation to Read Profile-Revised (MRP-R) survey, the survey portion was completed in two 15-minute sessions; the informal conversational interviews took approximately 10 minutes each. The i-Ready diagnostic assessments took between 45 minutes to approximately 2 hours to complete. Students are expected to spend a minimum of 45 minutes per week on task in i-Ready reading.

Data Analysis

The MRP-R uses a Likert Scale in the multiple-choice part of the survey and then has an open-ended question portion for the conversational interview. The participants' MRP-R scores were separated by the participants, value, self-efficacy, and total scores. The students who performed in the upper quartiles for time spent and achievement were then individually pulled and interviewed using the conversational interview from the MRP-R. The scores from the MRP-R were looked at in relation to their time spent on i-Ready, as well as their achievement on i-Ready. I utilized the Student Growth report (see Appendix C) from i-Ready which compares student performance on Diagnostic 1 (August 2017) with Diagnostic 2 (January 2018) to define the top 25% of students who achieved. I utilized the Instructional Usage Report (see Appendix D) from i-Ready which shows how much time on task students have spent on average in the past four weeks (between January 22 and February 18). The i-Ready program is equipped with

checkpoints to make sure that the students are actively participating, while students are engaged in i-Ready lessons they have to respond to a question or prompt every few seconds. This check in may be as simple as following a directional prompt, i.e. click an arrow, or is an academic question.

Each student enrolled in i-Ready takes three diagnostic assessments a year; specifically at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. Each grade level has its own benchmark of what is considered "on level" and " one year's growth". In second grade, a child is considered Level K (kindergarten) if they score between 100-418 points, Level 1 (first-grade) if they score between 419-488 points, Level 2 (second grade) if they score between 489-560 points, and Level 3 (third grade) if they score between 561-602 points (Curriculum Associates, 2017). Each student's score has their own standard deviation ranging from +/- 9 to +/- 12. The diagnostic test can last anywhere from 45 minutes to two hours depending on how the student performs. Students begin the diagnostic with a current grade-level equivalent question and adapts the test based on the student's answer. For example, if given a mid-2 (middle of the year second grade) question, and a student answers incorrectly they will get a lower level question (potentially an early-2 question). If the student answers correctly they will progress to a late-2 (end of the year second grade) question. The test continues to adjust between above and below the student's level until it finds the just-right level for the student. In the second grade, a year's growth is equivalent to growing 46 points between Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic 3. Therefore, in between Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic 2 students should have made 23 points of growth in order to be on track to make their required growth.

This exploratory study sought to determine the motivation to read for the top 25% of students who showed the most growth in i-Ready and spent the most time on task in i-Ready. I

looked at the students from the top quartiles of the i-Ready report separately, with its relationship to the MRP-R results. Two students were present in both the time spent, as well as, the achievement analysis.

Once all quantitative data was collected and analyzed, observations were made to draw conclusions about students' reading motivation and their time spent and/or achievement on i-Ready. Following the quantitative data analysis, the top performing instructional usage and performance groups were identified, and subsequently observations were made about students' motivation to read based on the high time spent and the remaining class participants, as well as high achieving and the remaining nine class participants.

Methodological Limitations

The nature of this study provided some methodological limitations. One limitation is that the sample size was small and only represented a small population. The i-Ready program is utilized throughout the United States of America in grades K-12 and my population only represents a small group in comparison with the whole.   The second grade participants are not representative of the entire second grade population in the school, state of Florida, or the Nation. Another limitation is that only one MRP-R, i-Ready growth report, and i-Ready instructional usage report were used. Motivation is a multifaceted part of reading and the MRP-R did not directly assess every area of motivation. Students' motivation to read may also be affected by outlying factors, as students grow as readers in the classroom many factors can affect their motivation to read. As parent involvement fluctuates, grade-level expectations escalate, and the general effects of the present classroom environment factor into students daily lives they are also creating potential consequences on students motivation to read. This study was also limited by its duration, as it only measured student success between Diagnostics 1 and 2, while all the

students have a third Diagnostic with its own set of goals. It also only looked at student's

motivation to read based on their time spent in February, and not each month that they actively

participated on the i-Ready program. An additional limitation is that only the top 25% of

students were studied, the middle and bottom performing/time on task students were not a part of

any deeper data analysis. Further limiting this study, was the researcher's role as both the

researcher and general education teacher. A final limitation is that the MPR-R (2013) is a self-

report survey and the students may have answered however they felt at the time; their self-

reported answers which may not accurately reflect their inner thoughts while reading.

Summary

This chapter presents the methodological approach, data collection procedures, and data

analysis techniques relevant to this study. Overall, the methods in this study were designed to

address questions concerning students' progress on i-Ready and their motivation using purposive

and convenience sampling. The main data collection used in this study was student's i-Ready

performance, instructional usage and a survey. The results are described in detail in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this exploratory study was to look at second grade students' motivation to read in relationship with their achievement, as well as their time spent on i-Ready. In this chapter, an analysis of the motivation to read of both the high achieving and high time spent students in my second grade class are presented. Participants were identified by using two i-Ready reports: Instructional Usage and Growth Report. All participants were given the Motivation to Read Profile- Revised (MRP-R) and comparisons were made between high time spent in i-Ready and high performance in i-Ready second graders and their class peers. The sections below present: (a) an overview of the results and (b) the results of the data analyses conducted to answer each of the study's four research questions.

Overview of Results

Each of the questions for the survey had four possible answer choices ranging from one to four points; one being the least motivated and four being the most. This scale does not allow for neutrality, the students either are or are not positively motivated to read. Participating students from my second grade class completed the MRP-R (2013) in the spring of 2018. Individually, I pulled the top five high time spent and top five high performing students to complete the conversational interview portion of the MRP-R, some participants were prevalent in both quartiles pulled resulting in eight students participating in the interview.

MRP-R survey results are based on a scale score of 20-80 for the total score and 10-40 for each sub section score (value and self-concept). The higher the score, the more positively students are motivated to read. The MRP-R showed that on average, the 14 participants had a level 3, or positive response for 90% (18) of the questions except two: questions 5 and 12.

Question 5 was a self-concept question that reads "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]* ", for this the students' average response was a 2. Question 12 was a value of reading question and read, "I think becoming a good reader is [*not very important, sort of important, important*, *very important]*" (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 278) and participants responded with a 4. Overall the average scores placed students in the positively motivated to read category. Participant G chose to omit question 18, a value of reading question, this question stated "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*]", (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 278).

Overall the entirety of the participating students had a higher value of reading average score than self-concept score. Table 1 shows the fourteen participating students responses on the MRP-R Survey.

