

Construction and validation of a Reading Motivation Scale for Language and Communication Teachers (RMSLCT)

Construcción y validación de una Escala de Motivación Lectora para Profesores de Lenguaje y Comunicación (EMLPLC)

Mijal Jodeck-Osses*¹ 

Daniela Tapia-Salinas² 

Aníbal Puentes³ 

¹ Universidad Andrés Bello, Chile

² Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

³ Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Funded: This research is part of the Master's programme in Reading Comprehension and Text Production at Universidad Andrés Bello, funded by CONICYT (Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica). PFCHA/National Master's Scholarship for Education Professionals-2018-2019.50180076, National Master Scholarship 2019-22191585.

 * Contact: mijal.jodeck@gmail.com

Received: 15/09/2020; Accepted: 21/07/2021

Abstract

Reading, understood as a universal tool, constitutes a determining and transversal factor in school and social learning. In psychology and didactics, the interest in inquiring about the reading practices of those teachers in charge of mediating this process is growing, under the assumption that those considered good readers are also better mediators of the reading learning process of their students. To this aim, a Likert-type motivational scale has been constructed and validated, taking the judgments of eight experts as information. The scale is inspired by the Expectation-Value Theory of Eccles & Wigfield (2002), which highlights the indicators referring to the reading habits of teachers in the personal and professional sphere. The scale was validated using the Lawshe (1975) statistical procedure, modified by Tristán-López (2008), which allowed defining the relevance and clarity of the Expectation-Value indicators. The results of the study confirm that the reading motivation scale designed for language and communication teachers, in a Chilean sample, is a valid and reliable instrument that allows discovering the strengths and weaknesses in the field of reading motivation, through the assessment of their own expectations and the value placed on reading.

Keywords: Reading habits; reading motivation; reading interests; expectation; values clarification; teacher characteristics

Resumen



La lectura, entendida como herramienta universal constituye un factor determinante y transversal en los aprendizajes escolares y sociales. En psicología y didáctica se acrecienta el interés por indagar acerca de las prácticas lectoras de aquellos maestros encargados de mediar este proceso, bajo el supuesto de que aquellos considerados buenos lectores, son también mejores mediadores del aprendizaje lector de sus estudiantes. Con este propósito se ha construido y validado una escala motivacional, tipo Likert, tomando como información los juicios de ocho expertos. La escala se inspira en el modelo Expectativa-Valor de Eccles y Wigfield (2002), que destacan los indicadores referidos a los hábitos de lectura de docentes en el ámbito personal y profesional. La validación de la escala se realizó mediante el procedimiento estadístico de Lawshe (1975), modificado por Tristán-López (2008), que permitió definir la pertinencia y claridad de los indicadores de Expectativa-Valor. Los resultados del estudio confirman que la escala de motivación lectora diseñada para profesores de lenguaje y comunicación, en una muestra chilena, es un instrumento válido y confiable que permite conocer las fortalezas y debilidades en el ámbito de la motivación lectora, por medio de la valoración de sus propias expectativas y el valor atribuido a la lectura.

Palabras clave: Hábitos de lectura; motivación lectora; intereses lectores; expectativa; clarificación de valores; características de los docentes

Introduction

There is a consensus that reading is a determining factor in shaping language competence and the school and social learning that takes places throughout life. In accordance with the Curricular Principles for primary and secondary education (Ministry of Education of Chile, MINEDUC, 2018, 2015), and the international PIRLS study (Mullis et al., 2016), reading is a crosscutting practice in all educational activities, an essential cultural tool for accessing and transmitting information. In this area, Language and Communication teachers are considered among those mainly responsible for working on learning to read, and they have been given the role of reading mediators. Therefore, research on teachers' reading practices becomes relevant because of the assumption that teachers who are considered good readers would also be better mediators of their students' learning to read (Munita, 2017; Powell-Brown, 2003).

The study of reading motivation on pedagogical practices alerts teachers who play the role of reading mediators without being genuine possessors of enthusiasm and motivation for reading in their private lives. Applegate & Applegate (2004) called this problem the "Peter Effect" ("nobody gives what they don't have"), whereby teachers who have a weak relationship with reading, without valuing it or enjoying it on a personal level, can hardly contribute to their students developing intrinsic motivation for reading, since they do not have it. According to Elche and Yubero (2019), reading practices aimed at increasing pleasure and providing an adequate reading experience require explicit modelling and a close relationship with reading.

The aim of this research is to present the process of development and validation of an instrument to measure the level of Reading Motivation in Language and Communication teachers, considering the variables associated with this construct, according to Eccles and Wigfield's Value achievement motivation model (2002). This selection of model is justified on three grounds: its theoretical soundness, the possibility it provides for measurement by particular dimensions, which makes it possible to know in particular the strengthened and

weakened areas of teacher motivation and, finally, in relation to the above, it would allow an intervention based on the results to be carried out.

Background

Reading subject and didactic reading subject

“Subject reader” refers to any individual who, in accordance with their socio-cultural context, practices literary reading, giving it meaning in relation to their own values and experiences (Émery-Bruneau, 2010). It is characterised by the development of reading behaviour, i.e., it incorporates reading as a usual practice, endowed with intentionality and positive valuation given the satisfaction aroused by it (Larrañaga & Yubero, 2005).

