

The Effects of Teacher Praise on Motivation in Literature Circles in the EFL Classroom

Aaron Valdis Gauss 高加州

National Taitung University

Abstract

While a number of studies have investigated the effects of Literature Circle on Taiwanese EFL learners reading comprehension (Lee, 2006; Shen, 2013), the effects of teacher praise on motivation during Literature Circles have gone largely unexplored. The current study investigates the effects of Literature Circle and teacher praise on learner motivation. Following a pre-test, treatment, post-test scientific design, participants completed a 15 item questionnaire and additional data was collected over the four week treatment period. Two forms of data analysis were integrated in the current study. Primary data analysis was restricted to examining differences in pre-test/post-test

scores. Secondary data analysis was an ongoing process using Modified Analytic Induction (MAI) described by Bogodan and Biklen (2007). MAI was applied to group observations, analysis of the video recordings, participant participation, and worksheets which were turned in by each of the two Literature Circle groups. Participants were pooled from two English conversation groups and consisted of second year university students majoring in English in Taiwan. Findings of the primary quantitative analysis indicated that both groups made a number of changes in their responses to the questionnaire. However, these changes failed to provide evidence for a significant trend in the data. Despite a number claims found in related literature asserting the importance of praise in the L2 environment, no significant evidence was found in the present study to support this claim.

Keywords : Teacher Praise, Motivation, Literature Circles

Introduction

It has long been recognized that “motivation is one of the most important factors affecting a student’s performance of English learning” (Zhao, 2012, p.100). In an ever increasingly competitive international academic environment, the pursuit of enhanced learner performance is arguably the chief motivator for academic institutions ever vying to place their graduates and by default their institutions in advantageous positions of ranking. As such, innumerable researchers have dedicated their careers to uncovering more effective strategies to bolster and facilitate language learning performance. One of the fruits of this research is the universal consensus that high learning motivation is directly correlated with increased performance.

Motivation is defined as “an internal state that arouses, directs, and maintains behavior” (Woolfolk, 2012, p. 376). Research by Lai (2011) found evidence that motivation is subject to manipulation through specific instructional practices. This finding has contributed to a corpus of data which has reinforced the importance of establishing instructional practices which can facilitate the language learning process by appealing to that “internal state that arouses, directs, and maintains (language learning) behavior.

The curious states and constructs that illusively materialize as

motivation have intrigued researchers and writers for millennia. The *Book of The Watchers*, ascribed to the biblical Enoch (great grandfather of Noah) chronicles and analyses the motivations that the sons of heaven had for disobeying the Most High; To choose wives from the daughters of men and beget children by them. Plato mused in the *Republic* about the nature of motivation and its correlation with action as a pursuit of virtue. The founding fathers of the United States of America specify their motivations explicitly for creating a new republic with the famous opening sentence of the Declaration of Independence “When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.” In *Teaching by Principles*, Douglas Brown (2007) poses questions such as “What is motivation? Can it be acquired, or is it just “there”? Can it be taught? Where does it come from?” After taking into account views and descripts of motivation from behavioral, cognitive and constructivist theories Brown asserts that foreign language learning requires global, situational and task oriented elements. Finally, Brown points out that in regard to the extrinsic pressure that are present in the school curriculum environment, the equally present intrinsic

motivations of personal goal-setting and learner-centered individualization can result in increased motivation which improve self-esteem, self-actualization and the ability to decide for one's self. What all of these authors and countless others have described over the span of recorded human history is that motivation and the actions that it results in are an intricate aspect of humanity itself. Without motivation and desire, free will is meaningless. However, with motivation, even the seemingly impossible becomes attainable.

Researchers, educators and learners have developed a wide array of methodologies designed to expedite second language acquisition. Questions regarding nature over nurture, learning environment, input and interaction, language transfer, cognitive factors, sociocultural aspects attrition, individual variation and other psychological and physical factors have been scrutinized with regard to second language learning in extensive detail. Indeed, entire libraries are dedicated to the corpus of work on aforesaid subjects and an analysis of these is simply beyond the scope of the present work. Nevertheless, of this profusion of theoretical frameworks, a system of literature based and task oriented group work which has gained considerable traction within the TESOL and SLA community is called Literature Circles. Literature Circles as a practical methodology is described in some detail in the literature review section of this article.