Table 1 Participants Motivation to Read Profile Survey Responses

Name	1 SC	2 V	3 SC	4 V	5 SC	6 V	7 SC	8 V	9 SC	10 V	11 SC	12 V	13 SC	14 V	15 SC	16 V	17 SC	18 V	19 SC	20 V	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total
Participant A	3	3	4	2	2	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	34	30	64
Participant B	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	31	61
Participant C	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	22	34
Participant D	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	40	80
Participant E	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	3	3		1	1	20	19	39
Participant F	2	3	1	2	4	1	4	2	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	30	28	58
Participant G	2	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	3	3	4	24	34	58
Participant H	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	36	34	70
Participant I	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	26	28	54
Participant J	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	28	36	64
Participant K	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	30	37	67
Participant L	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	4	3	34	34	68
Participant M	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	27	30	57
Participant N	3	3	3	4	1	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	2	4	3	3	2	3	25	35	60
Participants Average	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	28	31	60

n=14

The results of the MRP-R, for students who spent the most time on i-Ready, shows that students on average responded with a "3" for 80% (16) of the questions and a "4" on the remaining 20% (4) of the questions; this represents an overall positive motivation to read. On average, the participants from this group had a higher value of reading score than self-concept score. The participants responded with an average of a level 4 response to questions 2, 9, 12, and 14. Questions 2, 12, and 14 are value of reading questions, while question 9 is a self-concept question; these strong motivation responses are reflected in this group of participants' strong value score, 33 out of a possible 40 points total. The results for the high time spent participants are displayed in Table 2, the remaining second graders responses are in table 3.

Table 2 High Time Spent Second grade Students' Motivation to Read Profile-Revised Reponses

Name	1 SC	2 V	3 SC	4 V	5 SC	6 V	7 SC	8 V	9 SC	10 V	11 SC	12 V	13 SC	14 V	15 SC	16 V	17 SC	18 V	19 SC	20 V	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total
Participant H	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	36	34	70
Participant L	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	4	3	34	34	68
Participant F	2	3	1	2	4	1	4	2	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	30	28	58
Participant B	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	31	61
Participant K	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	30	37	67
Group Mean	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	32	33	65

n=5

Table 3 Remaining Students' Motivation to Read Profile-Revised Reponses

Name	1 SC	2 V	3 SC	4 V	5 SC	6 V	7 SC	8 V	9 SC	10 V	11 SC	12 V	13 SC	14 V	15 SC	16 V	17 SC	18 V	19 SC	20 V	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total
Participant A	3	3	4	2	2	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	34	30	64
Participant C	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	22	34
Participant D	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	40	80
Participant E	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	3	3		1	1	20	19	39
Participant G	2	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	3	3	4	24	34	58
Participant I	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	26	28	54
Participant J	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	28	36	64
Participant M	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	27	30	57
Participant N	3	3	3	4	1	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	2	4	3	3	2	3	25	35	60
Participants Mean	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	26	30	57

n=9

The students who had spent the highest amount of time on i-Ready responded positively to the survey as well as the conversational interview. Overall, the students were engaged while discussing their motivation to read and were able to have a discussion about their reading. Participant H, L, F, B and K are all performing on a second grade level both on i-Ready and in the classroom. They responded positively to discussing their reading and seemed interested in discussing the topics in the interview. When reflecting on the conversations with each

participant, Participant F's responses stood out the most due to this participant's lack of responses despite the researcher rephrasing questions and asking for elaboration. Participant F kept mentioning word meaning being difficult or how his teacher could help him to improve his reading skills. This student seemed fixated on a self-identified weakness in vocabulary when discussing his self-concept of reading. Throughout the self-concept portion, the student responded with vocabulary related answers to 4 out of the 5 questions. Participant K was excited and engaged during the interview. Participant K is an on level student who enjoys reading, particularly narrative stories and books about animals. This participant mentioned easy words and medium words in discussing what kind of reader she was. She provided "it" as an example of an easy word and "appreciate" as an example of a medium word. Participants L and H were present in both the high growth and high time spent group. Participant L enjoys reading fun books like *Junie B. Jones* and *The Cat in the Hat.* She would like to read hard chapter books like *Bad Kitty* and *Charlotte's Web.* Participant H restated many of the questions when answering the questions. Participant H likes to read chapter books like *Junie B. Jones*; she enjoys that these books are both funny and entertaining. Participant H believed that there was nothing a teacher could do to make reading more enjoyable because she already enjoys reading. Although this student did not have the highest MRP-R score out of the 14 participants, she did have the highest MRP-R scores for the survey and her conversational interview was very positive. Participant B was positively responding to the conversational interview. She was excited to explain the kinds of books that she likes to read, expressing how her favorite book character, Junie B. Jones does crazy stuff that makes the books dramatic. She describe Junie B. Jones as being both calm and crazy, making the books about her interesting to read. This particular respondent made comments about engaging in research on the computer as a form of reading and the kind of

reading that she will partake in as an adult. She was the only participant to mention doing

research on her computer and i-Pad. This student was excited to discuss her reading and

displayed a positive attitude towards reading. The participants' conversational interview

responses are listed in table 3.

Table 4 High Time Spent Motivation to Read Profile- Revised Conversational Interview Responses

	Participant H	Participant L	Participant F	Participant B	Participant K
SC 1. "What kind of a reader are you?"	"I think I am a very good reader"	"a good reader because I can figure out how to say the words on my own."	"an okay reader, because I don't know some of the words" clarified that it was word meaning"	"an okay reader because sometimes I struggle on words"	"A good reader because I read the easy and medium words"
SC 2. "What's the easiest thing about reading?"	"Answering questions and reading the words"	"Reading the title"	"The pictures, you can understand them easier."	"When you come to a big word that you know" (sound out and meaning)	"You can read easy words and words you already know."
SC 3. "What's hard about reading?"	"If there are different things that you don't know, then it takes you a while."	"Reading all the words (stamina)"	"Understanding the words, because I don't know the words" clarified, word meaning."	"When you don't know what a word means"	"Some hard words you don't know" clarified both decoding and vocabulary
SC 4. "What do you have to do to become a better reader?"	"I read books and learn new words"	"Read a lot at home, read a lot of hard books" defined hard books as chapter books"	"Read more"	"I don't know, learn new and practice words"	"Know what words and sentences mean. I can ask someone if I don't know the words"
SC 5. "How could teachers help you become a better reader?"	"Help me read bigger books and better words"	"Help with the meaning of hard words"	"Help me understand what words mean"	Help me read by reading harder stuff"	"Telling us what to do and how to do it"
V 3. "What kinds of things other than books do you read at home?"	"I sometimes read on my tablet." On the internet "uses i-Ready"	"Commercials" Uses the internet to "Watch videos", for communication "I text my mom when she is at work".	" I don't remember" On the internet, he just plays games.	"I use the computer and i-Pad for research"	"No, I don't read on the computer, I play games on the computer"
V 7. "Is it important to learn to read well?"	"Yes because as you get older you may not know what words mean"	"Yes, so you can get better at reading"	"Yes, so you can get smarter"	"Yes, because you can learn more things and work harder"	"Yes, because if you don't read well you won't know what the words or sentences mean."