“Didactic reading subject” refers to the interaction between the role of the teacher as a “reading subject” (an individual who carries out reading on a personal level, valuing and enjoying it intrinsically) who - in turn - acts as a mediating agent of reading on a professional level, while referring to the interaction produced between the personal and professional spheres of the teacher as reader and mediator (Émery-Bruneau, 2010; Falardeau et al., 2011; Munita, 2017).

Currently, evidence on the influence of teachers’ reading habits on their pedagogical practices and the promotion of reading in the classroom is growing and shows that both the development of attitudes and reading habits require a suitable model, as they would be developed by imitation and example (Granado, 2014; Granado & Puig, 2014).

Cremin et al. (2009) highlight language teachers are fundamental mediators for children’s reading development, since teachers who teach reading must enjoy and recognise the aesthetic value of reading in addition to mastering reading science specifically. In schools, reading is often restricted to an evaluation mechanism, e.g., finding grammatical categories or analysing the syntax of a sentence; linking reading to a curricular purpose (Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Applegate et al., 2014).

Munita (2013), argues that the personal experiences of reading mediators act as a vehicle that gives meaning to their pedagogical practices, so their personal experiences of reading will directly influence their beliefs and thus their approach to reading in the classroom (Asselin, 2000; Boggs & Golden, 2009; Gupta, 2004; Phillips & Larson, 2009; Trent, 2011).

Commeyras et al. (2003) and Cremin et al. (2009) have conducted research indicating that teachers’ reading practices are transferred to the classroom. They asked teachers responsible for teaching reading to undergo intervention programmes, such as reading circles and reflection spaces that sought to strengthen their students’ relationships with reading through the re-signification of their own reading experiences. The teachers were accompanied in tackling new readings, and in actively participating in lectures about them, in order to broaden their knowledge of literature, build their confidence and promote skilful use of literature in the classroom. This resulted in positive changes in the teachers’ reading identity: re-signification of habits such as reading for pleasure, reflection on themselves as readers and improvement of their students’ relationship with reading, as they created more opportunities to develop the

children's metacognitive awareness as readers and built interactive reading communities in their classrooms.

This way, those teachers who read more frequently, more books and of a wider range of genres, will have a broader reading background and will thus be able to provide their students with behavioural guidelines regarding the dedication and personal enjoyment that the reading experience arouses (Larrañaga & Yubero, 2005; Dueñas et al., 2014), ensuring that they become affectively and emotionally involved in reading (Commeyras et al., 2003).

Research aimed at studying the effectiveness of literary teaching (López-Valero et al., 2016) suggest the importance of having effective teaching practices in the field of reading reinforcement, mainly consisting in the appropriate selection of texts, considering the students' needs and interests, developing reading as a voluntary and sustained activity, establishing inclusive methodologies consisting mainly of constantly interacting with students around recommendations and personal impressions about literature, participating as peers of their students and not necessarily as discussion guides, and understanding the purpose of teaching the pleasure of reading, rather than using it as a means to achieve other knowledge (Cremin et al., 2009).

Teachers' reading motivation

Motivation is essential in learning and mainly refers to something that determines that a person initiates an action in pursuit of a goal and persists to achieve it (Herrera et al., 2004). Researchers emphasise the importance of balancing affective and cognitive aspects involved in reading development (Paris & Oka, 1986) and conclude that early engagement would play a crucial role in the level of achievement in later years in the motivational and social role of reading.

Empirical evidence that literacy training requires reader-teachers is strong (Guthrie, 1996; Sanacore, 2002; Scott, 1996; Wang & Guthrie, 2004). Schunk (1990) argues teachers with low self-esteem or low feelings of self-efficacy tend to avoid opportunities that promote reading development and challenge among their students, and intrinsically fail to motivate them, since the relationship between teaching behaviours and student motivation has been characterised as reciprocal (Skinner et al., 1990).

That said, what levels of reading motivation do teachers actually have? There are teachers who choose not to read because of a lack of commitment to the task despite having adequate reading skills (Scott, 1996). Research aimed at determining the reading habits and motivation of practising teachers suggests that a large number of them do not make private and leisure reading a priority (Nathanson et al., 2008; Powell-Brown, 2003). Furthermore, few teachers enjoy reading and see it as a leisure activity, as they attach little value thereto (Mueller, 1973), limit themselves to reading what their work requires (Tovar, 2009) and are not frequent library users (Cremin et al., 2008; Tenti-Fanfani, 2005). Finally, Asfura and Real (2019), in an attempt to portray the reading practices reported by final-year Language and Communication pedagogy students from four Chilean universities, found that a large number of them would have presented unfavourable family contexts for the development of their reading biographies. This was due to the low educational level of the parents of the future teachers, who were the

first generation in their family to have access to higher education. These data are relevant, as parents' schooling and reading habits are considered decisive factors for early and significant contact with literature, since the environment represents a space of primary importance for exploring the relationship of individuals' lives with reading activity (Manresa, 2009).