Purpose of the Study

Throughout the process of language teaching, special emphasis may be placed on any number of different aspects of the target language depending on the course goals. Regardless however of the particular language goal of focus, the two receptive skills of listening and reading are considered to be of equal importance in most classrooms. In fact, even in those classes supposedly focused on listening skills, learners are often expected and required to spend a great deal of the class reading; Hence the need for textbooks focused on listening skills. Accordingly, researchers have identified a variety of strategies and techniques that learners employ to facilitate these means of comprehension, one of which is Literature Circles as described by Candler (2011) which is covered in detail in the Literature Review section of this study.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the possibility of any correlation between Literature Circle, teacher praise, and motivation. There were two research questions posed in the present study.

RQ 1: How do *Literature Circle* activities affect participant *motivation*?

RQ 2: How does teacher *praise* affect participant *motivation*?

Literature Review

Most educators agree that motivation is important in the classroom, but what is motivation? Motivation is typically conceptualized as being of two sorts, intrinsic and extrinsic. On a general level, motivation is the effort that learners put into L2 learning as a result of a desire or need to do so (Ellis, 2008). However, intrinsic motivation is better characterized as happening when needs, wants, or desires within oneself, provide reward-driven behavior (Brown, 2002).

There are a number of strategies that teachers use to foster or encourage motivation. These strategies include but are not limited to giving students frequent opportunities to respond, avoiding heavy emphasis on grades and competition, reducing the task risk without oversimplifying the task, modeling motivation to learn for students and teaching particular learning tactics (Woolfolk, 2010). These strategies can help students stay focused on tasks, especially when they encounter difficulties. Placing a heavy emphasis on appropriate learner output, while actively disregarding undesirable learner output, conditions learners to focus on positive outcomes, which facilitates a positive classroom environment and increased desirable learner output (Conroy, et al. 2009).

Another important strategy that educators may use to boost motivation is by creating a positive classroom climate through oral praise. However, the effective use of praise is something that needs to be balanced with other factors such as criticism and rapport in the classroom (Brown, 2007). Too much praise renders is less and less effective over time and can ultimately become useless. Some factors which show contrast between effective praise and ineffective praise are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Effective Praise Versus Ineffective Praise (adapted from Brophy, 1981)

Effective Praise	Ineffective Praise
✓ Shows genuine pleasure and concern	■ Is impersonal, mechanical, and “robotic”
✓ Shows verbal and nonverbal variety	■ Shows bland uniformity
✓ Specifies the particulars of an accomplishment, so students know exactly what was performed well	■ Is restricted to global comments, so students are not sure what was performed well
✓ Is offered in recognition of noteworthy effort on difficult tasks	■ Is offered equally strongly for easy and difficult tasks
✓ Attributes success to effort, implying that similar success can be expected in the future	■ Attributes success to ability, lucky, or other external factors

✓ Fosters intrinsic motivation to continue to pursue goals	■ Fosters extrinsic motivation to perform only to receive more praise
✓ Is delivered without disrupting the communicative flow of ongoing interaction	■ Disrupts the communicative flow of ongoing interaction

Note: Reprinted from *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, by Brown, H. D., 2007, p. 253. Pearson Longman.

There are a number of factors which show contrast between effective praise and ineffective praise. Effective praise, among other things, shows genuine pleasure and concern and attributes success to effort. As such, teacher initiated praise using phrases such as “That’s exactly right!”, “Excellent work!” and “Nicely done!” must be delivered based on student output rather than on a predetermined schedule. In contrast, ineffective praise is impersonal, mechanical, and shows bland uniformity (Brophy, 1981). Emphasis was placed on effective praise, given as often as possible but without compromising the tenets of effective praise as listed in Table 1 during the treatment phase of the current study.