The results of the MRP-R (2013) for students who showed the most growth between

Diagnostic 1 and Diagnostic 2 are listed in table 3. The group's average response was a "3" to

80% of the question, a "4" to 10% of the questions (questions 16 and 12), and a 2 to 10% of the

questions (questions 5 and 6). The responses of a "3" and a "4" are considered a positive

motivation to read. Participating high performing students showed a higher value of reading

score than self-concept score.   The results of the high achievement participants are displayed in

Table 4, the remaining second grade students are in table 5.

Table 5 High Achievement Second grade Students' Motivation to Read Profile-Revised Reponses

Name	1 SC	2 V	3 SC	4 V	5 SC	6 V	7 SC	8 V	9 SC	10 V	11 SC	12 V	13 SC	14 V	15 SC	16 V	17 SC	18 V	19 SC	20 V	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total
Participant H	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	36	34	70
Participant E	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	3	3		1	1	20	19	39
Participant N	3	3	3	4	1	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	2	4	3	3	2	3	25	35	60
Participant G	2	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	3	3	4	24	34	58
Participant L	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	4	3	34	34	68
Group Mean	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	28	31	59
n=5																							

Table 6 Remaining Second grade Students' Motivation to Read Profile-Revised Reponses

Name	1 SC	2 V	3 SC	4 V	5 SC	6 V	7 SC	8 V	9 SC	10 V	11 SC	12 V	13 SC	14 V	15 SC	16 V	17 SC	18 V	19 SC	20 V	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total
Participant A	3	3	4	2	2	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	34	30	64
Participant B	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	31	61
Participant C	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	22	34
Participant D	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40	40	80
Participant F	2	3	1	2	4	1	4	2	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	30	28	58
Participant I	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	26	28	54
Participant J	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	27	36	63
Participant K	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	29	37	66
Participant M	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	26	30	56
Participants Mean	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	28	31	60
n=9																							

The top 5 students who grew the most between i-Ready diagnostics discussed their

motivation to read through the MRP-R conversational interview. Participants E and N were very

short in their responses and despite rephrasing, or trying to clarify they did not provide much

clarity on their feelings towards reading. Participant E frequently referred to video games and

would try to discuss video games instead of reading. Participant E is performing at a level 1 on

i-Ready and is over a year behind the expectations of second grade. This student showed the

most amount of growth on the diagnostic, but is still not meeting grade level expectations.

Participant E responded with "I don't know" or "nothing" to a majority of the questions

(specifically 6 questions), even if the questions were rephrased or clarified. This participant were

more interested in discussing video games and tried to talk about them twice during the

interview. When this participant is an adult, he believes that he will have to read a menu and

was not able to identify anything else that he would read in adulthood. This student does not

have a positive motivation to read and recognized that he struggles with reading when he

responded that nothing was easy about reading. Participant N is currently in the school's ESOL

program and receives speech services. This student likes to read *Green Eggs and Ham*, and *The

Foot Book* because they are fun books and have a lot of feet. As an adult, this student stated that

they will read *The Foot Book*. Participant G showed high amounts of growth on i-Ready, and

showed a generally positive response to the survey. Participant G enjoys reading fun books, that

are mostly about animals. She was able to mention a lot ways that she reads other than books

when specifically asking about different technology-based ways of reading. Participant G was

not able to identify i-Ready as a method of reading on the computer, when additional prompts

were used after asking about reading things other than books at home. This participant has also

showed a lot of growth in the classroom as well as on i-Ready, beginning the school year over a

year behind and presently is almost on grade-level. Participants H and L were animated and

interested in discussing reading. These two participants are also performing on a second or third

grade level in i-Ready and are meeting the grade-level expectations in the second grade

classroom. These two were able to have a conversation about reading and discuss reading more

than the remaining three participants from the high growth group. Their survey responses are in

table 7.

Table 7 High Growth Motivation to Read Profile- Revised Conversational Interview Responses

	Participant H	Participant L	Participant G	Participant E	Participant N
SC 1. "What kind of a reader are you?"	"I think I am a very good reader"	"a good reader because I can figure out how to say the words on my own."	"an okay reader because I'm not as good as my mom but not as bad as bad readers"	"I don't know. I just play video games"	"I don't know. Reading is okay"
SC 2. "What's the easiest thing about reading?"	"Answering questions and reading the words"	"Reading the title"	"Reading the little baby things"	"Nothing"	"Sounding words out"
SC 3. "What's hard about reading?"	"If there are different things that you don't know, then it takes you a while."	"Reading all the words (stamina)"	"The words I don't get and don't know how to read"	"I forget where I was quickly"	" When there is a long word" clarified: meaning and sounding out
SC 4. "What do you have to do to become a better reader?"	"I read books and learn new words"	"Read a lot at home, read a lot of hard books" defined hard books as chapter books"	"Practice reading a lot"	*shrugs* "Practice reading"	"Practice, work on sight words"
SC 5. "How could teachers help you become a better reader?"	"Help me read bigger books and better words"	"Help with the meaning of hard words"	"Read to me a lot"	"I don't know, practice"	"Read out loud to me"
V 3. "What kinds of things other than books do you read at home?"	"I sometimes read on my tablet." On the internet "uses i-Ready"	"Commercials" Uses the internet to "Watch videos", for communication "I text my mom when she is at work".	"Food names, eBooks on an i-Pad, use the internet to help me read"	"Stuff on the TV or video games"	"Homework"
V 7. "Is it important to learn to read well?"	"Yes because as you get older you may not know what words mean"	"Yes, so you can get better at reading"	"Yes, cause when you grow up you will get a job and have to read" a contract	"Yes, to get a job"	"Yes because you have to read a test"

Research Question One: *What is the motivation to read of second grade students who have spent high amounts of time on i-Ready*

A Likert Scale was used for participating second grade students MRP-R survey responses to examine their motivation to read. Reponses with a score of level 1 represented a low

motivation to read and a 4 represented a high motivation to read. The results showed that students who spent a high amount of time on i-Ready had an overall positive motivation to read. More specifically, in their value of reading, the participants answered questions 2, 9, 12, and 14 with an average score of a 4. Questions 2, 12, and 14 fell into the value section of reading motivation, and question 9 fell into the self-concept category.

