KEAR, KATHRYN, Ph.D. Teachers' Adaptations and Rationales as They Relate to Openness of Task and Student Motivation. (2009)
Directed by Dr. Gerald Duffy. 150 pp.

Prior research has investigated teacher adaptations and rationales as they relate to literacy instruction. This research hinted at a relationship between instructional adaptations and open tasks, notably that open tasks seemed to produce more adaptations than closed tasks. Further, research in the motivation field has determined that high-challenge tasks, which are similar to open tasks, produce higher student motivation than low-challenge tasks. Based on the prior research, this study was constructed to examine the connections between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation. Would open tasks allow for more and higher quality adaptations and rationales? Further, would open tasks produce higher student motivation than closed tasks?

Four second-grade teachers were selected for the study, from two types of classrooms, scripted and unscripted, in which it was assumed the tasks found in the classrooms would be different. Five average-level student participants were selected in each classroom. The unscripted teachers received an intervention to ensure that their tasks included open task features, whereas the scripted teachers received no intervention. I observed each teacher for five days during their literacy block to identify potential adaptations and collect tasks. I conducted post-lesson interviews of the teachers to determine adaptations, their rationales for adapting, and the perceived motivation of participating students. I conducted post-lesson interviews of selected student participants about their motivation while completing tasks. Confirmed adaptations and their rationales

and the thoughtfulness of each were coded and rated according to prior established criteria. I rated the openness of tasks with a rubric. Modified motivation data was collected and subsequently analyzed according to Turner's (1995) codes.

The unscripted teachers produced made more and higher quality teacher adaptations and required more open tasks than their scripted colleagues. However, the student motivation results were ambiguous and neither set of students could be determined to be "more motivated."

Implications for practice, policy and future research are discussed.

TEACHERS' ADAPTATIONS AND RATIONALES AS THEY RELATE TO

OPENNESS OF TASK AND STUDENT MOTIVATION

by

Kathryn Kear

A Dissertation Submitted to
The Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2009

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to all those who supported me

throughout my studies and the dissertation.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been accepted by the following committee of the Faculty of

The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

_____

_____

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focused on teacher's instructional adaptations and rationales and student motivation during instruction in scripted and unscripted classrooms. Researchers have long suggested that teachers are adaptive in their instruction (Borko & Shavelson, 1990; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Corno, 2008; Duffy, 1991). Previous research established that thoughtfully adaptive teaching exists in classrooms (Duffy et al., 2007, 2008; Kear, 2008). Further, this research suggests that lessons with closed tasks produce fewer and less thoughtful teacher adaptations than those containing open tasks (Duffy et al., 2007). While motivation research indicates that open tasks, which are similar to Miller and Meece's (1999) high-challenge tasks increase student motivation (Turner, 1995), are teacher adaptations related to openness of tasks and do instructional adaptations affect student motivation?

This study examined the relationship between adaptations and student motivation in scripted and unscripted classrooms, where it was assumed there would be a difference in task openness. This research is a modified replication of Turner's (1995) study about the influence of openness of task on aspects of student motivation. Turner evaluated how openness of task, among other factors, related to students' "motivated literacy" for reading. Specifically, Turner examined whether teacher/pupil interaction, the assigned task, and the literacy environment affected how motivated children were during task

completion. Turner found that the assigned task did affect student motivation, as she defined it.

While Turner's study addressed motivation and openness of task, it did not address the connection between task openness and adaptations the teacher makes during the lesson. This study did so. Additionally, this study followed Turner's lead in connecting aspects of students' motivation to task.

Consequently, the purpose of this collective case study was two-fold. First, I sought to compare two different situations in which it was assumed task openness would be different. Next, I sought to determine whether a relationship existed between teachers' adaptive actions, task openness and student motivation.

Statement of the Problem

Prior research establishes that teachers make adaptations or changes to their lessons during instruction. Duffy and his colleagues (2007) refer to this phenomenon as "thoughtfully adaptive teaching," Duffy, Roehler, and Rackliffe (1986) refer to it as "responsive elaboration," and Clark and Peterson (1986) describe a synopsis of studies using the terms "flexible," "spontaneous," and "interactive," showing how teachers change their intended plans "on the fly." Leinhardt and Greeno (1986, as cited in Borko & Shavelson, 1990), suggested that "interactive decisions" are present within the context of each lesson, ideas teachers must consider prior to beginning the next phase of the lesson. Research on effective teaching also notes that a characteristic of effective teachers is the ability to adapt lessons during instruction (Allington & Johnston, 2002; Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Block, & Morrow, 2001). Last, researchers who

investigate how people learn and teach refer positively to the ability to adapt while teaching (Bransford, Derry, Berliner, Hammerness, & Beckett, 2005; Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000).

However, there are two main concerns with adaptive teaching. First, prior studies found that researchers observed as few as one adaptation per lesson (Duffy et al., 2008). Is the instruction that well-planned that student interactions are predetermined and task directions are completely clear? What few adaptations were observed were also found to typically require little metacognitive thought to create (Duffy et al., 2008). Second, researchers have been unable to determine adaptive teaching's effect on students (Duffy et al., 2007). While teacher's adaptations are thought to help students, there is no empirical evidence at present of positive student outcomes to adaptations.

Investigating instructional tasks may be a way to examine these two issues. Researchers have long thought that there is a vast difference in terms of student motivation between open and closed tasks (Miller, 2003; Miller & Meece, 1999; Thornburg, 2005; Willems, 1981). High-challenge (i.e., "open") tasks are tasks in which there are no set right answers (Miller, 2003). The work required in such a task is sustained over time, requires protracted prose, and collaboration (Miller, 2003; Willems, 1981). Miller (2003) and Thornburg (2005) found that high-challenge tasks were more motivating to students than low-challenge (i.e., "closed") tasks. Turner (1995) found that students exhibited more motivated literacy during open tasks than closed ones. Prior research demonstrates that student motivation will decrease when tasks are not engaging enough for the student (Turner & Paris, 1995; Turner & Patrick, 2004). Further, Duffy

and colleagues (2007) presented two pilot studies in which adaptive teaching and higher student engagement may have been found more often in unscripted classrooms than scripted ones, and that the unscripted lessons seemed to feature mainly open tasks, while the scripted lessons featured closed tasks. These hints at a connection between instructional adaptations and open and closed tasks need to be studied; further, since it is believed that unscripted classrooms utilize more open tasks, thus resulting in increased student motivation, it is therefore believed that instructional adaptations may result in increased student motivation.

The overall problem, thus, is to determine whether there are any connections between instructional adaptations, task openness, and student motivation in scripted and unscripted classrooms.

Consequently, the specific questions this study seeks to answer are:

1. What frequency, type, and quality of teacher adaptations are made in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
2. What frequency, type, and quality of rationales for adaptations are made in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
3. What openness level of literacy tasks are found in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
4. What motivation is evidenced in the interview portion of Turner's motivated literacy in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
5. What is the relationship between task openness and students' responses to the interview portion of Turner's motivated literacy in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
6. What is the relationship between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness and students' responses to the interview portion of Turner's motivated literacy in:

a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

Significance

This research is important for two main reasons. First, while we know that instructional adaptations exist in classrooms, we do not yet know what their effect on students might be. While effective teacher research states that effective teachers employ adaptations in their instruction, we do not know if those adaptations aid or assist the student learning. It is vital that educators understand the effects of instructional practices. Second, this study seeks to define the relationship between instructional adaptations and task openness.