Literatures Circles is a language teaching strategy which has been shown to attract learners’ reading interests more than the traditional methods of reading activities and arouse reading desire because the learners in literature circles have a collaborative and cooperative social learning atmosphere Karatay (2017). Literature Circle, which was a

major aspect of the treatment in the current study, was described by Candler (2011). Tenets of Literature Circles include placing students in groups of four and assigning each student one of four roles. The first role of *summarizer* involves creating a written summary of a specific reading passage. The second role, *vocabulary finder* involves choosing a minimum of 2 words from a given reading passage and translating those words into L1 and teaching those words to the rest of the team. The third role, question writer involves writing questions and answers based on the reading passage. Finally, the last role is called *story mapper*. Story mappers are tasked with creating a visual representation of a given reading passage. Participants in these roles do not work alone however as they are encouraged to work together to help each other achieve each of their prescribed goals.

A study by Lee (2006) on the effects that Literature Circles had on EFL oral communication skills investigated the communicative competence of Taiwanese high school students. Students from two eighth grade English classes participated in the study. Data from an experimental class which was treated with Literature Circles in cooperative learning activities was contrasted with data from a class which was taught using traditional methods. Results of Lee's study strongly supported the use of Literature Circles activities as students in that group achieved higher quiz scores and oral test scores than their counterparts in the class taught with the traditional approach.

In a 2013 study by Shen, comparisons were made on comprehension rates for participants in book clubs, Literature Circles, and instructional conversations for Taiwanese EFL college students. There were two groups for each of these three variables including a control and an experimental group. The scores for over 160 participants were included in data analysis. Findings indicated no differences found between control and experimental groups on factual comprehension of texts. However, some evidence indicated that interpretive comprehension on theme-related essays may have been higher for all of the experimental groups, including that using Literature Circles. While scores for these students were higher, they were only modestly higher than those of the students in the control groups which gave some support to the employment of Literature Circles in EFL classroom settings.

Methodology

This research was conducted primarily as a quantitative study following the scientific method. There were two classes of participants. Class A was the control group which received a *normal amount* of praise. Class B was the treatment group and received *extra* praise. Student directed praise followed the “effective praise”

guidelines for both classes. However, special emphasis was placed on the praise administered in Class B, the experimental group. Accomplishments were recognized so that participants knew exactly what was performed well. Class A, the control group, received less praise than Class B.

The present study was also secondarily considered from a qualitative case study perspective. This was done so to explore the happenings which occurred in the current case. As a result, the findings of the present study are not intended to be interpreted as generalizable or extendable to other cases.

Research Site

The research was undertaken at a private university in central Taiwan. Classes were administered in the English Department. Classes were taught exclusively in English; however participants were required to bring dictionaries to all class meetings to facilitate translation when learner comprehension was otherwise inhibited.

Participants

Participants for the present study were pooled from two English

Conversation classes of university students. Both Class A (N=23) and Class B (N=25) consisted of second year students majoring in English. The average age of students was 20 years old and they had all studied English for an average of 9 years in Taiwan. These full time students were enrolled in comprehensive curriculums; however this was their only class with a Native English Speaking Teacher.

Unfortunately, due to high rates of absences, not all of the students completed the study. A number of students were absent on the day of the pre-test and also on the day of the post-test. In total, the numbers of participants for Class A (N=16) and Class B (N=18) were reduced. This variable was beyond the control of the researcher and in fact, to be expected. The learners in this university came from disadvantaged backgrounds and, on average, about 30% of the students in the department were automatically dropped from their classes due to a lack of attendance as per Ministry of Education guidelines which stipulate that students may not miss more than 12 class hours per semester.

Data Sources and Collection

This study followed a pre-test, treatment, post-test scientific design. Data were collected over a four week period in the fall semester. Before the first treatment session, participants completed

the pre-test. The pre-test and post-test were in reality, one in the same. This was a 15 item based questionnaire using a four point Likert Scale (Likert, 1932). Questions were written to assess participant motivation about learning English and how that was affected by Literature Circles activities. See Appendix A.