The conversational interview portion of the MRP-R was used to further understand the student's motivation to read. The students who spent high amounts of time on i-Ready all responded relatively positively to both the value and self-concept portions of the interview. When asked if it was important to learn to read well, all five students responded that it was important to read well, even if they did not have a reason why. The informal survey responses indicated that one student felt they were a very good reader, two felt they were good readers and two felt they were okay readers. Furthermore, only one respondent, Participant H, identified the i-Ready program as a method of reading. It took time discussing different ways we read on the computer for students to make the connection that they use the i-Ready program to read. Prompting began from question 3 on the value of reading portion, which questioned the participant's on other things they read other than books at home, once they responded I then inquired about other methods of reading at school, followed by reminding them that we read on the computers every day and then participants began to respond that they used i-Ready to read. These participants were all able to eventually acknowledge i-Ready as a form of reading. These five students are all above, on, or just slightly below level. Participant H currently has the highest i-Ready Reading score in the class. This participant loves to read, which can be seen in the survey response. When discussing other ways that people can read besides books, this participant offered a wealth of responses about the different devices she reads on and was able to

identify that they read on i-Ready. Participant H felt that there was nothing her teacher could do to make reading more enjoyable because she already likes reading. Additionally, this student felt that reading could be improved by working on bigger and harder words, which she clarified as being vocabulary. This student enjoys using a dictionary while reading and actively engages in reading books by taking notes and writing down questions. The participants i-Ready levels, survey responses, and conversational interview comments can be found in table 6.

Table 8 High Time Spent Participants Additional Information

Participant	SC Total	Value Total	Mot Total	MRP-R Conversational Interview Comments	i-Ready Level
Participant L	34	34	68	Self-identified as a good reader Wanted to work on stamina and the meaning of hard words to become a better reader Outside of books identified that she reads commercials	Early 2
Participant H	36	34	70	Self-identified as a very good reader Wanted to work on figuring out new words Recognized i-Ready as being a form of reading without prompting	Level 3
Participant F	30	28	58	Self-identified as an okay reader Found vocabulary to be the hardest part of reading Believes the pictures in books to be the easiest part of reading	Mid 2
Participant B	30	31	61	Self-identified as on okay reader Found word meanings to be the most challenging part of reading	Early 2
Participant K	30	37	67	Self-identified as a good reader Believed figuring out words you don't know in terms of meaning and decoding to be the hardest part of reading	Early 2

Participant H had the highest quantitative response to the MRP-R and was the most positively engaged during the conversational interview and enjoyed discussing reading. This student responded to each question with excitement. Participant L had the next highest response to the survey and was able to respond to each question confidently, even when she was unsure of questions, she still responded with a smile. Participant F had the lowest response to the survey portion and was rather melancholy while participating in the interview, offering the answers to the questions but not responding with enthusiasm. This student was rather lackadaisical in his responses and seemed impatient. His survey and conversational interview were very similar, he was not disinterested in reading, but also not responding with much enthusiasm. Participant B and K were very similar in their attitudes and responses. They seemed happy to be discussing reading and offered detailed responses during portions of their interviews.

Research Question Two: *What is the motivation to read of second grade students who have high achievement on i-Ready?*

As previously reported, the MRP-R uses a Likert Scale to examine the motivation to read of students in the areas of self-concept and value, and a total motivation score is obtained by combining these two scores. The high-performing students responded with a high motivation to read (response of a 3 or 4) for 90% of the questions and a low motivation (response of a 1 or 2) to read for 10% of the questions. Overall, this group had a positive motivation to read, and their scores reflected being more positively motivated in the area of value, then self-concept. The questions that received low motivation to read were equally representative of the self-concept and value sections for the survey. The two questions that received an average of a "4" were value of reading questions. Overall, these participants were positively motivated to read.

An informal conversational interview was also used to address the students' level of reading motivation. The interview consisted of 13 questions separated into two sections, self-concept as a reader and value of reading. In addition, the questions were designed to scaffold upon one another to pinpoint specific student awareness. Overall, this group of participants were indecisive during their conversational, specifically Participants E, F, and N. These three participants were not engaged in the interview responded with short responses that they often could not expand on their responses. Participant E stood out due to an overall score of 39 out of 80, and the omission of question 18. In fact, this participant was very disinterested in discussing reading, despite getting to spend some one-on-one time with the teacher. When asked questions about reading, this student identified reading prompts for video games as the main form of reading. Moreover, the respondent stated, "I don't know" for 6 out of the 13 questions. This participant also stated that "nothing" is easy when it comes to reading and learning to read. Finally, the participant shared that he does not spend any time outside of school reading books.

Of the five students representing the highest performing in the class, two felt that their teacher could help them become better readers by helping them with the meaning of big words. When asked about what kind of a reader the students thought they were one responded as an okay reader, one said very good, two did not know, and one responded with a good reader. A trend from all participants in this group was that they all felt it was important to learn to read well, showing a high value of reading. Participants N, G, E, and L responded that in order to become a better reader they had to read more or practice, but could not identify specific ways to become a better reader. The majority of the group (Participants E, N, and G) began the year reading well below grade level and showed high levels of growth thus far in the year. Although these participants have already made a year's growth as determined by the i-Ready program, they are still significantly below grade level. The only two students performing on a level 2 or above in i-Ready were participants L and H, whom were present in both high time spent and high performing upper quartiles.

Table 9 High Performing Participants Additional Information

Participant	SC Total	V Total	Mot Total	MRP-R Conversational Interview General Comments	i-Ready Level	i-Ready Growth
Participant L	34	34	68	Self-identified as a good reader Wanted to work on stamina and the meaning of hard words Identified commercials as a form of reading outside of books	Early 2	+45
Participant H	36	34	70	Self-identified as a very good reader Wanted to work on figuring out the meaning of new, big words Recognized i-Ready as being a form of reading	Level 3	+46
Participant E	20	19	39	Doesn't know what kind of a reader he is, because participant just plays video games Felt nothing is easy about reading Responded that tracking is the hardest part of reading	Level 1	+105
Participant N	25	35	60	Does not know what kind of a reader he is, but feels reading is okay Identified sounding out hard words and finding the meaning of those words as the hardest part of reading	Level 1	+44
Participant G	24	34	58	Self-identified as an okay reader Felt it was easy to read little baby things and it was hard to sound out new words	Level 1	+52