Definitions

This section will address the definitions of the terms to be used in this study investigating teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation. Included in the definitions are the underlying terms involved in the research project, including terms found in Turner's (1995) work.

Teacher adaptations were defined as "a form of executive control in which teachers modify professional information and/or practices in order to meet the needs of particular students or particular instructional situations within the framework of the lesson plan;" (Duffy et al., 2008). Further, an adaptation is "a non-routine, proactive decision (i.e., it is not something we see the teacher do in other observations) that requires thought and is invented on the spot in order to make instruction suitable for the goal the teacher is pursuing" (Duffy et al., 2008, p. 5). Adaptations were initially screened using the following rules, in which the teacher:

- provided a response to an unanticipated student question or behavior; or

- diverged from the lesson plan; or

- made a public statement about a change of plan;

and, in which the action:

- was non-routine, proactive, thoughtful and invented; and

- included a change in the professional knowledge or the professional practices the teacher was using; and

- was done to anticipate the needs of students or instructional situations (Duffy et al., 2008).

In a post-lesson interview, the adaptation was confirmed by the teacher as an unplanned change. Only events meeting these criteria were adaptations.

Rationales were defined as the reasons the teacher provided for the adaptation in the post lesson interview in response to a probe. Rationales were teachers' own perceptions of why they made decisions, as evidenced through oral reflection (Duffy et al., 2006, 2007, 2008; Risko, Roskos, & Vukelich, 2005).

Tasks were defined as the written work students completed at the direction of the teacher (Miller & Meece, 1997; Turner, 1995). Tasks included completing worksheets, drawing pictures, writing stories and sentences, and creating other written works, such as posters and graphic organizers.

Tasks were defined to be open, moderately open, and closed, as measured by Parson's framework for task openness (Parsons, 2008a). Task openness was thus determined from the cumulative number of points for each of the five rating areas. Each

task could score from one to three points per characteristic area, with one point meaning the task was more closed with that aspect and three points meaning it was more open. Tasks with a cumulative rating of 5-8 were closed; tasks with a rating of 9-12 were moderately open, and tasks with a rating of 13-15 were open (see Appendix A).

Motivation was defined by modifying the interview portion of Turner's (1995) measure of "motivated literacy." Turner's motivated literacy was defined by evidence of three factors: strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control. Turner called her student motivation component "motivated literacy." However, because I am only using a portion of Turner's "motivated literacy" data collection methods, this aspect is called "motivation" in this study, instead of "motivated literacy." Details of Turner's motivated literacy categories are included in Chapter II.

Strategic reading was defined by the combination of reading strategy and learning strategy use, as specified by the student during interviews in answer to these questions:

- What were you supposed to learn from the task you just did? (Turner, 1995)

- What were you thinking about as you did this task? (Turner, 1995); and by the teacher during interviews in answer to these questions:

  - What reading strategies did you notice _____ using?

  - What learning strategies did you notice _____ using?

While the first two questions were used by Turner (1995), the teacher interview questions were created by the researcher to highlight the reading and learning strategies students used, as noticed by their teachers. Participants referred to ways to attack the task, wanting understanding, seeking to learn. Students who wanted to "get it right" or "[did not]

know" what they were supposed to learn from the task were not deemed to be using strategic reading skills (Turner, 1995). Strategic reading was coded using the same codes Turner (1995) used.

Persistence was defined by how a student used skills to attack hard parts within the task as specified by the student in answer to these interview questions:

- What was the hardest part of the task for you? (Turner, 1995)

- How did you handle the hard parts? (Turner, 1995); and as specified by the teacher in answer to this interview question:

  - How persistent did you notice _____ was?

The student questions were used by Turner (1995); however, the teacher interview question was created by the researcher to determine student persistence as observed by the teacher. Students and teachers referred to persistence as student behaviors of using strategies or more effort (Turner, 1995). Asking for the teacher's help and guessing were not indicative of using persistence. Persistence was coded using the same terms Turner (1995) used, except for the addition of two codes to reflect student interview answers which Turner did not encounter and thus did not allow for within her coding system.

Volitional control was defined as actions that the student took to aid his or her concentration during the task, as specified by students in answer to these interview questions:

- How did you get the work done?

- What did you tell yourself as you completed the work?; and as specified by the teacher in answer to this interview question:

- What actions did you notice _____ take to aid his/her concentration?

These interview questions were not used by Turner (1995); instead, Turner used observation to determine the volitional control of the students. Therefore, these questions were created by the researcher, based on Turner's (1995) observation protocol and codes, to illuminate the volitional control strategies used by the students. Teachers referenced, and students used, strategies such as thinking about the task, circling important words, referring back to the book, and figuring out answers. Other students did not demonstrate volitional control by not knowing how they controlled their working environment or seeking teacher help to aid concentration (Turner, 1995). Volitional control was coded using the same codes used by Turner (1995).

To determine whether the scripted or unscripted students were "more motivated," I totaled the frequency counts in each of Turner's motivation literacy categories according to scripted and unscripted contexts and compared the results: strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control. I used the provided codes from Turner (1995) in each category, developing frequency counts of how often students or the teacher mentioned a specific reading strategy, attack skill, or otherwise. The frequency counts in each motivated literacy category will be summed across codes. In other words, "more motivated" will be measured by the totals of frequency counts per category as determined by (a) the number of coded interview responses students made to each of Turner's questions on strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control per task; and (b) the number of interview responses each teacher made regarding targeted students' strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control on that day. If the total for one group of

students was 20% more than for the other context, I defined that group as "more motivated" in that category. For one of the other context to be considered "more motivated," that context must exceed 20% in each of the three categories (strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control).

For the purposes of this study, scripted lessons were defined as SRA Reading Mastery module two lessons (*Reading Mastery Classic*, 2003). Reading Mastery is a scripted program, formerly called DISTAR (Wiltz & Wilson, 2005-6), encompassing phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Module two is on grade level with grade two reading competency (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007). Modifications to lessons were prohibited by the program and the administration.

Unscripted lessons were defined as lessons in which the teacher was allowed or encouraged by the principal to modify instruction (B. Clarida, personal communications, October 1, 2007). Such unscripted lessons could include those created by others, provided that it was accepted policy within the school that the teacher could modify lessons to reflect the needs of the students.

Lesson plans were defined as the instructional decisions teachers made about their instructional work prior to the lesson (Doyle, 1983) and in this study are defined as written plans for instruction. In the scripted classrooms, the lesson plans were provided and teachers were told what to say. In the unscripted classrooms, lesson plans were plan notations of the lesson's main points. While the quality of the lesson plan varied from minimal to developed, enough information was included so that I was able to understand

what content was connected with the lesson and what content was not. In cases in which the lesson plan was not available, data was not collected. This removed transitional movements, time fillers, and free center time from the data collection.

The "soft coaching" intervention was defined as an hour to an hour-and-a-half coaching conversation between the researcher and the individual unscripted teacher participants (Clark & Florio-Ruane, 2001; Collins & Collins, 2004; Sparks, 2002). This conversation focused on mutual examination of the task rubric and discussion on how to ensure tasks for observed lessons scored higher on the rating scale.