The 15 items were equally divided into three parts (5 questions each). The first part, made up by questions 1,3,4,5, and 10, assessed participant *motivation*. The section part, made up by questions 6,7,11, 12 and 14, assessed the effect of *Literature Circles*. The third section, made up of questions 2, 8, 9, 13 and 15 assessed participant feelings about the teacher's *praise*. The questions were intentionally scrambled to ensure test design validity. Additionally, participants were asked on the post-test to respond in an open ended written question about their experience with Literature Circles. The question asked "How do you feel about Literature Circles?"

When giving the directions for completing the pre-test, participants were informed that their responses on the pre-test would in no way affect their class grades. This was done in order to encourage honest responses. In the successive three weeks, participants engaged in Literature Circles activities during videotaped classes. All classes were conducted in English, however students were required to use dictionaries, and permitted to discuss class-related business in their L1 (Mandarin). On the last day of data collection, participants completed

the post-test. At that time, they were reminded that their responses were in no way correlated with their class grades in order to encourage them to provide honest responses.

During the taped treatment sessions, the researcher employed the praise phrases “That’s exactly right!”, “Excellent work!” and “Nicely done!” in recognition of noteworthy effort and achievement on challenging activities and tasks with greater frequency for the treatment group than the control group. Control group students were also given normal praise using the form “good”. However, praise delivered in the control group was less present and pronounced than that which was present in the treatment group.

Data Analysis

Two forms of data analysis were integrated in the current study. Primary data analysis was restricted to examining differences in pre-test/post-test scores. Secondary data analysis was an ongoing process using Modified Analytic Induction (MAI). Bogodan and Biklen (2007) stated that MAI “is employed when some specific problem, question, or issue becomes the focus of research. Data are collected and analyzed to develop a descriptive model that encompasses all cases of the phenomena” (p. 70). MAI was applied to class observations,

analysis of the video recordings, participant participation, and the worksheets which were turned in by each Literature Circles group.

Primary Data Analysis

In carrying out primary data analysis, the data were first collected and quantified. This was done to show the total number of times any specific item on the questionnaire was selected in each class. For example, Table 2 shows that only two participants selected option 1 *Very different from me* on question number one.

Data from the Class A is shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5. High scores are denoted by an asterisk and scores of 10 or more are marked in bold font. The values 1-4 (shown on the Y-axis) represent the Likert Scale options which were available on the questionnaire. The top row labeled 1-15 indicates the 15 questions which were on the questionnaire.

Results of the Class A pre-test indicated that only two items received any high scores of 10. With a total participant population of 16, a score of 10 indicates that a certain answer was selected just over 60% of the time. Questions 2 *My teacher's positive comments about my English are important to me* assessed praise and question 10 *I push myself to study English so that I can reach my own goals* which

assessed motivation, both received overwhelming support for option 3 *A little like me*. See Table 2.

Table 2 Class A Pre-Test

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	*6	2	0	0	4	0	0	0
2	6	0	*8	*8	5	1	2	3	*6	3	4	4	7	5	3
3	*7	10	5	6	*6	6	*9	4	*6	10	*9	*7	*8	*9	*9
4	1	5	0	1	3	*9	5	3	2	3	3	1	1	2	4

Note. High scores are denoted by an asterisk and scores of 10 or more are marked in bold font.

After four weeks of treatment, the post-test was administered. Table 3 shows the results of the post-test. On this post-test, only question 2 received a score over 10 (12) for option 3. This was not a significant change from the pre-test.

Table 3 Class A Post-Test

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	0	0	7	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	5	0	0	2

2	*7	0	*8	*9	5	2	3	5	5	4	4	*7	*7	6	2
3	5	12	1	5	*8	*8	5	*6	*7	*9	*9	2	*7	*8	*9
4	4	4	0	1	1	6	*8	4	1	3	3	2	2	2	3

Note. High scores are denoted by an asterisk and scores of 10 or more are marked in bold font.