Participant E responded with short responses, no elaboration, and was disinterested during the interview. The only time this student was eager to respond was when he was able to mention video games. This student was not positively motivated to read and did not want to talk about reading. Participant E could not identify any books that he likes to read beyond cool books. With much prompting he later identified liking Captain Underpants books. This student had little interest in answering questions and would often just shrug and say "I don't know". Participant N was slightly more engaged than Participant E but struggled to elaborate on his responses. Despite prompting and probing, the student still responded curtly. This student lacked confidence in his response, often answering questions with apprehension, even when reassured that there were no right or wrong answers. Participant G believed that as an adult she would do

"good reading" and elaborated to define good reading as reading tiny print, cursive, or chapter books. This student enjoys reading and has worked hard this past year and made a fantastic progression towards mastery of second grade standards, despite beginning the year a year below level. Participant H appeared to enjoy the interview process and discussing reading, asking for clarification on questions and offering in depth responses without prompting required. She was passionate and attentive while responding to each question with unprompted elaboration. Participant L was also positive in her conversational interview, and overall confident in herself and her responses. At times, she was apprehensive, specifically in her responses to the value of reading section.. She was unsure about different things she read at home and at school, as well as different ways to learns about books. Participant L had a self-concept score equal to her value score, but while interviewing her she was much more enthusiastic in answer the self-concept questions than the value questions.

Research Question Three: *Is there a difference in the motivation to read of second grade students who spent high amounts of time on i-Ready and the remaining second graders?*

Likert scale survey responses were used to examine the potential differences in motivation to read of the high-performing students. Overall, data showed that there were differences in the motivation of students who spent the highest amount of time on i-Ready. Data showed that these students had a higher average self-concept score than the average of the remaining participants. High time spent students responded with an average response of a "3" for nine questions, and a "4" for one self-concept question, showing high amounts of confidence in their reading ability. Data showed that self-concept scores for the high time spent students were the most different from the averages of the participating students.

Ten questions were asked to determine how much the high time spent on i-Ready representatives value reading. Data reported that their value of reading score was higher than the average value score of the fourteen participants.

The students representing the high time spent, were students who are performing on or above a second grade level according to i-Ready. The overall average score showed that these students were very highly motivated to read. Overall, this group found that vocabulary was an area they would like to work on or struggled in. This group of participants as a whole, represent a group of above, on, or slightly below level students. All participants are currently working on second grade skills and no participants in this group were more than a year behind grade-level expectations at diagnostic 2. Participant H has the highest i-Ready score in the class, after diagnostic 2. Participant F had the lowest total score for this section, in conversationally discussing reading with this student, there was frequent mentioning of a lack of vocabulary skills. Participant F had spent a high amount of average time on i-Ready, but interestingly enough had the lowest amount of growth in the class, this participant was the only student who regressed between diagnostic 1 and diagnostic 2. Participant F felt that the inability to figure out word meanings was prohibiting his reading ability. This student mentioned that the pictures were the easiest part of reading because they assist in telling you what the words mean.

Research Question Four: *Is there a difference, in the motivation to read, of second grade students who were high performing on i-Ready and the remaining second graders?*

Likert survey responses were used to examine the motivation to read of the high-performing students. After analyzing the survey responses for both groups, no major differences were identified. On average, the students responded similarly to the majority of the questions, regardless if they spent a lot of time on i-Ready or achieved a lot of growth in the program. The

total scores in both the self-concept as a reader and the value of reading were basically the same. Interestingly enough, forty percent of this group, Participants E and N, are currently reading below grade level and are in danger of possible retention; yet they are making a great amount of growth on the program. Participant G stands out because he or she is high performing yet demonstrates a significant lack of self-confidence in his or her overall ability to read. Furthermore, this student is identified as having Specific Learning Disabilities and is receiving extra support services from school personnel. Overall, participants E, G, and N needed a lot of prompting and support to provide answers to the survey. Participants E, G, and N are currently performing at a first grade level and receiving Level 1 lessons (below level) from the i-Ready program. Participant E had the largest amount of growth in the entire school, yet is only performing at a first grade level. This participant also was disinterested during the survey, providing short comments and shrugging whenever prompted to elaborate. Participants E and G were unable to identify i-Ready as a form of reading on the computer. Participants H and L were present in both the high time spent and high achieving in the i-Ready program groups. Moreover, both participants H and L had the highest motivation to read and present in the top performing and high spent groups.

The participants that were exclusively prevalent in the high achievement group (E, G, and N) are currently performing below grade-level despite their large amounts of i-Ready growth. In addition, N and G were very short with their responses, not offering many comments on reading. They were disinterested in the discussing reading, showing that they are not positively driven to read. During the survey only Participants L and H were able to identify i-Ready as a form of reading, the remaining three participants did not mention that i-Ready was a form of reading on the computer, despite probing further during the conversational interview. Although Participant

52

E exhibited the most i-Ready growth, this participant had the second lowest self-concept score and the lowest value score (with an omitted value question) on the MRP-R survey. Participant E was the most indecisive and disinterested during the conversational interview.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this exploratory study was to look at second grade students' motivation to read in relationship with their achievement, as well as their time spent on i-Ready. The results were obtained through the MRP-R (2013). The data obtained in this study is not indicative of the student's i-Ready motivation.

Data reported that overall, the fourteen participating students were positively motivated to read. Students who were high preforming on i-Ready had a value, self-concept, and total score that was approximately the same as the participant's averages. The results from the MRP-R (2013) survey showed that students who spent high amounts of time in i-Ready were generally more positively motivated to read than the rest of the class population. This may be due to the fact that half of the MRP-R (2013) focused on students' self-concept of reading, and the particular students who spend more time on i-Ready might be passing more reading lessons, which could potentially lead to the students' feeling more confident in their reading abilities. More specifically, the students are provided with several opportunities to have access to the i-Ready program when they spend more time on the program. Students are required to go on i-Ready during ELA center rotations, can choose to go on first thing in the morning in lieu of completing an entry in their writing journal, and have an allotted amount of time in the Digital Learning Lab on a weekly basis. The students who completed more than the 45 minutes of i-Ready per week are doing so by choice, making this group of high time spent students a group of driven students who are potentially more invested in their reading development. The group that spent the most amount of time had the highest motivation to read. This group's quantifiable portion of their MRP-R (2013) result averages, were also noticeably higher than the class averages. In interviewing these students, I found that one student felt they were a very good

reader, two felt they were good readers, and two felt they were okay readers. All these students responded that they felt the hardest part of reading was identifying unknown words, with one of those students clarifying further by stating this meant in terms of both decoding and determining meaning; while the rest felt the hardest part was solely figuring out the meaning of unknown words.