Methods

This study looked at the instructional adaptations of four second-grade teachers, two scripted and two unscripted, and their students' motivation. The unscripted teachers received an intervention of "soft coaching" (Clark & Florio-Ruane, 2001; Collins & Collins, 2004; Sparks, 2002) about the task ratings rubric, in which the researcher purposively sought an increase in the openness of literacy tasks present in the classroom.

Each of the teachers was observed during five literacy blocks over a two week time frame for a total of approximately eight hours each. During literacy block instruction, the teacher was tape-recorded with the researcher noting suspected instructional adaptations when they occurred. All literacy tasks produced by the student participants during these lessons were collected. Each student participant was interviewed about motivation for the tasks on two of the five research days. Further, the teacher was interviewed on a daily basis about instructional adaptations and their accompanying rationales. On the days that a student was asked about his motivation for task completion,

the teacher was interviewed about her perceptions of the same student's motivation for task completion. Each interview was tape-recorded and transcribed (Weiss, 1994).

Assumptions and Limitations

Six assumptions were made in developing this study. First, it was assumed that scripted classrooms would require closed tasks while unscripted classrooms would include more open tasks. Second, it was assumed that types, numbers, and openness of tasks of fall semester second grade would be similar to tasks of Turner's spring semester in first grade (1995). Third, it was assumed that motivation could be measured in the student and teacher interviews alone, and not with observations as Turner did (1995). Fourth, it was assumed that the intervention had equal impact on the two unscripted teachers and that these teachers would assign high challenge tasks during the known observation periods. Fifth, it was assumed that both Title I schools had similar school environments and that there was a random representation of students throughout the classrooms. Last, it was assumed that unscripted teachers would be similarly adaptive in their instruction, regardless of their years of experience.

There are two limitations for this study: size and the definition of motivation. Regarding size, the study was limited by a small sample size and a short data collection period. Four teachers are not representative of the general second grade population, much less those of all elementary grade levels. Since the teachers were in two schools in one school district, generalizability was not an option. Further, schools have a limited number of teachers in each grade level, making the potential participant selection narrow and difficult to match. The selected teachers were not all classroom teachers (although they

each taught second grade reading), were not of the same ethnic background, and differed in experience levels. Due to the short data collection period, results should not be extrapolated beyond the data collection time period. Further connected to the short data collection period, the intervention was limited in its implementation. Prior research indicates that effective professional development persists over time, is generated from the teacher's needs in the classroom, and should be social for peer problem solving (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990). This coaching intervention did not stem from the teacher's own concerns for her instruction; instead, it was a professional development enacted to support the research study. The soft coaching intervention persisted over only three weeks in each scenario. Since the intervention does not meet professional development best practices, the study results are thus limited.

The second limitation was the definition of motivation. Although I tried to replicate Turner's study as closely as possible, due to the resources I had available, I could not measure motivation as Turner did (1995).

Conclusion

It is vital that we understand teachers' instructional adaptations and rationales as they relate to task openness and the relationship between instructional adaptations, task openness, and student motivation. We can better understand how adaptations occur in with open and closed tasks, as well as how students are motivated in task completion. Specifically, do instructional adaptations occur more often and in different ways with open tasks? Further, are students in open task classrooms more motivated than their peers in scripted classrooms?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Background

This mixed-methods study examined the relationships between instructional adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation in scripted and unscripted classrooms. Three specific lines of research undergird this study: research on teacher adaptations and rationales, research on tasks, and research on motivation. These three lines of research suggest that there may be a relationship among the variables. This study examined how teacher adaptations and rationales and student motivation differed in two settings which were assumed to produce different task openness. Therefore, the foundations of this study are the prior research investigating teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation.

Teacher Adaptations and Rationales

The research into teacher adaptations and rationales is based upon three lines of research and theory. First, I will discuss teacher decision making research. Next, I will review the research on reflection. Next, I will review the research on instructional adaptations and rationales, which will be followed by the history of teacher adaptations and rationales at UNCG. This final section includes how adaptations and rationales have been measured in prior work by Duffy and colleagues (2008).

Teacher Decision Making Research

Research into teacher decision making pinnacled in the 1980s, when researchers wanted to understand how teachers made their instructional decisions. Clark and Peterson (1986) stated that a decision was "deliberate choice to implement a specific action" (p. 274). This decision could have been preactive (planned) or interactive, created while teaching (Borko & Shavelson, 1990). For the most part, teachers employ a common instructional decision, the selection of a routine (Leinhardt & Greeno, 1986). This means that teachers have set methods and ways for doing instructional things, from the passing out of paper and lining up for lunch, to the process of performing a shared reading with a Big Book. These routines have variations within them; however, they look very similar from one incidence to another. Another common decision teachers make is the use of a mental script while teaching (Borko & Shavelson, 1990). The script follows a series of teacher and student inputs that are usually predetermined by the teacher. The script can emerge during reading comprehension questions, instructional scaffolding, or through the use of inquiry. In any situation, the teacher uses both of these tools to regulate instruction on a frequent basis.

Interactive decision making depends on thinking while actively teaching (Clark & Joyce, 1981; Shavelson & Stern, 1981). This is also referred to as flexibility while teaching (Clark & Joyce, 1981). In a model of interactive decision making, Shavelson and Stern (1981) propose the theoretical understanding that there are cues during instruction, or antecedents, which may need attention, leading to decisions (Marland, 1977, as cited in Borko & Shavelson, 1990). When these decisions occur, teachers

mentally refer to routines or alternatives available for selection to produce a reactive action to the cue. Interestingly, Borko and Shavelson (1990) report that only up to 14% of the cues regard content, subject matter or instructional objectives, while the remainder of the cues encompasses all other aspects of teaching.

Little research or theory has since mentioned teacher decision making. Bransford, Derry, et al. (2005) highlighted the quality of teacher decision making as an important and evolutionary aspect of teacher development. Further, Duffy and colleagues' adaptive instruction (2007, 2008) has built upon the foundational understandings first proposed by the teacher decision making researchers.

Teacher decision making theory and research peaked in the 1980s. Mental models, analyses of decision trees, and cue understandings highlighted the research of this time.

Reflection Research

This section will detail the primary foci of reflection theory and research. Reflections on decisions teachers make are critical aspects of instruction. When teachers think about their decisions, interactions, and student behaviors, they grow (Greene, 2001). "The teacher has to learn what it is to learn to let others learn" (Greene, 2001, p. 83), and that learning can emerge from constant reflection.

Schon proposed three aspects to reflection: reflection-in-practice, reflection-on-action and reflection-in-action (1983; 1987). Reflection-in-practice refers to the thinking teachers do about how they know what they do in their pedagogy (Schon, 1983). For example, a teacher may contemplate how she knows a student comprehends the text even

while the student is reading aloud. As the teacher reflects, she may consider the prosody involved or pay close attention to the sidebar comments of the child about the book. Reflection-on-action is related. The teacher who reflects on action may think after all classroom interactions, consciously determining whether the action or decision was best (Schon, 1983). Reflection-in-action occurs in situ, as the "in the moment" practice of thinking about the actions the teacher is presently making, anticipating aspects such as questions, and adjusting understandings based on the external stimuli (Schon, 1987).

Zeichner and Liston (1990) explored how teachers think about their present instruction. Teachers share a complex reality with other professionals in that they encounter myriad situations for which actions must be made but also learned from. Risko and her colleagues (2005) connected reflections with metacognition, in that reflection is thinking about thinking.