Analysis of the post-test for Class A indicated that 7 out of 15 of the answers showed shifts in high scores. For example, on the pre-test for Class A, option 3 received the high score for question 1. However, post-test results showed that the high score had changed to option 2 for question 1. Table 4 shows changes in highest scores for each question on the questionnaire. Fields marked NA indicate that there was no shift in high score for that question.

Table 4 Class A Changes in Highest Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Pre	3	NA	NA	NA	3	4	3	1	NA	NA	NA	3	NA	NA	NA
Post	2	NA	NA	NA	4	3	4	3	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	NA

Note: Example. While option 3 received the highest scores on the pretest for question 1, the posttest indicated a shift to option 2 for the highest scores.

Data from Class B is shown in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Results of the Class B pre-test indicated that only one item received a score over 11. With a total participant population of 18, a score of 11 indicates that a certain answer was selected just over 60% of the time. Questions 10 *I push myself to study English so that I can reach my own goals* which assessed M, received overwhelming support for option 3 *A little like me*. This finding was consistent with Class A pre-test results. See Table 5.

Table 5 Class B Pre-Test

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	3	0	*9	5	3	1	0	*6	3	0	0	*8	0	2	2
2	*7	0	6	5	4	4	1	5	*5	2	4	*8	2	3	1
3	5	*9	3	*7	*9	5	8	5	*5	13	*8	1	*8	*7	7
4	3	*9	0	1	2	*8	*9	2	5	3	6	1	*8	6	*8

Note. High scores are denoted by an asterisk and scores of 10 or more are marked in bold font.

Table 6 shows the results of the post-test for Class B. On this post-test, four questions received a score over 11 for options 3 and 4. Question 2 *My teacher's positive comments about my English are important to me* assessed praise and option 4 was most often selected.

Question 7 *I can improve my English by doing group work* assessed Literature Circles and option 4 was most often chosen. Question 10 *I push myself to study English so that I can reach my own goals* assessed motivation and option 3, like in the pre-test, was most often chosen. Finally, question 14 *In comparison with my listening, speaking and writing skills, my English reading skills are my strongest skill* which assessed Literature Circles most often saw the selection of option 3. This was a significant change from the pre-test.

Table 6 Class B Post-Test

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	1	0	6	3	3	0	0	6	2	0	0	*7	1	0	0
2	*6	0	10	4	*5	2	4	10	*8	2	2	*7	5	5	3
3	5	7	2	*6	*5	6	3	1	7	11	7	4	*8	11	10
4	*6	11	0	5	*5	10	11	1	1	5	*9	0	4	2	5

Note. High scores are denoted by an asterisk and scores of 10 or more are marked in bold font.

Analysis of the post-test for Class B indicated that 6 out of 15 of the answers showed shifts in high scores. For example, on the pre-test for Class B, option 1 received the high score for question 3. However,

post-test results showed that the high score had changed to option 2 on the post-test. Table 7 shows changes in highest scores for each question on the questionnaire. Fields marked NA indicate that there was no shift in high score for that question.

Table 7 Class B Changes in Highest Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Pre	NA	NA	1	NA	3	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	3	NA	*	NA	4
Post	NA	NA	2	NA	*	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	4	NA	3	NA	3

Secondary Data Analysis

As for the secondary MAI analysis, it may be recalled that class observations, participant participation and worksheets were qualitatively assessed as well. Results from the class observations indicated an overall air of enthusiasm on the part of the participants in both classes. While on during the first Literature Circles session, some students seemed disengaged at first, the method of putting the participants in groups actually facilitated participation. In fact, the participants showed more willingness to participate on the Literature Circles activities than they did during their regular classes. Lastly, the

overall quantity of writing and quality of work turned in on the Literature Circles group work sheets significantly improved over the course of the treatment. Most groups not only wrote longer questions and summaries over the course of the Literature Circles treatment, the content of those questions became more comprehensive.

For example, Group A failed to write anything for a summary after the first treatment. However, after observing the contributions made by their classmates and with assistance from the teacher, by treatment 3, they wrote “*Stanly Yelnats is a bad boy. The judge tell him that he needs to go Camp Green Lake. His mother get him toothbrush, toothpaste, and a box of stationary.*” This summary was considered to be comprehensive as it started out with the main point of the passage followed by some supporting details. This concludes both the primary and secondary data analysis sections.