In this study, students' reading motivation was quantified through the MRP-R (2013), the students were also able to express their opinions about their self-concept and value of reading through the conversational interview portion of the MRP-R (2013). Part of this study, focused on students who achieved the most between diagnostic 1 and diagnostic 2. The high achievement group of students had no difference from the class averages, not showing any significant difference in those two groups. Participant E was very unsure while responding to questions, showing very little interest in the survey and often responded with "I don't know". In fact, when questioned, the easiest thing about reading to this student was nothing. This particular participant also omitted a question on the survey. Participant E's self-concept score was the second-lowest in the class, the value score was the lowest (with an omitted value question), and overall had the lowest total score.

Methodological Limitations

The limitations of this study are as follows. First, the survey only measures a participant's self-concept and value of reading. Students' motivation to read is multi-dimensional and other areas of motivation could be addressed, as the three areas of motivation are interest, dedication, and self-confidence. This survey looked at the second grade student's confidence (self-concept) and interest (value) of reading, yet omits determining a participant's dedication to reading. Second, the sample was purposive limiting the sample population to

students enrolled in my second grade reading i-Ready class. Third, the sample size was small and does not represent all of the population that utilizes the i-Ready program. The i-Ready program is utilized in many districts and grade levels throughout the nation, and my participants did not accurately reflect this entire population. Additionally, the data collected from the MRP-R was self-reported. Self-reports rely on the honesty of participants and their understanding of the questions. Student participants' understanding of the questions may vary, and in turn, may affect how they respond to survey questions. Fifth, the researcher is the general education teacher for these participants. The researcher had a personal connection to the students which could interfere with the students' responses. Sixth, the study timeline also added to the methodological limitations: this study focused on students in the middle of the school year, rather than a full academic year. Another diagnostic will be taken in May to determine the students' end of year growth, and this growth report will determine the high growth students over the entire year. Utilizing this report could yield different results. Seventh, research was limited because the design of the study did not allot for interviewing all fourteen participants, just the top quartile of each group. Having conducted withal 14 participants would have allowed for a better insight into their motivation to read and would have made observations between the two groups more thorough. Finally, the survey itself was designed for students in grades two through 6, so perhaps using a survey designed for lower elementary students, specifically Kindergarten through second grade, would have yielded different results. At times during the conversational interview, the questions seemed to go beyond what the students could understand, specifically for the students who are presently performing below grade level. Based on methodological limitations, implications for future research are offered in the section below.

Implications

Reading motivation plays a significant role in the habits children develop as readers (Gambrell & Morrow, 2015). In our current technology driven classrooms, that use computerized literacy intervention programs such as i-Ready, it may be beneficial to begin connecting reading motivation strategies to online instruction. There are online reading instructional programs available that identify specific areas students are interested in reading, however, currently the i-Ready program is not designed to have students identify them at this time. Furthermore, though several students identified vocabulary, in particular determining meaning of unknown words, as an area of weakness, teachers are encouraged not to specifically add lessons in any one component of reading. Teachers are able to add lessons for students; however, during on-site professional development meetings, the i-Ready team discouraged classroom teachers from adding lessons as this could sway the overall adaptability measures already included in the program; thus altering the overall norm-referenced measures for each grade level. Teachers could also utilize the MRP-R in order to see where students feel they need to focus to become a better reader in order to give them additional support in these areas, if the i-Ready program still discourages from adding lessons. The students' inability to recognize i-Ready as a form of reading, also implores me as to what they view i-Ready as, in the future it would be interesting for classroom teachers to track students opinions of views of i-Ready to further drive their instruction. Since my student population did not realize this was reading until prompting, maybe explicit instruction on the purpose of i-Ready and how it could impact students reading may be beneficial in connecting the program to reading in the students eyes. Classroom teachers could also try and align their classroom activities to the lessons on i-Ready in order to create this connection for the students that i-Ready is reading. If time allowed, classrooms could incorporate other forms of digital literacy, asides i-Ready, in order to engage

students and build students digital literacy since the i-Ready program focuses on lessons, and not the students retrieval of information from the web. Teachers and schools can utilize more diverse digital literacy that allows for students to engage in online research and utilize programs to create additional experiences and practice with digital literacy.   More specifically, if given the opportunity and time were allotted to do so, students could be encouraged to explore other topics of interest and use the computer to find information on said topic.

An additional implication could be the presence of positive reading motivation interventions into the i-Ready program. Choice is a powerful factor of reading motivation, and as students' progress through i-Ready lessons, it could be helpful if the i-Ready program allowed students to choose certain aspects of their lessons. Students could choose between vocabulary or phonics, or potentially choose the topics of the stories or themes.

Implications for Future Research

As part of future research steps, I would revisit the administration of the survey, giving the survey several times throughout the school year, as suggested from Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell, and Mazzoni (2013), thus tracking student's motivation to read as they progress academically. Now that a group of high performing and time spent of students' motivation have been analyzed, an expansion can begin to look at students throughout the year, looking at how students change with regards to their motivation to read. I would specifically like to see a correlation between a student's motivation to read throughout the year when implementing the i-Ready program for the first time; pulling specific groups based on longevity of program use, i.e. looking at schools who have used the program for several years and comparing those students' motivation to read with those of a school who is implementing the program for the first time. Since groups representative of the top quartiles of growth and time spent have now been looked

58

at in terms of i-Ready, it would be interesting to look at upper and lower quartiles for based off an entire grade-level and not one specific classroom.

A limitation to this study was the sample size and sample selection. For future research purposes, it would be beneficial to increase the population size to better represent the population. i-Ready is used throughout the state of Florida, and the nation as well as in multiple grade-levels, so a larger sample that represented the entire population that utilizes the program would be beneficial for future research.

The high time spent group of students on i-Ready all felt that they needed to work in the area of vocabulary in order to become a better reader, which led me to wonder if these students are getting vocabulary lessons on i-Ready. When we discuss reading with students, and they are able to self-identify a weakness, it could be helpful for their self-concept of reading if they are receiving areas in this area that they feel they struggle in. In the future, it would be interesting to look into whether or not students are receiving support on i-Ready in the areas they feel they are weakest.

In addition, the administration of this survey could be considered a limitation as it was done by me, the classroom teacher. Students may have answered how they thought I would want them to answer, rather than answer honestly had someone more objective administered the survey. The personal relationship could skew some students' answers since certain questions were about the classroom and teacher. In the future, having the survey administered by another member of the school staff, a paraprofessional or coach, could ensure that students survey responses are truly representative of their self-concept and value of reading.