The above reflection history lends itself greatly to the rationale theory proposed next by Duffy and colleagues (2006, 2007, 2008).

Instructional Adaptations and Rationales Research

Instructional adaptations and rationales have a short history, unless you consider all the other names this action has been cited. This research and theory review will explain the history of adaptations and rationales, highlight the work of Duffy and his colleagues (2006, 2007, 2008), and provided the analytical background needed for the present study.

Instructional adaptations by teachers have long been touted by researchers, yet rarely explored. Bransford, Derry, et al. (2005) noted that adaptive expertise of teachers

is the ultimate teacher goal. In this situation, the teacher has an amount of knowledge, presumably expert level, coupled with an ability to recognize the situations in which adaptations to instruction may be made. Borko and Shavelson (1990) termed it "improvisation while teaching." Duffy et al. (1986) examined "responsive teaching" in explicit instruction classrooms, as teachers deviated from the planned lessons.

Clark and Peterson (1986) examined the results of five studies in which teachers adapted their instruction. Across the studies, the researchers found that the majority of teachers' instructional decisions were about the students or the instruction. This early exploration into spontaneous adaptations and their subsequent reasons demonstrates that the 'what' and 'why' of instructional changes are important in understanding teacher decision-making.

Sawyer (2004) makes the point that in discussion-based instruction, the teacher must be improvisational due to this unknown. Similarly, Duffy (1991) calls for the teacher to adapt to respond to student needs, as do many others (Bransford, Darling-Hammond, & LePage, 2005; Bransford, Derry, et al., 2005; Snow, Griffin, & Burns, 2005).

The rationales, or reasons, teachers have for adaptations are vital to understanding how classroom decisions are made. While the adaptation itself is important, it is simply the "what" of the classroom. The adaptation reveals what the teacher's actions were. It is the rationale for that action with which we gain an understanding of "why" the teacher made the action she did. This will provide light into the decision-making about tasks, lesson construction, lesson presentation, and student interaction (Risko et al., 2005;

Duffy, 2005). Further, the connection between the rationales and the task assist in understanding perceived qualities of those adaptations.

Rationales are the reasons teachers make instructional decisions, whether they are made in the preactive, interactive, or postactive phase. Rationale research began with teacher decision-making research (for example, Clark and Peterson (1986) used stimulated recall for rationales of "in flight" thinking), and continued with the research on instructional adaptations. Duffy and colleagues have done extensive work on rationales for interactive adaptations, or the actions determined and performed while in situ teaching (2007, 2008).

Another connection with teacher rationales is the role metacognition plays in making decisions, and formulating rationales as a result. Metacognition is the thinking about thinking, which in the case of rationales would be the awareness of the teacher about the thoughts she had as she was coming to the decision to make the adaptation (Risko et al., 2005).

Lin, Schwartz, and Hatano (2005) suggest a theory called adaptive metacognition, in which teachers encounter variable situations during instruction, varying from student to student or class to class. Therefore, a one-size-fits-all instructional plan will not address such a variable situation, and teachers must be metacognitive to negotiate such variation. When teachers are metacognitive, they monitor the classroom, make changes to their instruction as needed, and quickly assess the effectiveness of the instructional change. All of this happens within the metacognitive scope (Lin et al., 2005).

Teacher rationales are the thought to be attached to the adaptations, since they seek to explain teacher thinking and justification for the adaptations (Duffy et al., 2006, 2007). When an adaptation occurs, the teacher has been thinking a series of thoughts in which the decision was made, any obstacles were overcome, and possibilities were examined. It is these thoughts which we sought to capture.

History of Teacher Adaptations and Rationales at UNCG

In this section, I will review the established measurements for adaptations and rationales as performed by Duffy and colleagues (2006, 2007, 2008). Then I will discuss how the work shall be analyzed in this study.

Duffy and his colleagues have performed extensive research on adaptations and rationales (2006, 2007, 2008). The research began as an explanatory study in which they sought to determine if instructional adaptations even existed in classrooms. If they did, they sought to capture then qualitatively and determine patterns. Pilot and preliminary studies began; yes, this line of research was possible due to the presence and organizability of the adaptations (Duffy et al., 2006). Next, the team sought to narrow its focus to guided reading and tutoring instruction in the thoughts that the scaffolding involved in these situations might more readily allow for adaptations (Duffy et al., 2007). Following the guided reading and tutoring studies, five members of the research team developed similar dissertations in the hopes of developing understanding about five aspects:

- How are tasks tied to adaptations? (Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009; Davis, 2009)

- How are interventions tied to adaptations? (Parsons, 2008b)

- What effect do instructional adaptations have on students? (Scales, 2009)

- What knowledge do teachers use when constructing adaptations? (Davis, 2009; Williams, 2009)

- How do teacher learn from their use of adaptations? (Williams, 2009)

Duffy and colleagues' coding scheme was originally developed using grounded theory analysis (Duffy et al., 2006; 2007; submitted). Since the grounded theory codes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) were recursive in nature (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and had not yet stabilized prior to this present study's inception, the team could not yet begin coding adaptations and rationales separately. Therefore, the team analyzed all adaptation and rationale data from this research project collaboratively (Davis, 2009; Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009).

Teacher adaptation data was analyzed through field notes, teacher interviews, and lesson plans. Comparison of the lesson plan to the field notes yielded suspected teacher adaptations. However, the member check during the teacher interview confirmed that the adaptation was an unplanned event.

When teachers confirmed the action was unplanned, the research team then had to ensure the action met our adaptation criteria. The adaptations were read aloud to the research team members, based upon field notes from the data collection and transcripts from teacher interviews. When the actions were designated as adaptations and not simply reactive responses, the research team then determined the type of adaptation that had been presented. The research team agreed to code all adaptations and rationales as a

group, provided at least three members were present. Unanimous agreement was required

for certifying instructional decisions as adaptations, as well as for coding said adaptations

and their attached rationales.

Analysis of the teacher adaptations was according to the work of Duffy and

colleagues (2007, 2008). Then, the codes were proofed through subsequent constant

comparison:

Table 1

Adaptation Codes and Examples

	Code for adaptation	Examples from study
1	Teacher changes lesson objective	Change in instruction from development of writing to focus on interpersonal skills when working in a cooperative group
2	Teacher changes instructional materials, strategies, routines, procedures, or means by which the objective is met	Change of strategy to access prior knowledge from completing graphic organizer as individuals to completing the tool as partners
3	Teacher invents example, analogy, verbal or physical illustration	Student does not understand "sparkle", so teacher demonstrates meaning with hands and words
4	Teacher inserts a mini-lesson	When student does not remember how to write the main idea, teacher inserts mini-lesson into instruction
5	Teacher suggests different ways students could deal with situation or problem	In a group project, one student is not participating with the other on the creation of a poster. Teacher suggests to the group a different way of interacting so that all children are included in the work
6	Teacher omits planned activities (not for time reasons) or inserts something	Students finish early with assigned tasks, so teacher groups early finishers together and starts new instruction in a new text
7	Teacher changes planned order of instruction	Teacher reorders planned lessons since the writing lesson is an extension of the reading lesson, moving spelling to later

Similarly, the rationale codes were determined by the research team. Once the adaptation was determined, the accompanying rationale was read aloud to the research team members from the transcript of the teacher interview. Oftentimes, teacher's explanations were extremely detailed and sometimes diffuse, making the teasing out of the main rationale difficult. We were looking for the primary reason why the teacher had made the instructional adaptation. Once the reason itself was parsed out of the explanation, that rationale was coded according to the framework presented (Duffy et al., 2007, 2008) (see Table 2).