In terms of self-efficacy, understood as an individual's own conception of their capacity for action (Bandura, 1977, 1993), it is not an inherent characteristic of the individual, but it is learned and changes in relation to the situations they face (Dellinger et al., 2008). In the case of teachers, it would be related to their confidence to perform a task and their perception of achieving learning outcomes (Dellinger et al., 2008). This ability is developed early in the academic spheres of professional training (Woolfolk & Burke, 2005). Therefore, during their academic education, students of pedagogy build their own perception of their ability to teach (Shulman, 1987) in addition to building disciplinary knowledge, and this is influenced by the perception of the education they have received (Woolfolk and Burke, 2005).

Research within the framework of General Primary Education Teaching indicates that teacher training has been recently controversial in Chile, due to the rapid overcrowding and low selectivity of the students who are admitted to study, as well as the scarce initial teacher training in disciplinary areas (Sotomayor et al., 2013). A review of the syllabi of these degree programmes in the area of language (Sotomayor et al., 2011) shows that they emphasise content related to language management, understood as the teaching of spelling and the characteristics of literary genres, highlighting metalinguistic knowledge over content appreciation, and that there is little reference to the teaching of literature and strategies for its evaluation.

A study aimed at studying how students see Basic Education Pedagogy on the training received in their higher education years showed that they identified the greatest emphasis of their training in terms of disciplinary content, teaching didactics, teaching and evaluating mechanisms for learning to read and write and little preparation in terms of the teaching of literature (Sotomayor et al., 2013).

This is particularly relevant as there is a lack of real opportunities for trainee teachers to develop proper reading self-efficacy, which is related to the persistence of the Peter Effect (Applegate et al., 2014), therefore entering a vicious circle around the lack of reading skills and of motivation and enjoyment of reading.

Achievement motivation

Cognitive theories of motivation that emphasise the intrinsic component, attributions for success or failure, and individual feelings of self-competence are expectancy and value (Atkinson, 1964; McClelland, 1985), with the underlying principle that any individual's expectations of performance interact with the values attributed to the assignment and, therefore, with commitment to determining the level of persistence therein, positioning individuals as active and rational decision makers (Pintrich & Shunk, 2006), making it possible to apply it to teaching-learning situations and processes (insofar as the subject is the agent of their own academic achievement).

For the purposes of this research, we used the Expectancy-Value motivation model proposed by Eccles and Wigfield (2002), as in addition to its proven validity in a series of studies, it is versatile in terms of application in different fields of study (Carreño & Garrido, 2013; Meece et al., 1990; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wentzel & Wigfield, 1998; Wigfield et al., 1991). Similarly, by considering both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects, it allows for the generation of interventions aimed at addressing the individual's motivation to read (Muñoz et al., 2016; Valenzuela & Nieto, 2008).

Expectancy-Value Model

The first element addressed by Eccles and Wigfield's (2002) model is the expectancy that an individual has about their own ability to perform a task adequately, and on the other hand, the value that the person assigns to the task. It is made up of four elements: a) importance: level of significance for the individual to perform a specific task; b) interest: enjoyment of performing a task as it is intrinsically valued by the user (Deci & Ryan, 1985); c) utility: ratio of assignment to the individual's goals and future plans, and finally d) cost: what the individual is willing to gain or lose in exchange for performing the task, in terms of giving up other activities in order to engage in an activity (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). Motivation is thus understood as the confluence between expectancy and value.

In short, based on the review and the findings presented, the importance of "didactic readers" for the training of readers has been realised. However, the existing information on teachers' reading behaviour has been collected using qualitative research techniques, and there is little quantitative information on this area. This confirms the need for a valid and reliable instrument allowing us to analyse the reading motivation of teachers in charge of educating readers.

Method

Sample

The sample corresponds to a non-probabilistic selection, by convenience, made up of 30 participants of which 21 are women (70%) and 9 are men (30%). All of them were required to have a degree in teaching Spanish and Communication. As an additional requirement, they were asked to be working in a private, public and/or subsidised private school, in the 2nd cycle of General Primary Education and/or Secondary Education, in the Valparaíso region.

Instrument

The instrument developed corresponds to a Likert-type scale, aimed at identifying aspects related to the reading habits of the teacher, both on a personal and professional level, and was designed according to the Expectancy-Value motivation model proposed by Eccles and Wigfield (2002).

Between the two dimensions of the model, it is made up of 30 items distributed as follows: Expectancy (6), Value: Importance (6), Interest (6), Utility (6) and Cost (6). This distribution is based on the literature, where behaviours linked to reading and motivational habits are analysed separately, based on the importance, interest, utility and cost attributed to reading (Benevides & Peterson, 2010; Cremin et al., 2008; Tenti-Fanfani, 2005; Miret, 2008; Romero, 2007; Tovar, 2009). The overall construction of the scale was carried out considering the experts' suggestions, in terms of presenting an instrument duly formulated for teachers, referring to the aspects of extension (number of indicators) and format.

The items were presented randomly. Participants reported their degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the 30 statements presented, assigning them a score: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neither Agree, nor Disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree.

From the scores assigned by the participants, it is proposed to calculate the average obtained for each of the dimensions, which would allow them to know their strengths and weaknesses in the area of reading motivation, considering the interaction between their own expectancies and the value they attribute to the task. In order to allow participants to visualise their results, a matrix where they can calculate the means obtained is available, thus encouraging reflection and decision making in order to enrich their role as a didactic reader.