As classrooms continue to implement i-Ready, another area that would be intriguing to look into, is teacher perception of student performance in comparison with i-Ready student

performance. In the i-Ready publications they have shared their ability to predict student achievement on standardized tests; it would be an interesting to compare students i-Ready performance with teacher perspective to get a better picture of the student.

A final limitation, is whether or not the time spent on i-Ready is directly related to the number of lessons passed and if this affects a student's motivation to read. As they pass lessons are they more eager to read independently or do they simply want to stay on i-Ready because they are showing mastery in the program?

Conclusion

The purpose of this exploratory study was to look at second grade students' motivation to read in relationship with their achievement, as well as their time spent on i-Ready. Accordingly, this study examined the motivation to read of students who spent a high amount of time on i-Ready and high growth on i-Ready. Data were collected from the i-Ready program as well as the MRP-R. Overall, data showed that there are slight differences in motivation to read of students who spent a high amount of time on i-Ready and those that did not spend as much time in the program. The high spent time group had a slightly higher motivation to read. The high-achieving students showed an insignificant difference in their MRP-R results when looking at their scores against the class averages, although two students were disinterested in discussing reading during the MRP-R conversational interview.

APPENDIX A: APPROVAL LETTER

Approval of Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
          FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Chloe Webb**

Date: **March 25, 2018**

Dear Researcher:

On 03/25/2018 the IRB approved the following human participant research until 03/24/2019 inclusive:

Type of Review:	UCF Initial Review Submission Form
	Expedited Review
Project Title:	EXPLORING HIGH PERFORMING SECOND GRADE STUDENTS' S READING ACHIEVEMENT AND TIME SPENT ON I-READY WITH THEIR MOTIVATION TO READ
Investigator:	Chloe Webb
IRB Number:	SBE-18-13910
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

The scientific merit of the research was considered during the IRB review. The Continuing Review Application must be submitted 30days prior to the expiration date for studies that were previously expedited, and 60 days prior to the expiration date for research that was previously reviewed at a convened meeting. Do not make changes to the study (i.e., protocol, methodology, consent form, personnel, site, etc.) before obtaining IRB approval. A Modification Form **cannot** be used to extend the approval period of a study. All forms may be completed and submitted online at https://iris.research.ucf.edu .

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 03/24/2019, approval of this research expires on that date. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

Use of the approved, stamped consent document(s) is required. The new form supersedes all previous versions, which are now invalid for further use. Only approved investigators (or other approved key study personnel) may solicit consent for research participation. Participants or their representatives must receive a copy of the consent form(s).

All data, including signed consent forms if applicable, must be retained and secured per protocol for a minimum of five years (six if HIPAA applies) past the completion of this research. Any links to the identification of participants should be maintained and secured per protocol. Additional requirements may be imposed by your funding agency, your department, or other entities. Access to data is limited to authorized individuals listed as key study personnel.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

This letter is signed by:

Page 1 of 2

APPENDIX B: SEMINOLE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL APPROVAL LETTER

March 13, 2018

Chloe Webb
940 City Plaza Way – Apt. 230
Oviedo, FL 32765

Dear Ms. Webb,

I am in receipt of the proposal and supplemental information that you submitted for permission to conduct research in the Seminole County Public Schools. Thank you for very clearly delineating the required components of the research request. After a review of these documents, it has been determined that you are granted permission to conduct the study described herein.

Your project, *Exploring High Performing Second Grade Students' Reading Achievement and Time Spent on iReady with Their Motivation to Read*, is of interest to the district. Your first order of business is to confirm with Ms. Garcia that you have her permission to conduct research on her campus.

We look forward to receiving a copy of your results. Best of luck with your study!

Respectfully,

Anna-Marie Cote

Anna-Marie Cote, Ed.D.
Deputy Superintendent, Instructional Excellence and Equity

cc.   Dr. Marian Cummings, Executive Director, Elementary Schools
        Dr. Robin Dehlinger, Executive Director, Elementary Schools
        Mr. Shawn Gard-Harrold, Director, Teaching and Learning
        Ms. Martha Garcia, Principal, Bentley Elementary School

APPENDIX C: MOTIVATION TO READ PROFILE-REVISED (Malloy, Marinak, B, Gambrell, & Mazzoni, 2013)

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

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

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:

APPENDIX D: i-READY STUDENT GROWTH REPORT

Window 2 Average Scale Score	Average Scale Score Increase Achieved	Average Target Growth for One Year	Number of Students included in Report	Total Number of Students
488	+30	46	18	18

● Window 2 (K-7) - 01/08/2018 - 01/31/2018
● Window 1 (K-7) - 08/14/2017 - 10/06/2017

			Growth Data		
Scale Score			Growth	Target Growth for One Year	Grade
430			+105	46	2
325					
468			+52	46	2
416					
580			+46	46	2
534					
496			+45	46	2
451					
439			+44	46	2
395					
484			+39	46	2
445					
502			+35	46	2
467					
506			+29	46	2
477					
502			+29	46	2
473					

or a variety of reasons and are included in the aggregate growth as zero. See the report

75

APPENDIX E: i-READY INSTRUCTIONAL USAGE REPORT

Academic year: Current (2015-2016)
Select Students by: Teacher
School: Harrington Elementary

Teacher: MALONE, ANNMARIE
Class/Group: G-Period07 (Reading)

Back   Print/Save

Week of Monday 12/07/15 — Sunday 12/13/15
ANNMARIE MALONE (Reading)

Class Summary

	Last Week		Weekly Average for Last 4 Weeks			
1	% Active Students Meeting 45+ min of Instruction	Avg Time on Task (min)	% Active Students Meeting 45+ min of Instruction	Avg Time on Task (min)	# Students Using Instruction (active) ❓	Total Students
Overall	80%	42	74%	39	23	23

Student Detail

Students ⇅	Week to Date — Time on Task (min) as of last night 45 min goal ⇅	Last Week — Time on Task (min) 12/07/15 - 12/13/15 ⇅	Last 4 Weeks — Weekly Average Time on Task (min) 11/16/15 - 12/13/15 ⇅
BLESSING, DIANA	47	42	46
BUSH, MARC	38	40	37
CARR, SARAH	32	22	32
CASHNUM, ANTONIO	52	39	46
CRANDAL, REBECCA	41	40	40
DOMINIC, DANISHA	40	23	39
GROGAN, SAMUEL	23	13	25
JAMES, SAMANTHA	48	40	45
LOPEZ, SOPHIA	39	22	36

77

LIST OF REFERENCES

Barrows, H., & Tamblyn, R. (1980). *Problem-based learning: an approach to medical education*. New York. NY: Springer

Cambria, J., & Guthrie, J. T. (2010). Motivating and engaging students in reading. *The NERA Journal,* (46)1, 16-29.