Multiple rationales were not allowed for a single adaptation. Instead, a primary rationale was selected by the research team (Davis, 2009; Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009). After the adaptation and rationale types were coded, the research team determined the amount of cognitive thought that was associated with each item coded. For instance, there was a vast difference in the amount of cognitive thought that was required for defining a word as opposed to changing an entire lesson spontaneously. Further, there was a marked difference in the metacognitive thought that was associated with a rationale of teaching culturally-responsive compared to a rationale of reteaching because students did not understand the material. Therefore, an evaluation of quality was required.

These were the criteria for the quality designations (Duffy et al., 2007; 2008):

- Considerable: "An adaptation or rationale must evidence an exemplary or creative use of professional knowledge practice and be associated with a larger goal the teacher holds for literacy growth" (Duffy et al., 2008, p. 6).

Table 2

Rationale Codes, Definitions, and Examples

Rationales	Definitions	Examples from Study
Objective not met	Teacher adapts to repair student confusion or misunderstanding or suggests that her instructional goals are otherwise not met.	"That's when I asked him if he really understood what an inference was and he said no." (LY11)
Challenge or elaborate	The teacher adapts to add to the planned lesson by exploiting a teachable moment where unplanned content is examined.	"I wanted to give her a task that maybe she would say, 'oh maybe I can add something else' or that kind of thing." (HO12)
Give strategies	The teacher adapts to teach students a specific strategy.	"I figured when they are working on their vocabulary, sometimes they will just go straight to the dictionary. And I wanted them to work on context clues and I figured that was the best way to do it is show them in the book." (HO31)
Make connections	The teacher adapts to help students make connections to their prior knowledge, their real lives, texts, or vocabulary.	"I thought seeing that and relating it to the text would make her understand it a little better." (LY12)
Knows students	The teacher adapts using her knowledge of students to inform her instruction.	"she had finished reading early and I wanted to make sure that she was staying on task of because she tends to wander off easily" (HO12)
Knows classroom dynamics	The teacher adapts using her knowledge of the relationships among students and patterns of behavior of the classroom.	"I didn't want to necessarily call him out because he gets really upset when you do. So I try my very best not call him out in front of everybody. But I thought if he were to reread that they really wouldn't know what he was doing because they were doing something else." (LY21)
Check student understanding	The teacher adapts to ascertain students' understanding of materials or processes.	
Anticipate student learning needs	The teacher changes instruction because she anticipates future difficulty.	
Manage behavior	The teacher adapts to prevent or to respond to misbehavior or off-task action.	"Then that would just let him know that I noticed that he wasn't being positive." (LY21)
Manage time	The teacher adapts because of excess or limited time.	"I had extra time and I didn't want to continue to talk and waste time. I didn't know what else to do." (LY32)
Promote engagement	The teacher adapts to engage the student by appealing to their interests or emotions.	"I just wanted . . . and I was very proud of James . . . I noticed toward the end that he had opened up more. I wondered how feedback from me causes him want to open up and want to talk and share . . . it makes him more confident in himself. Sometimes I can get stuff out of him but after that point he was like . . . he talked more it seemed like and he was more willing to share and not just sit there and say 'I don't know.'" (LY32)

- Thoughtful: An adaptation or rationale "is tied to the specific lesson objective or larger goal but does not meet any of the criteria for [sic] minimal" (Duffy et al., 2008, p. 6).

- Minimal: An adaptation or rationale "meets any of the following criteria: it requires little thought, or is a fragmented or unclear or incorrect use of professional knowledge or practice, or does not contribute usefully to a lesson objective or goal" (Duffy et al., 2008, p. 6).

As required for adaptations and rationales, at least three members of the research team had to be present, and all members present had to agree upon the metacognitive thought quality rating (Davis, 2009; Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009).

As noted in the beginning of this section, instructional adaptations and rationales have a short history, unless you consider all the other terms used to describe the action. As such, this review traced the research history, focused on the work of Duffy and his colleagues (2006; 2007; 2008), and provided the analytical background needed for the present study.

The connections between teacher decision making, reflection, and instructional adaptation and rationales theory and research overlap and intermingle. This section has discussed how these aspects align with this study. By examining the adaptations teacher make to the lesson plan, we can gain an understanding of the decision-making involved. Since unscripted lessons, with open tasks, seem to produce more and higher quality teacher adaptations than scripted lessons, with closed tasks (Duffy et al., 2007), tasks are the natural next step in the research discussion. When students are in control of the

learning, such as during independent student writing, there are a broad range of interactions between themselves and the teacher, which stimulates increased numbers of teacher adaptations. During teacher-directed lessons, such as group read aloud, there is markedly less opportunity, or perhaps less ability, to make adaptations. Therefore, lesson context is important in relation to the number and quality of teacher adaptations.

Task Openness

This section is divided into three sections. First, tasks will be defined. Next, I will review previous research on tasks. Last, I will explain how task openness will be measured in this study.

Tasks Defined

The direction of the task openness research comes from the merging of student motivation and tasks (Doyle, 1983; Miller & Meece, 1997, 1999; Thornburg, 2005; Turner, 1995). Further investigations regarding tasks looked at their authenticity, or tasks which replicated out-of-school, real-life work (Duke, Purcell-Gates, Hall, & Tower, 2006; Parsons, 2008a).

Doyle (1983) first explained that tasks were about creating a product or exploring a process or resource. He found that in a first-grade classroom, students completed between three and five tasks daily during literacy instruction. However, the research on tasks has not always been limited to the product or process students use; instead, the term "task" has been used to describe actual products to cooperative and collaborative actions in which there are no written products. Multiple definitions thus exist; however, in this study, tasks will refer to physical student-produced products.

Previous Research on Tasks

In this section, I shall review the previous research on tasks.

Turner (1995) examined four characteristics of tasks to determine their motivational aspects: challenge and self-improvement, student autonomy, student interests, and social collaboration. In her skill-oriented, basal classrooms, 77% of the tasks were classified as closed, which means solo students completed workbook pages, usually requiring one-word answers. In the literature-based or whole language, classrooms, 73% of tasks were classified as open. During these tasks, students discussed and manipulated text during games, read aloud with partners, and wrote on topics of their own choice. Turner further posited that when faced with open tasks, students responded with more motivated behaviors, as measured in her study.

Miller and Meece (1997) provided a year-long intervention with third grade teachers to increase the challenge level of their students' required reading and writing tasks. Completed tasks were collected throughout the school year. Students were then administered a questionnaire after they completed simple (simple defined as simple marks being completed alone in a single day) and complex (complex being defined as requiring peer collaboration and paragraph-level writing over more than one day) tasks. In classrooms where the students completed high-challenge, or complex, task assignments, students were more intrinsically motivated than when they completed simple tasks. Further, by reducing the number of assignments during the school day by making some tasks complex, student motivation increased, particularly with regards to the ego-social factor.