Pilot application

The pilot application was carried out online and participants were instructed to answer the scale by means of an instruction manual containing the objective of the study, the contextualisation of the study and an informed consent form.

Content validity and expert judgement

In order to ensure that the indicators of the scale effectively refer to the construct they were intended to measure, their relevance, coherence and sufficiency were assessed using Lawshe's method (1975). The instrument was initially made up of 84 indicators: (17) Expectancy; (10) Importance; (17) Interest; (24) Utility; and (16) Cost. It was subjected to a content review by means of a judgement of 8 experts with PhD degrees and experience in the field of reading and/or motivation. The version of the instrument sent to the experts contained the conceptual definition of Reading Motivation, together with the description of the Expectancy-Value motivation model of Eccles and Wigfield (2002), in order to homogenise the understanding of the construct to be measured. They were asked to rate each of the statements on a scale of 1 to 5 in terms of *relevance* (the item is clear and has no more than one possible interpretation) and *clarity* (the item is aimed at obtaining the information sought).

Once the judges' ratings for each indicator had been obtained, we calculated the Content Validity Ratio (Content Validity Ratio CVR), using Lawshe's formula (1975), applying the modification made by Tristán-López (2008) (hereinafter CVR') and Microsoft Excel 2016 ® for data processing. These values show the level of agreement reached among the judges, in

relation to the relevance and clarity of the indicators; those items with a CVR' equal to or greater than 0.5823 fall within the *acceptable* category.

Figure 1 corresponds to the formula for calculating the CVR of each item according to Lawshe's (1975) model. Figure 2 shows the formula for determining the CVR' for each item, according to Lawshe's (1975) model, modified by Tristán-López (2008).

Figure 1.

Content Validity Ratio Equation (CVR) Lawshe's method.

$$CVR = \frac{n_e - \frac{N}{2}}{\frac{N}{2}}$$

Where:

n_e : Number of panellists who agree on the "Relevance" and "Clarity" categories.

N: Total number of experts.

Figure 2.

Content Validity Ratio Equation (CVR') Lawshe's method Modified by Tristán.

$$CVR' = \frac{CVR + 1}{2}$$

Where:

CVR: The content validity ratio for each item.

With regard to the selection of the items included in the final version of the instrument, in the first instance, those indicators considered acceptable according to the CVR' results (79 for relevance and 80 for clarity) were taken and those which did not have the minimum score (0.58) were withdrawn.

In a second instance, a new selection was made from the 79 items assessed as acceptable and clear. This considered those that scored the highest and were most representative of the construct, according to the opinion of the experts. Finally, those items considered to be similar to each other and those with the highest number of suggestions for modification by the experts were withdrawn. Therefore, the 6 indicators relating to the Expectancy dimension and Value sub-dimensions were selected (withdrawing the remaining 54), resulting in a final version of the instrument of a total of 30 items, which was considered adequate by the experts in terms of length.

Based on the CVR' of the 30 selected items, the average of these values is calculated to finally obtain the overall Content Validity Index (hereafter CVI), which, according to Tristán-López, (2008) should be interpreted as "the concordance between the ability (skill, competence, knowledge, etc.) requested in a specific domain and the performance requested in the test that tries to measure that domain" (p.39) (see figure 3). The CVI of the instrument must be equal to or greater than 0.58

Figure 3.

Content Validity Index Equation (CVI).

$$cvi = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M CVRi}{M}$$

Where:

CVRi: Content validity ratio of acceptable items according to Lawshe's criteria.

M: Total number of test items considered acceptable.

Internal consistency analysis

In order to determine the reliability of the instrument, the results obtained from a single pilot application (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2001) were subjected to an internal consistency analysis. Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient was used, both for the Expectancy and the Value dimension (considering the 4 subcategories that make up the latter jointly) for which the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 software was used ©. Through this analysis, the correlation degree between the indicators that make up the scale (see figure 4) was determined in order to ensure that the items are considered homogeneous, i.e., that they all measure the same construct, ensuring a higher degree of internal consistency (Magnusson, 1990).

Figure 4.

Cronbach Alpha equation.

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K - 1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K S_i^2}{S_t^2} \right)$$

Where:

K: Number of items.

S_i^2 : Variance of each item.

S_t^2 : Variance of the sum of the scores per assessor.

According to Peralta et al. (2012), the criteria and values to evaluate the results of Cronbach Alpha Coefficient are the following Excellent (> 0.9); Good (> 0.8 and < 0.9); Acceptable (> 0.7 and < 0.8); Questionable (> 0.6 and < 0.7); Poor (> 0.5 and < 0.6) and Unacceptable (0.5).

Results

The results obtained for the CVR and CVR' for all items are shown in table 1 together with the overall CVI of the instrument.

The results show that the 30 items selected for the final scale fall within the "Acceptable" category, according to the minimum value proposed by Lawshe's (1975) model modified by Tristán-López (2008) corresponding to 0.5823, scoring a CVR' of minimum value of 0.5. and a maximum value of 1.0.

Table 1.

Results Content Validity Ratio (CVR') and Overall Content Validity Index of the instrument (CVI).