Findings

Findings of the primary quantitative analysis indicated that Class A made changes to items 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12. Changes for 5 *I read English for fun more than one time a week*, 7 *I can improve my English by doing group work*, and 8 *I feel pressure from my parents / teachers about learning English* moved from lower scores to higher scores.

These questions were about motivation, Literature Circles, and praise respectively. Questions (1) *I like to read challenging English articles and/or books*, (6) *I feel comfortable when doing reading activities with my classmates*, and (12) *I prefer doing class work by myself* experienced a shift towards lower scores on motivation and Literature Circles.

Uniformity was not found in these results as a detailed analysis of these findings indicates that some of the changes, such as those found in items 6 and 12 for example, effectively canceled each other out. That is, analysis of the data indicated that while shifts in results did occur; they were neither uniform nor generalizable within Class A.

Findings of the primary quantitative analysis indicated that Class B made changes to items 3, 5, 8, 11, 13 and 15. These changes were mostly dissimilar from changes in Class A. With the exception of question 15 which trended negatively (from 4 to 3), all of the questions showed increases in agreement. However, like the findings for Class A, a detailed analysis of these findings failed to show a trend in the data.

Discussion

There may be a number of reasons why uniform changes were not

found in either the control group of the treatment group. Unfortunately, close scrutiny of the video, work sheet, and questionnaire data were unable to offer sufficient insights into this phenomenon. Nevertheless, sufficient information was collected to address the two research questions.

In addressing research question 1, *How does Literature Circle affect participant motivation?*, Literature Circles were found to have little if any effect on participant motivation. The results of the post-test failed to indicate a correlation between the Literature Circles treatment and motivation. However, it must be noted that participants did display a willingness to participate in Literature Circles and enjoyed it during the activities. As noted above in the secondary analysis, written work on the Literature Circles worksheets indicated a deeper level of involvement in task completion over the course of the experiment. Qualitative analysis which included the post-test open ended question about Literature Circles indicated that participants overwhelmingly enjoyed Literature Circles. All but one of the participants who responded on the open-ended question indicated that Literature Circles was “fun”. Unfortunately, this engagement and enjoyment failed to materialize in meeting the threshold of significance on the post-test assessment. Previous research supports this finding and indicates that learner backgrounds and personal experiences such as gender, developmental level, socioeconomic class and ability level

(topics beyond the scope of the previous study) may affect the way in which learners reciprocate praise (Hitz & Driscoll, 1988)

No conclusive evidence was found with regard to research question 2 which asked “How does teacher *praise* affect participant *motivation*?” It is believed that a lack in data trending may be due to the fact that a large amount of variation in opinion existed within each participant population. While some results from the questionnaire indicated praise affected motivation, others did not. Despite this lack of statistical evidence on the results of the questionnaire, it must be reiterated that participants did indicate that they had enjoyed the Literature Circle classes. One possible reason for this apparent disconnect that the treatment period may have been insufficiently long enough to affect any significant change in motivation. Perhaps future studies could extend the treatment period and conduct a series of easements to provide evidence for data trends reflecting motivation over time.

Additionally, MAI analysis of the video tapes indicated an increased level of participation in Literature Circles. In the final session, students expressed an excitement about writing their answers on the board and sharing their ideas with the rest of the class which was not present in the initial classes. Shyness, an omnipresent force in the prototypical Taiwanese EFL classroom, seemed to have been greatly diminished and groups worked together excitedly to share their work

with the class.