In an extension of prior studies on the same topic, Miller and Meece (1999) investigated third graders' preferences for high- and low-challenge reading and writing tasks using performance judgments and value ratings. Tasks were determined to be high- or low-challenge based on the amount of writing, collaboration, and duration required for the tasks. Students who had frequent exposure to high-challenge tasks preferred them because "they felt creative, experienced positive emotions, and worked hard" (Miller & Meece, 1999, p. 19). Low-challenge tasks were disliked because they were boring and did not challenge the students' thinking.

In a similar vein to Miller and Meece's (1997, 1999) work, Thornburg (2005) examined how fourth-grade literacy tasks affect student motivation and understanding. In addition to using Miller and Meece's high- and low-challenge task definitions (1999), Thornburg also added Medium-challenge tasks, asks which did not meet a clear definition of either high- or low-challenge, such as a collaborative multi-day assignment which still required simple word or mark answers. Thornburg found that students' motivation levels decreased when task challenge decreased, and vice versa.

Parsons (2008a) pulled together aspects of the above-mentioned research on tasks: authenticity (Turner, 1995; Duke et al., 2006), collaboration (Miller and Meece, 1997, 1999), challenge (Turner, as "open" [1995]; Miller and Meece as "simple" and "complex" [1997]; and Miller and Meece, [1999]), student direction (as Turner "choice" [1995]; Miller & Meece [1999]), and sustainability (Turner [1995]; Miller and Meece [1997, 1999]). He created a "task openness: rating to form the measurement device

(2008a). This rubric was then used in Parson's (2008b), Scales' (2009), and Davis'
(2009) related research studies.

I have reviewed the research on task openness as it relates to student motivation.
Previous research on task openness shows that researchers view many of the same
aspects of tasks as important. For instance, the amount of writing a task required was
present in all of the discussed researchers' work. In each case, the challenge, or openness,
level of each task was found to have some connection to student motivation, as it was
measured by each study.

Measuring Tasks

In this section, I will discuss how tasks will be measured in this study.

Authenticity on the task openness rubric (Parsons, 2008a) referred to how
authentic the task was in relation to the student's life outside of school (Duke et al.,
2006). The more authentic to students' lives the task was, the more open that task was.
Collaboration referred to the level of collaboration between students to complete a task.
For instance, the task could require solo completion, minimal collaboration, or a high
level of collaboration between peers (Miller & Meece, 1999). Challenge refers to the
level of work a student puts into a task (Miller & Meece, 1999). In tasks which required
challenge, there were different routes to solving the problem, there was no one "correct"
answer, and the student selected the level of difficulty (Miller, 2003; Thornburg, 2005).
Challenge is defined here as the prose required for the task, such as letter-, word-,
sentence-, and paragraph-level writing (Parsons, 2008a), with the paragraph-level writing
being cited as higher challenge. Student direction refers to the amount of choice a student

has in completion of the task (Parsons, 2008a). When a student was allowed substantial input into the task (Miller, 2003) the task was deemed more open (Parsons, 2008a). The sustainability required for the task refers to the amount of time a student spent on task completion. Tasks varied between one sitting, completion over the course of a day or two, or longer time allotments (Miller & Meece, 1999). These five characteristics (authenticity, collaboration, challenge, student direction, and sustained time required for the task) combined to determine the relative openness of the task itself (Parsons, 2008a).

Tasks were analyzed according to the rubric in Appendix A and analyzed according to prior research studies (Davis, 2009; Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009). This analysis piece was created by Parsons (2008a) from the research of Miller and Meece (1999) and Duke et al. (2006/2007). Each item was assigned a hierarchical value of one, two, or three, with three being the most in each case. The first descriptor, authenticity, examined the relative amount the task is authentic to student lives (Duke et al., 2006/2007). The hierarchy analyzed the task from primarily school-found tasks to outside of school tasks. The next descriptor was collaboration, in which the amount of peer work involved in completing the task was analyzed (Miller & Meece, 1999). Collaborating throughout the task completion scored a three. The challenge involved in each task comprised the third category. For this aspect, the type of work was examined, with differences ranging from letter- and word-level to paragraph-level reading and writing being required (Miller & Meece, 1999). The fourth category examined the extent to which choice plays an integral role in the task. Student-directed activities related to this input. The amount of student choice, from no input through maximal input, determined

the value ranking of the task. The last category examined the amount to which the task was sustained over time (Miller & Meece, 1999).

This data was analyzed qualitatively using the numeric data on the six features of the task (Parsons, 2008a, 2008b). The data were analyzed according to each case scenario. Tasks were ranked as high, medium, and low (a score on the task rubric of 12-15, 9-11, and 5-8, respectively).

The researcher and two critical friends examined 30 tasks from the research studies and independently rated each task (Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009). Spearman's rho was used to establish the reliability rating. Task openness analysis was established with a .83 interrater reliability (Parsons, 2008b; Scales, 2009).

This section reviewed the research literature on task openness, which dealt with the authenticity of the task to the student's outside-of-school life, the collaboration of peers involved with the task, the word-level of the writing involved, the amount of choice the student has in determining the task elements, and how sustained the task is over time. This section also presented the task rubric research bases and analysis involved with prior studies.

Motivation

In this section, I will present the historical, theoretical, and research basis of student motivation. I will next focus on the task-oriented aspects of motivation. Finally, I will discuss the motivation methods and analyses used by Turner (1995).

Definitions of Motivation

Motivation was first theorized to involve three basic aspects, of which there are various blendings and mixtures: task-involvement, ego-involvement, and extrinsic involvement (Crutchfield, 1962; Nicholls, 1983). Ego-involvement involved an individual's concentration on self. During effort, this person does not want to be seen as wrong (Nicholls, 1983). As a result of being ego-involved, the person has no interest in learning and just wants to avoid being seen as stupid (Diener & Srull, 1979, as cited in Nicholls, 1983). Contrarily, task-involvement referred to focus of the student not on himself, but rather on the task (Nicholls, 1983). Learning and understanding are the goal for the goal's sake (Nicholls, 1983), and the individual truly wants to understand. Csikszentmihalyi (1977) called this "enjoyment of experience." When the individual with task-involvement was fully engaged, this was Csikszentmihalyi's flow, or self-forgetfulness (Nicholls, 1983). Last, extrinsic involvement referred to learning as being a means to an end, such as pleasing the teacher, earning a sticker, or getting a pizza (Nicholls, 1983).

Following Nicholls' theory, task-involvement was the key in student motivation. Instead of choosing tasks at which he would succeed (ego-involvement), the task-involved student would choose what he had a reasonable level of succeeding at (task), to maximize learning, and to present himself with a realistic challenge (Nicholls, 1983). This high concentration on task-involvement means the student is intrinsically-motivated to learn or understand. Researchers looked at evidence of students being task-involved by

measuring student engagement and time on task (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Pressley et al., 2001).

However, researchers explored alternative understandings of motivation and other aspects related to the initial definition were considered. Miller and Faircloth (2009) narrowed the aspects of motivation to two: expectancy-value and valuing. Expectancy-value refers to what students expect of their learning (Bandura, 1977; Wigfield & Eccles, 2002). If they expect success, they will succeed. If students expect failure, they will do so. Contrarily, valuing is the connection school work has with the interests, drive, desires, etcetera, of the student. The more a student values the learning or task at hand, the more meaningful it becomes and is thus motivating (Brophy, 1999; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

Motivation thus is known in many different ways by a variety of researchers and theorists. As exploration of motivation continues, there will doubtless be other understandings of what motivation is.