Construct	Dimension	Subdimension	Category/ Item	5	4	3	2	1	cvr	cvr'		
Motivation	Expectancy		2	7	0	1	0	0	0.75	0.875		
			3	6	1	1	0	0	0.75	0.875		
			4	5	2	1	0	0	0.75	0.875		
			9	9	5	2	0	1	0.75	0.875		
			10	10	6	1	0	1	0.75	0.875		
			13	13	5	1	2	0	0.5	0.75		
	Value	Importance		18	5	2	0	0	1	0.75	0.875	
				19	7	0	0	0	1	0.75	0.875	
				21	4	2	1	0	1	0.5	0.75	
				22	5	2	0	0	1	0.75	0.875	
				24	4	2	1	0	1	0.75	0.875	
				25	5	2	0	0	1	0.5	0.75	
		Interest			28	8	0	0	0	0	1	1
					29	4	3	1	0	0	0.75	0.875
					30	6	1	1	0	0	0.75	0.875
					32	5	1	1	0	1	0.5	0.75
					34	5	3	0	0	0	1	1
		Utility			35	5	3	0	0	0	1	1
					45	6	1	0	1	0	0.75	0.875
					46	5	2	0	1	0	0.75	0.875
60	6				2	0	0	0	1	1		
63	6				1	1	0	0	0.75	0.875		
64	6				0	1	0	1	0.5	0.75		
Cost			68	5	2	0	0	1	0.75	0.875		
			69	5	1	0	0	2	0.5	0.75		
			74	4	2	0	0	2	0.5	0.75		
			75	4	2	0	0	2	0.5	0.75		
			76	7	0	0	0	1	0.75	0.875		
			77	7	0	0	0	1	0.75	0.875		
			80	5	1	0	0	2	0.5	0.75		
									cvr			
										0.854		

As for the selected items, those with the lowest scores in the area of relevance were 13, 21, 25, 32, 69, 74, 75 and 80 with a CVR' index of 0.5, thus falling within the “acceptable” category; while in Clarity the items with the lowest scores were 4, 8, 9 and 12, whose CVR' was 0.625, thus also falling within the “acceptable” category. Finally, overall CVI of 8.85, higher than 0.58, and therefore acceptable according to Tristán-López’s proposal. (2008).

The analysis of internal consistency based on the calculation of Cronbach alpha (table 2), yielded a value of 0.858 in the Expectancy dimension and 0.829 in the Value dimension, the alpha of the total instrument being 0.866 with a variance of 0.205. According to the established values, the following are in the “Good” category. This indicates that the instrument is consistent, that the items are correlated with each other and that they measure the same construct.

Table 2.

Results obtained from internal consistency analysis Cronbach alpha.

Dimension	Cronbach Alpha	No. of elements
Expentancy	.858	6
Value	.829	24
Instrument totals	.866	30

Discussion and conclusions

The Reading Motivation Scale for Language and Communication Teachers (RMSLCT) proved to be a valid and reliable instrument that allows to know the strengths and weaknesses of teachers' reading motivation, through the assessment of their own expectations and the value attributed to reading, according to Eccles and Wigfield's Expectancy-Value Model (2002).

The Content Validity Ratio (CVR²) of the items yields values between 0.5 and 1.0, placing them above the minimum acceptable. The overall Content Validity Index gave a value of 0.85, also above the acceptable minimum (0.58). The internal consistency analysis, calculated based on Cronbach alpha, yielded a value of 0.858 for the *Expectation* dimension; 0.829 for the Value dimension, and 0.866 for the instrument as a whole, with a variance of 0.205. Nevertheless, there is a projected need to apply the instrument to a larger sample in order to expand the results obtained.

On the other hand, in view of the evidence in the literature that the teaching of reading requires the presence of didactic readers, the need for an instrument such as the one presented here is ratified, as it would make it possible to ascertain the expectations that teachers have about their own reading skills. It would also show how they value the task in terms of the level of importance it will have for them, their capacity to enjoy the task intrinsically, how useful they perceive it to be, and how they position themselves in relation to the cost of the activity, in terms of, for example, the priority assigned to it compared to other activities.

Knowledge of these aspects would make it possible to lay the foundations for intervening in teachers' reading motivation and promote the development of attitudes aimed at increasing their own expectations and the value they place on reading. In order to contribute to the improvement of their pedagogical practice, this could be translated, for example, into encouraging them to use strategies such as those referred to in the literature, which are used as efficient practices by those teachers who have a close and transcendental relationship with reading. These include recommending books, promoting instances of oral and collective reading with students, free selection of what they will read, allowing class time for independent reading, and discussing books.

Finally, RMSLCT fulfils the need for a quantitative instrument to objectively measure reading motivation, either to complement the results revealed by the interviews with pre-service and in-service teachers, or to measure the construct independently. In either case, the objective of

understanding and intervening in teachers' reading motivation would be addressed, considering the extensive evidence that a teacher who enjoys reading in their private life can act as a role model and mediate the consolidation of reading as a practice intrinsically valued by their students.