Conclusion

While task engagement and overall participant enjoyment increased during the treatment, the findings of the present study did not find statistically significant evidence supporting increased motivation for groups that receive extra praise during Literature Circles. Participants responded positively to Literature Circles and showed a marginal increase in motivation, but the increase failed to meet a significant threshold. One limitation of the present study is that this longitudinal study was conducted in just four weeks. Future studies could extend this treatment time to investigate the issue future. Another possible limitation of the present study was that the questionnaire was written in English. While it is believed that the students understood the questions on the questionnaire, future studies could include bilingual drafts. Finally, if more information could be collected via semi-structured interviews as an amendment to the post-test, it may add insight to the findings of the present study. These limitations notwithstanding, it is clear that praise has other effects on classroom atmosphere, student-teacher relationships and overall student morale which were not the subject of the present study. Despite the

lack of evidence found to support the efficacy of praise on Literature Circles in the current study, the importance of fostering a positive classroom atmosphere, student-teacher relationship and overall student morale cannot be underestimated.

Appendix A

English Name _____ Date _____

Directions: I am interested in how you feel about your reading. There are no right or wrong answers. Circle **ONE** number on each line that most shows your opinion.

1 = Very different from me

2 = A little different from me

3 = A little like me

4 = A lot like me

Motivation Statements	1	2	3	4
1. I like to read challenging English articles and/or books.	1	2	3	4
2. My teacher's positive comments about my English are important to me.	1	2	3	4
3. No one notices when I do a good job in English group.	1	2	3	4
4. I read English for fun at least once a week.	1	2	3	4

5. I read English for fun more than one time a week.	1	2	3	4
6. I feel comfortable when doing reading activities with my group mates.	1	2	3	4
7. I can improve my English by doing group work.	1	2	3	4
8. I feel pressure from my parents / teachers about learning English.	1	2	3	4
9. My teacher encourages me too often.	1	2	3	4
10. I push myself to study English so that I can reach my own goals	1	2	3	4
11. I learn more when doing group activities in group.	1	2	3	4
12. I prefer doing group work by myself.	1	2	3	4
13. I wish my teacher would encourage me more.	1	2	3	4
14. In comparison with my listening, speaking and writing skills, my English reading skills are my strongest skill.	1	2	3	4
15. When my teacher notices that I did a good job, it makes me work harder.	1	2	3	4

References

- Bogodan, R.C. & Biklen, S. K. (2007). Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods. Pearson.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the “post-method” era: Toward better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. *In methodology in language teaching*. (9-18). Cambridge university press.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). Teaching by Principles, An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Pearson Longman.
- Candler, L. (2011). Laura Candler’s power reading workshop: A step-by-step guide. Raphel Marketing.
- Conroy, M. A., Sutherland, K. S., Snyder, A., Al-Hendawi, M., & Vo, A., Winter 2009. Creative a Positive Classroom Atmosphere: Teachers’ Use of Effective Praise and Feedback. Virginia Commonwealth University.
- https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kevin_Sutherland/publication/280312067_Creating_a_positive_classroom_atmosphere_Teachers%27_use_of_effective_praise_and_feedback/links/55b1b32208aec0e5f4311bbe/Creating-a-positive-classroom-atmosphere-Teachers-use-of-effective-praise-and-feedback.pdf

- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford.
- Hitz, R., & Driscoll, A. (1988, July). Praise or encouragement? New insights into praise: Implications for early childhood teachers. *Young Children*, 6-13.
- Karatay, H. (2017). The Effect of Literature Circles on Text Analysis and Reading Desire. *International Journal of Higher Education*, (6) 5.
- Lai, E. R. (2011). *Motivation: A literature review*. Pearson.
- Lee, S. J. (2006). The effects of literature circle in cooperative learning activities on EFL oral communicative competence among junior high school students in Taiwan (master's thesis). MCU eThesys. (etd-0904107-105028)
- Likert, R. (1932). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. *Archives of Psychology* (140) 1-55.
- Shen, F. Y. (2013). Using group discussion with Taiwan's EFL college students: A comparison of comprehension instruction for book club, literature circles, and instructional conversations. *English Language Teaching*, 6, 58-78.
- Woolfolk, A. (2011). *Educational Psychology*. Pearson.

Zhao, L. (2012). Investigation into Motivation Types and Influences on Motivation: The Case of Chinese Non-English Majors. *English Language Teaching* (5) 3, 100-122