Relationship between Motivation and Tasks

One way to narrow the understanding about motivation is to examine how motivation relates to tasks. Since the first motivation theory mentioned tasks in the task-involvement aspect (Crutchfield, 1962) and the second large theory discussed it in regards to valuing (Miller & Faircloth, 2009), tasks are an important part of understanding how students perceive their interest and attitude towards completing that work. To understand motivation in regards to tasks, we look at the task-related student motivation research produced by Miller, Meece, Turner, and their colleagues in the 1990s.

Miller and Meece (1999) found that students preferred high-challenge tasks over low-challenge tasks (see Chapter II, Task Openness for more details). When the researchers asked students how they felt about the tasks, students exhibited more motivation to complete the open tasks as opposed to the closed tasks. Other studies support this finding (Miller, 2003; Thornburg, 2005; Turner, 1995; Turner & Paris, 1995; Turner & Patrick, 2004).

Turner (1995) examined an aspect of motivation termed motivated literacy to explain how students interacted with text and approached learning dependent upon the task openness. Turner defined motivated literacy as strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control. The way in which a student attacks the task and then reconstructs understanding of the material is strategic reading and "indicates the students' cognitive engagement in literacy" (Turner, 1995, p. 419). Persistence indicates the amount to which the student persists with the task, which explains not only the level of flexible problem-solving but also the perceived ability to solve the problems (Turner, 1995). Persistence is a key to motivated literacy, since the child who persists has a reason to do so. Volitional control evidences itself in self-talk and positional-talk to help children understand how to complete their academic work. These strategies are found in the interactions among students or demonstrated in actions (Turner, 1995). It is the combination of strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control which contribute to the understanding of motivated literacy. Turner's (1995) findings revealed that students in whole language classrooms, where there were many open tasks, exhibited greater student motivation than

students in basal reading classrooms, where there were many worksheets and similar closed tasks.

Measuring Motivation

In this section, I shall review how motivation has been measured in prior studies as motivation related to tasks and then I shall explain how it will be measured in this study.

Miller and Meece (1997, 1999) utilized student interviews to understand student motivation to complete their tasks. These interviews consisted of students looking at their work and answering a series of questions about aspects of the tasks, such as how hard the work was, did the student enjoy completing it, and what was the task's purpose.

Thornburg (2005) based her research on the Miller and Meece work of the 1990s. She used student interviews to highlight their expectations about the work, liking for the tasks, and how interested they were in completing the tasks. Thornburg also measured students' on-task behaviors during her observational period and collected anecdotal notes about those behaviors.

Scales (2009) measured student engagement in her year-long adaptive teaching research. She observed students in six classrooms, in 3-minute sweeps, denoting which children were either on-task or off-task, and compared this information with the task being completed. This is similar to the work of Anderson et al. (1979), among others, who looked at student engagement to measure student motivation.

Turner (1995) viewed motivation differently. Her work is based on the understanding that students who use strategies to attack their reading and writing and

who persist are demonstrating motivated literacy. In other words, student motivation that is demonstrated through literacy can be viewed as motivated literacy.

Turner defined motivated literacy as effective strategy use, persistence, and volitional control and measured it by observing student work and by conducting student interviews. Turner compared those factors of observations and interviews quantitatively; however, since I could not observe the teacher and the students simultaneously, there was insufficient data for similar data analysis in this study. I therefore only used the interview portion of Turner's motivated literacy data collection methods. That is, what I did was use Turner's questions to interview student participants about their motivation when completing tasks. Similarly, I modified Turner's student questions to interview teachers about their perceptions of how students were motivated during task completion.

Motivation data in this study were collected through student and teacher interviews and student work and was divided by teacher participant, task type, and the context of the lesson. Students' and teachers' open-ended responses to the student motivation questions were categorized and analyzed by task type, student or teacher statement, and instructional context through open coding based off of Turner's (1995) categories. Frequency counts were used to organize the data according to the case organization protocol.

In this study, strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control were weighted equally when determining the overall results for motivation. The strategic reading questions were grouped, coded together, and viewed with a working hypothesis: Since scripted lessons mandate low challenge tasks, the unscripted students will be more

motivated by tasks than their scripted peers. Therefore, if each of the three components of motivation, as cited by Turner, is regarded as having equal weight, unscripted students will evidence their motivation by:

- Being more strategic in their reading (see Chapter IV, Strategic Reading)

- Using specific strategies to attack the hard parts of their tasks (see Chapter IV, Persistence, Part 2 of 3);

- Being viewed by the teacher as "more motivated" (see Chapter IV, Persistence, Part 3 of 3); and

- Exhibiting more volitional control to concentrate on the task completion (see Chapter IV, Volitional Control).

Turner (1995) set up the above-mentioned assumptions about motivated students. Motivation data will be analyzed by comparing the frequency of scripted and unscripted students' and teachers' coded answers to each of the motivation questions. In order for a set of students to demonstrate more motivation than another set of students, their total count of coded answers needs to be 20% higher than the comparison group(s). Some categories in each of the question areas will not be counted since they do not represent substantive reasons or ideas (see Chapter IV).

The results from the three areas will be equally combined to yield an overall motivation understanding for this study. Barring a reason to weight one area over another, the three motivation factors are deemed to be equal in worth at measuring motivation.

Student motivation is a complex issue. Whether one follows the earlier three aspects to motivation (ego-involvement, task-involvement, or extrinsic-involvement) or the later aspects of valuing and expectancy, there are varied measures and understanding from which to derive understanding about how to measure student motivation. What is clear is one thing: open tasks produce higher student motivation, no matter how it may be measured or defined.

Summary

The relationships described above suggest that a relationship exists among these them. For instance, one might determine that in the different types of classrooms, we would see a marked difference in task openness, more and higher quality teacher adaptations and rationales, and higher student motivation. However, this is not proven. Consequently, this study develops understanding of how task openness affects teacher adaptations and rationales and student motivation.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

By examining teacher adaptations in relation to task openness and student motivation, we can better understand how teachers adapt instruction based on student needs or the task itself, as well as grasp how motivated students are by these tasks. Thus, this study examined (a) the differences between teachers' thoughtful adaptations and rationales in two settings where it was assumed tasks would be different, and (b) the relationship between adaptations and tasks in those two settings and student motivation as defined for the purposes of this study.

Setting and Participants

Two school sites were selected with two classrooms each. One research site practiced scripted reading instruction and the other school's reading instruction was unscripted. Four second-grade teachers were selected to participate from the two Title 1 schools with diverse student populations in a Southeastern school district. The teachers were a convenience sample, selected based on adhering closely to the specified second grade curriculum in that school. Each school's principal nominated potential participants with that criterion and volunteers were sought from that pool of potential participants.