References

- Applegate, A., & Applegate, M. (2004). The Peter effect: Reading habits and attitudes of preservice teachers. *Reading Teacher*, 57(6), 554-565.
- Applegate, A. J., Applegate, M. D., Mercantini, C. M., Cobb, J. B., DeBoy, J. R., Modla, V., & Lewinski, K. E. (2014) The Peter Effect Revisited: Reading Habits and Attitudes of College Students. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 53:3, 188-2004. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2014.898719>
- Asfura, E., & Real, N. (2019). La lectura literaria al egreso de la formación inicial docente. Un retrato de las prácticas lectoras declaradas por estudiantes de pedagogía en educación secundaria en lenguaje y comunicación. *Calidad en la educación*, (50), 83-113. <http://doi.org/10.31619/caledu.n50.719>
- Asselin, M. (2000). Confronting assumptions: Preservice teachers' beliefs about reading and literature. *Reading Psychology*, 21(1), 31-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/027027100278338>
- Atkinson, J. (1964). *An Introduction Motivation*. VanNostrand
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3
- Benevides, T., & Peterson, S. (2010). Literacy attitudes, habits and achievements of future teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(3), 291-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2010.497375>
- Boggs, M., & Golden, F. (2009). Insights: Literacy Memories of Preservice Teachers Self-Reported Categories of Impact. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 9(2), 211-223. <http://www.readingmatrix.com/journal.html>
- Carreño, Á., & Garrido, J. M. (2013). Aprendizaje motivado en alumnos universitarios: validación y resultados generales de una escala. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 31(2), 347-347. <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.31.2.163581>
- Cohen, R., Swerdlik, M., & Velázquez, J. (2001). *Pruebas y evaluación psicológicas-Introducción a las pruebas y a la medición* (4ª edición). Mc Graw Hill.
- Clavero, F. H., Salguero, M. I. R., Venegas, J. M. R., & Ramírez, I. H. (2004). Tratamiento de las creencias motivacionales en contextos educativos pluriculturales. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 34(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie3412885>
- Commeyras, M., Bisplinghoff, B., & Olson, J. (2003). *Teachers as readers. Perspectives on the Importance of Reading in Teachers' Classrooms and Lives*. International Reading Association. <http://www.uilis.unsyiah.ac.id/oer/files/original/01532b0c1b2aff17e99ce310617569c1.pdf>
- Cremin, T., Mottram, M., Collins, F., Powell, S., & Safford, K. (2009). Teachers as readers: building communities of readers. *Literacy*, 43(1), 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4369.2009.00515.x>
- Cremin, T., Bearne, E., Mottram, M., & Goodwin, P. (2008). Primary teachers as readers: Primary teachers as readers. *English in Education*, 42(1), 8-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-8845.2007.00001.x>

- Deci, E., Ryan, R. (1985). Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior. *Plenum*, 86, 18-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
- Dellinger, A., Bobbett, J., Olivier, D., & Ellett, C. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-Self. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(3), 751-766. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.010>
- Dueñas, J., Taberero, R. Calvo, V., & Consejo, E. (2014). La lectura literaria ante nuevos retos: Canon y mediación en la trayectoria lectora de futuros profesores. *Ocnos*, 11, 21-43. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2014.11.02
- Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 109-132. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., & Schiefele, U. (1998). Motivation to Succeed. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3. Social, Emotional, and Personality Development* (5th ed., pp. 1017-1095). Wiley.
- Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(3), 215-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295213003>
- Elche, M., & Yubero, S. (2019). La compleja relación de los docentes con la lectura: el comportamiento lector del profesorado de educación infantil y primaria en formación. *Bordón. Revista De Pedagogía*, 71(1), 31-45. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2019.66083>
- Émery-Bruneau, J. (2010). *Le rapport à la lecture littéraire: des pratiques et conceptions de sujets-lecteurs en formation à l'enseignement du français à des intentions didactiques*. [Dissertation, Faculté des Sciences de l'Éducation: Université Laval, Québec]. <https://corpus.ulaval.ca/jspui/bitstream/20.500.11794/21444/1/27627.pdf>
- Falardeau, E., Simard, D., Carrier, L., & Gauvin-Fiset, L. (2011). Le rôle de l'affectivité dans l'enseignement de la littérature: portraits d'enseignants lecteurs. In C. Mazauric, M. Fourtanier, & G. Langlade (Dir.), *Textes de lecteurs en formation* (pp. 61-70). Peter Lang.
- Fanfani, E. (2005). *La Condición Docente*. Editores Argentina.
- Granado, C. (2014). Teachers as readers: a study of the reading habits of future teachers (El docente como lector: estudio de los hábitos lectores de futuros docentes). *Cultura y Educación*, 26(1), 44-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11356405.2014.908666>
- Granado, C., & Puig, M. (2014). ¿Qué leen los futuros maestros y maestras? Un estudio del docente como sujeto lector a través de los títulos de libros que evocan. *Ocnos* 11, 93-112. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2014.11.05
- Gupta, R. (2004). Old habits die hard: literacy practices of pre-service teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30(1), 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260747032000162325>
- Guthrie, J. (1996). Educational contexts for engagement in literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(6), 432-445.
- Larrañaga, E., & Yubero, S. (2005). El hábito lector como actitud. El origen de la categoría de "falsos lectores". *Ocnos*, 26(1), 44-70. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2005.01.04
- Lawshe, C. (1975). A Quantitative Approach to Content Validity 1. *Personnel Psychology*, 1, 563-575. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x>
- López-Valero, A., Encabo, E., & Jerez, I. (2016). Consideraciones docentes e investigadoras para la Didáctica de la literatura en Educación Infantil y en Educación Primaria. *Lenguaje y Textos*, 43, 7-14. <https://doi:10.4995/lyt.2016.5820>
- Magnusson, D. (1990). *Teoría de los Test* (2nd ed.). Editorial Trillas.