Cook, K. (2013). Computers in the classroom. *Research starters: Education (Online edition.* Retrieved from https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?auth=shibb&url=http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ers&AN=89164130&site=eds-live&scope=site*,*

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability 10 years later. *Developmental Psychology*, *33*, 934-935.

Curriculum Associates. (2017, June 5). *Florida Department of Education approves Curriculum Associates' i-Ready diagnostic for grades 3-12 as a norm-referenced assessment for private schools* [Press release]. Retrieved from https://www.curriculumassociates.com/aboutus/Press-Release-FL-Dept-of-Edu-Approves-Curriculum-Associates-i-Ready-Diagnostic-Gr3–12-Norm-Referenced-Assessment-Private-Schools.aspx

Becker, M., McElvany, N., & Kortenbruck, M. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivations as predictors of reading literacy: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *2014*(4), 773-785. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020084

Blaisdel, P., DeYoung, J. Hutchinson, S., & Pedersen, S. (May 1999). *Encouraging recreational reading in the elementary grades.* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ERIC. (ED435975)

Curriculum Associates. (2017). I-Ready teacher training guide   Curriculum Associates, North
    Billerica, MA. Copy in possession of author.

DeVries, B. A. (2008). *Literacy assessment and intervention for K-6 classrooms*. Scottsdale, AZ:
    Holcomb Hathaway.

Edmunds, K. M., & Bauserman, K. L. (2006). What teachers can learn about reading motivation
    through conversations with children. *The Reading Teacher, 59*(5), 414-424.
    doi:10.1598/rt.59.5.1

Eubanks, J. (2014). Potential ramifications of common core state standards adoption on
    information literacy. *Comminfolit, 8*(1), 23. doi:10.15760/comminfolit.2014.8.1.16

Gall, M. D., Gall. J. P.,& Borg, W. R. (2007*). Educational research*: *An introduction* (8th ed.).
    New York, NY: Pearson.

Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading
    Teacher, 50*(1), 14-25.

Gambrell, L. B., & Morrow, L. M. (2015). *Best practices in literacy instruction*. New York: The
    Guilford Press.

Gambrell, L. B., Palmer, B. A., Codling, R. M., & Mazzoni, S. A. (1995). Assessing motivation
    to read. Instructional Resources. Athens, GA.

Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Teaching for literacy engagement. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*(1), 1–
    29.

Guthrie, J., & Post, M. C. (2014, May). Student motivation the key to achieving CCSS goals:
    Marcie Craig Pose and John Guthrie talk about the new IRA bridges curriculum units.
    Reading Today, (5), 4.

Heitin, L. (2017, December 08). What is digital literacy? Retrieved from

      https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/11/09/what-is-digital-literacy.html

i-Ready. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.i-ready.com/

International Literacy Association. (2018). *What effective Pre-K literacy instruction looks like*.

      Retrieved from https://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/where-we-

      stand/ila-what-effective-pre-k-literacy-instruction-looks-like.pdf

International Literacy Association. (2017). *What's hot in literacy: 2017 report.* Retrieved from

      www.literacyworldwide.org

Jacobs, J. E., Lanza, S., Osgood, D. W., Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Changes in

      children's self-competence and values: Gender and domain differences across grades one

      through twelve. *Child Development,* 73, 509-527 doi:0009-3929

Kosanovich, M., & Verhagen, C. (2012, June 14). Building the foundation - a suggested

      progression of sub-skills to achieve the reading standards: foundational skills in the

      common core state standards. Retrieved from

      http://www.centeroninstruction.org/building-the-foundation---a-suggested-progression-

      of-sub-skills-to-achieve-the-reading-standards-foundational-skills-in-the-common-core-

      state-standards

Malloy, J. A., Marinak, B. A., Gambrell, L.B., & Mazzoni, S.A. (2013). Assessing motivation to

      read. *The Reading Teacher*, *67*(4), 273-282. Doi: 10.1002/trtr.1215

Malloy, J. A., Parsons, A. W., Marinak, B. A., Applegate, A.J., Applegate, M. D., Reutzel, D. R.,

      Parsons, S. A., Fawson, P. C., Roberts, L. D., & Gambrell, L. B. (2017). Assessing (and

      addressing!) motivation to read fiction and nonfiction. *The Reading Teacher*, *71*(3), 309-

      325. Doi: 10.1002/trtr.1633

Martin-Beltrán, M., Tigert, J. M., Peercy, M. M., & Silverman, R. D. (2017). Using digital texts vs. paper texts to read together: Insights into engagement and mediation of literacy practices among linguistically diverse students. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *82*, 135-146. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2017.01.009

Martínez, R. S., Aricak, O. T., & Jewell, J. (2008). Influence of reading attitude on reading achievement: A test of the temporal-interaction model. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(10), 1010-1023. doi:10.1002/pits.20348

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards*. Washington, DC: Authors.

O'Donnell, A. (2017, August 21). Overcoming the digital divide, step one: Increasing funding for technology and internet access [Blog series]. Retrieved from https://www.literacyworldwide.org/blog/literacy-daily/2017/08/21/overcoming-the-digital-divide-step-one-increasing-funding-for-technology-and-internet-access

Regional Business News. (2015). Plain local school district improves student outcomes using curriculum associates' i-Ready and Ready programs. Retrieved from http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/plain-local-school-district-improves-student-outcomes-using-curriculum-associates-i-ready-and-ready-programs-300100703.html

Reutzel, D. R., & Cooter, R. B. (2011). *Strategies for reading assessment and instruction: helping every child succeed*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Rob Waldron. (2017, December 11). Retrieved from https://fortwaynebreakingnews.com/stories/NjM4ODM5MDk/curriculum-associates-wins-a-2017-tech-andamp-amp-learning-stellar-service-award/

Schiefele, U., Stutz, F., & Schaffner, E. (2016). Longitudinal relations between reading

    motivation and reading comprehension in the early elementary grades. *Learning and*

    Individual Differences, 51, 49-58. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2016.08.031

Shanahan, T. (2006). The national reading panel report: Practical advice for teachers. Retrieved

    from www.learningpt.com

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral

    research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

The Alliance. (2012, May 31). Culture shift: Teaching in a learner-centered environment

    powered by digital learning. Retrieved from https://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/culture-

    shift-teaching-in-a-learner-centered-environment-powered-by-digital-learning/

Valtin, R., Bird, V., Brooks, G., Brozo, B., Clement, C., & Ehmig, S. (2016, March). European

    declaration of the right to literacy. Retrieved from http://www.eli-net.eu/about-

    us/literacy-declaration/