- Manresa, M. (2011). *Els Hàbits lectors dels adolescents efectes de les actuacions escolars en les pràctiques de lectura*. [Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona]. <https://ddd.uab.cat/reco rd/98719>
- Meece, J., Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. (1990). Predictors of math anxiety and its influence on young adolescents' course enrollment intentions and performance in mathematics. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.60>
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). How motives, skills, and values determine what people do. *American Psychologist, 40*(7), 812–825. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.40.7.812>
- MINEDUC (2018). *Bases Curriculares Primero a Sexto Básico*. Santiago: Unidad de Curriculum y Evaluación. Ministerio de Educación. https://curriculumnacional.mineduc.cl/614/articulos-22394_bases.pdf.
- MINEDUC (2015). *Bases Curriculares 7° Básico a 2° Medio*. Santiago: Unidad de Curriculum y Evaluación. Ministerio de Educación. https://curriculumnacional.mineduc.cl/614/articulos-34949_Bases.pdf.
- Miret, I. (2008). Bibliotecas escolares, (aún más) hoy. In J.A. Millán (Coord.). *La lectura en España. Informe 2008* (pp. 93-105). Fundación Germán Sánchez Ruipérez. <http://www.fge.es/lalectura/docs/miret.pdf>
- Mueller, D. (1973). Teacher attitudes toward reading. *Journal of Reading, 17*(3), 202- 205.
- Mullis, I., Kennedy, A., Martin, M., & Sinsbury, M. (2006). *PIRLS 2006. Marcos teóricos y especificaciones de evaluación. Estudio Internacional de Progreso en Comprensión Lectora* (2nd ed.). INECSE.
- Munita, F. (2013). Creencias y saberes de futuros maestros (lectores y no lectores) en torno a la educación literaria. *Ocnos, 9*, 69-87. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2013.09.04
- Munita, F. (2017). El sujeto lector didáctico: “lectores que enseñan y profesores que leen”. *Álabe, 17*. <https://doi.org/10.15645/Alabe2018.17.2>
- Muñoz, C., Valenzuela, J., Avendaño, C., & Núñez, C. (2016). Mejora en la motivación por la Lectura Académica: la mirada de estudiantes motivados. *Ocnos, 15*(1), 52-68. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2016.15.1.941
- Nathanson, S., Pruslow, J., & Levitt, R. (2008). The reading habits and literacy attitudes of inservice and prospective teachers: Results of a questionnaire survey. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(4), 313-321. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108321685>
- Paris, S., & Oka, E. (1986). Self-regulated learning among exceptional children. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 103–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440298605300201>
- Peralta, N., Godoi, V., Harter, G., & Miller, L. (2012). Validez y confiabilidad del índice de capacidad para el trabajo en trabajadores del primer nivel de atención de salud en Argentina. *Salud Colectiva, 8*(2), 163-173. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1851-82652012000200005>
- Phillips, D., & Larson, M. (2009). Embodied discourses of literacy in the lives of two preservice teachers. *Teacher Development, 13*(2), 135-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530903043962>
- Pintrich, P. y Schunk, D. (2006). *Motivación en contextos educativos. Teoría, investigación y aplicaciones* (2nd ed.). Pearson Educación.
- Powell-Brown, A. (2003). Can you be a teacher of literacy if you don't love to read? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 47*(4), 284–288. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40014774>
- Romero, F. S. (2007). La lectura como instrumento clave en el aprendizaje escolar. *Praxis Educativa, 2*(1), 13-26.

- Sanacore, J. (2002). Questions often asked about promoting lifetime literacy efforts. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 37(3), 163-168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105345120203700305>
- Scott, J. (1996). Self-efficacy: A key to literacy learning. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 36(3), 195-213. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol36/iss3/1
- Schunk, D. (1990). Introduction to the special section on motivation and efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0092681>
- Shulman, L. S. (1991). Ways of seeing, ways of knowing: Ways of teaching, ways of learning about teaching. *J. Curriculum Studies*, 23(5), 393-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027910230501>
- Sotomayor, C., Coloma, C., Sweis, G., Orellana, R., Hrepich, P., & Caselli, J. (2013). Percepción de los estudiantes de pedagogía sobre su formación inicial. *Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 5(11), 375-392. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4773729>
- Sotomayor, C., Parodi, G., Coloma, C., Ibáñez, R., & Cavada, P. (2011). La formación inicial de docentes de Educación General Básica en Chile. ¿Qué se espera que aprendan los futuros profesores en el área de Lenguaje y Comunicación? *Pensamiento Educativo, Revista de Investigación Latinoamericana (PEL)*, 48(1), 28-42. <https://doi.org/10.7764/PEL.48.1.2011.3>
- Skinner, E., Wellborn, J., & Connell, J. (1990). What it takes to do well in school and whether I've got it: A process model of perceived control and children's engagement and achievement in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.22>
- Tenti-Fanfani, E. (2005). *La Condición Docente. Análisis Comparado de la Argentina, Brasil, Perú y Uruguay*. Siglo Veintiuno Editores. <http://repositorio.minedu.gob.pe/handle/20.500.12799/3076>
- Tovar, R. (2009). La formación como lector y escritor: Un reto para el docente. *Educere*, 13(44), 109-116. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/356/35614571013.pdf>
- Trent, J. (2011). 'Four years on, I'm ready to teach': Teacher education and the construction of teacher identities. *Teachers and Teaching Theory and Practice*, 17(5), 529-543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.602207>
- Tristán-López, A. (2008). Modificación al modelo de Lawshe para el dictamen cuantitativo de la validez de contenido de un instrumento objetivo. *Avances en Medición*, 6(1), 37-48.
- Valenzuela, J., & Nieto, A. (2008). Motivación y Pensamiento Crítico: Aportes para el estudio de esta relación. *Revista electrónica de Motivación y Emoción*, 28(1), 1-8. <http://reme.uji.es/articulos/numero28/article3/texto.html>
- Wang, J., & Guthrie, J. (2004). Modeling the effects of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amount of reading, and past reading achievement on text comprehension between US and Chinese students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 162-186. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.39.2.2>
- Wentzel, R., & Wigfield, A. (1998). Academic and social motivational influences on students' academic performance. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10, 155-175. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022137619834>
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*, 12(3), 265-310. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297\(92\)90011-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297(92)90011-P)
- Wigfield, A., Eccles, J., Mac Iver, D., Reuman, D., & Midgley, C. (1991). Transitions during early adolescence: Changes in children's domain-specific self-perceptions and general self-esteem across the transition to junior high school. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(4), 552-565. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.27.4.552>
- Woolfolk, A., & Burke, R. (2005). Changes in Teacher Efficacy during the Early Years of Teaching. A Comparison of Four Measures. *Teacher and Teaching Education*, 21, 343-356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.01.007>

APPENDIX

Reading Motivation Scale for Language and Communication Teachers (RMSLCT)

This instrument is aimed at measuring the level of reading motivation of Language and Communication teachers. To this end, the scale has items that target your personal and professional reading.

Express your agreement or disagreement with the following 30 statements, marking the option that best reflects your opinion. Please note that 5 means that you completely agree with the statement and 1 means that you completely disagree with it.

- Completely disagree 1
- Disagree 2
- Neither Agree, nor Disagree 3
- Agree 4
- Strongly agree 5

1.	It is essential to read the entire Reading Plan that I give to my students, so that I can effectively guide their reading process.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Being a good reader is important for my professional performance.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I spend time reading about strategies and methods for teaching reading comprehension to my students.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Being a good reader is useful for my professional performance.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I find it interesting to read literary texts.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I read non-literary literature with interest.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I am aware of my weaknesses as a reader.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Reading is useful to clarify whether information from various sources is true or false.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I read on various topics with interest.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I find it useful to read travel brochures or catalogues to guide my own travels.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I consider it important to provide my students with readings on a wide range of topics and literary genres.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Reading is important in order to promote reading in the classroom properly.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I spend time planning/implementing activities inside or outside the classroom that focus on reading.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I prefer reading to other leisure activities.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I can understand texts that I find difficult or complex.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I find it useful to encourage critical reading in my students.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	It is important for the teacher to read the books suggested by the Ministry of Education in order to design an optimal reading plan.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I read to acquire new knowledge on topics of interest to me.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I am aware of my strengths as a reader.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I can let others know my thoughts on what I have read.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I find it important to read about pedagogical practices.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I enjoy reading so much that I often lose track of time while reading.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I commit myself to the reading I am doing until I understand it, even if that means putting aside other activities.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I spend time on compulsory readings for my students.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	When I am faced with new projects, I find it useful to read information about them and to guide my decision-making.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I spend a great deal of time selecting texts for my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I like to share my reading experiences with my students and/or close circle.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I can distinguish relevant information from irrelevant information when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I plan reading activities for my students in collaboration with the school library.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	I can apply strategies that facilitate my reading process.	1	2	3	4	5

Correction of Reading Motivation Scale for Language and Communication Teachers (RMSLCT)

1. Instructions:

a. The indicators that make up the RMSLCT, ordered according to the five dimensions of motivation set out in Eccles and Wigfield's (2000) Expectancy-Value model, can be found below. They are the following:

For each of the statements, you must mark the score assigned. Then add up the scores assigned to each item and put the total score obtained for each dimension in the final part (PT). Divide the sum in each of the five dimensions by the maximum score marked in each box and multiply the result by 100. Write the result in the corresponding space in the % row.

2. Correction:

								Max. 30 pts	
Expectancy	Question No.	28	15	20	19	7	30	Total 30	%
	Score								
Importance	Question No.	12	2	21	1	11	17	Total 30	%
	Score								
Interest	Question No.	9	14	22	5	6	27	Total 30	%
	Score								
Utility	Question No.	10	4	25	8	16	18	Total 30	%
	Score								
Cost	Question No.	3	13	29	23	26	3	Total 30	%
	Score								