The student demographics of the scripted school were used for selection of the comparison school. Out of the entire county, the selected scripted school contained the

only scripted program delivered with high fidelity, meaning teachers were strongly discouraged from changing the tasks, script, or instructional processes (K. Doyle, personal communication, September 17, 2007). This school used an established scripted program, Reading Mastery Classic, formerly called DISTAR, for direct reading instruction during the literacy block (*Reading Mastery Classic,* 2003). It was a failing school as recently as two years ago (Buchanan & Fernandez, 2005). Fewer than 30% of students were reading at or above grade level five years ago (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007). The school was taken over by a state Department of Public Instruction administration team and reconfigured for the purpose of increasing student achievement (G. Lathan, personal communication, September 24, 2007). During this takeover process, the school administration decided to adopt SRA Reading Mastery as their school-wide, leveled ability reading program. While this decision was determined by school administrators, and its implementation was mandated four years prior, the teacher faculty proudly cited SRA Reading Mastery as the reason why their reading achievement scores had improved so markedly during that time (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007). The student population is 95% African American with the remainder of students Caucasian and Hispanic (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007). The school is within walking distance of two historically black colleges, both of which supplies many school interns, volunteers, and work study students to the elementary school (N. Douglas, personal communication, September 24, 2007).

The comparison unscripted school has adopted a "balanced literacy program" in which Scott Foresman reading materials are provided to teachers, such as a textbook for each child, comprehensive teacher manuals, leveled guided reading texts, and spelling and comprehension workbooks (K. Peace Perry, personal communication, October 12, 2007). The teachers were encouraged by the principal to modify lesson materials to address student needs (B. Clarida, personal communication, September 28, 2007). The school is approximately 60% African American, 20% Caucasian, 18% Hispanic, and 2% other (B. Lee, personal communication, March 25, 2008). The teachers in the school were struggling with a recent increase in student mobility combined with the enrollment of an increasing number of students for whom English was not a native language. Although the teachers experienced steady student transiency rates and consistent student demographics in previous years, these change reflected in a change to the school culture (K. Peace Perry, personal communication, September 28, 2007). Teachers are simply concerned about how to address the needs for their new students.

The scripted and unscripted schools are each Title I schools, based on similar percentages of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch as determined by family income (see Table 3).

Teacher Participants

There were four teacher participants in this collective case study. Two second grade teachers were selected from volunteers at the scripted school and two from volunteers at the unscripted school. Although prior experience and educational levels varied across participants, restrictions caused by the context did not allow for matching.

Table 3

Summary of Classrooms

Classroom Context	Teacher	Students in class	Reading material
Scripted Classrooms	Teacher A	11 students	Reading Mastery 2.0
	Teacher C	12 students	
Unscripted Classrooms	Teacher B	18 students	Scott Foresman reading series, balanced literacy framework from NC
	Teacher D	17 students	

This was therefore a convenience sample (Mertens, 1998). The participants were purposively selected based on a high level of adherence to scripted or unscripted lessons.

The scripted school's teacher participants teach just the literacy block scripted lessons in groups of eight and eleven children. In the remainder of their day, each teacher works in a non-instructional capacity in the school (media coordinator and social worker), although each is a certified teacher. The teachers are African American with three and fifteen years' experience respectively. The teacher participants had two and five years experience with SRA Reading Mastery (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007). The school assigned the entire student body to cross-grade level groups according to their reading levels. The participating teachers had many second grade students in their instructional groupings; however, they also taught advanced first grade readers in the same group. Only students who were in the second grade and on level in reading were selected to participate.

In the unscripted school, the two Caucasian second grade teachers were in their first and second years of teaching. The principal of the unscripted school allowed his teachers to devise their own schedules for instruction; however, the teachers had to

include certain specified elements and amounts of time (K. Peace Perry, personal communication, October 12, 2007). For instance, both teachers allowed time for whole-group teacher-directed reading instruction, instructional-level guided reading groups, and working with words for developmental spelling. The school used the Scott Foresman basal reading and spelling series (K. Pearce-Perry, personal communication, October 12, 2007). This series included leveled guided reading texts and extensive supplemental materials. See Table 4 for a summary of participants.

Table 4

Summary of Participants

Scripted Classrooms	Teacher A	African American	15th year teaching
	Teacher C	African American	3rd year teaching
Unscripted Classroom	Teacher B	Caucasian	2nd year teaching
	Teacher D	Caucasian	1st year teaching

Reading instruction looked different for the four teacher participants. The scripted teachers taught used highly scripted teaching materials from SRA Reading Mastery. These materials included a teacher manual, student reading anthologies, and workbook pages that matched each lesson. The scripted school reading block lasted for 90 minutes most days, with the exception of two days when the teachers met with students for 70 minutes.

SRA Reading Mastery is designed so that one lesson is taught, one story is read, and one workbook page is completed each day. In the participating school, however, two lessons were taught on a daily basis. Teacher A taught her two lessons in sequence, by reading directly from the script on each page to review sight words with her students. The

teacher-directed script portion of Lesson 56 was promptly followed by the same section of Lesson 57, etc. After the call-and-response pair of lessons each day, Teacher A had the children read aloud round-robin style from the text, focusing first on Lesson 56's story, followed immediately by Lesson 57's story. Last, the students completed the worksheets for both Lessons 56 and 57. Teacher C, on the other hand, divided her class time into two distinct lessons. First, Teacher C led her students in the call-and-response teacher-directed portion of the lesson, introducing new sight words. Next, Teacher C's students read aloud the story which corresponded with the lesson, in discrete, teacher-determined portions. Last, the students completed the worksheet pages. When the students had finished the student work, the class once again began the lesson, followed by the read aloud, and finished with the worksheet completion.

In both cases, scripted Teachers A and C led the teacher-directed portion as a whole class, followed by one student reading aloud to everyone else in the class. Last, the task was completed independently. No student-to-student talk or related comments (such as "I like this story") were permitted during the lesson, read aloud, or worksheet completion. Reference to the reading texts was not allowed until the students had first attempted the questions, so correct answers relied upon the memory of the stories.

In the unscripted school, Teachers B and D were also dissimilar in their teaching of the literacy block. The balanced literacy included teacher-directed reading, guided reading, spelling, writing, and writing process instruction. Literacy block lasted for a minimum of 70 minutes one lesson (the Monday prior to Thanksgiving) to a maximum of

2 hours 30 minutes, which occurred in Teacher B's classroom when she elected to continue the writing process lesson into her allotted social studies time.

The complexion of the two unscripted teachers' classrooms varied. First, Teacher B practiced guided reading on a daily basis for 40 minutes (or two guided reading groups for 20 minutes each). Guided reading involved students reading text on their instructional levels, instruction on comprehension skills, and sometimes the completion of student work. During that 40 minutes, the remaining classroom students were spread throughout 5 or 6 literacy centers. The students were expected to complete tasks independently or with peer assistance and not ask the teacher, since she was occupied with teaching the guided reading lessons. Students attended two centers each day. Spelling was "taught" within the confines of two centers, usually a game for spelling practice and an activity that practiced the rime or vowel blend featured in the list that week. Writing was required for one center with each task directly relating either to a story just read (reader response) or to an experience the child has encountered (i.e., "tell me how to make a peanut butter sandwich"). Not all children attended all centers. Teacher B also taught a teacher-directed reading lesson in which she read aloud a story from the basal series to the whole group and taught comprehension skills directly related to the story. This teacher-directed lesson lasted from 15 minutes to half an hour. Writing process instruction occurred twice during the five days' observation period. In each case, unscripted Teacher B taught a 10-minute mini-lesson on an aspect of the process, followed by a quick whole-class review of where students were in the process. Students then went to work on their writing, segueing from independent drafting to peer collaboration for revising, editing, and sharing. The teacher

performed editing conferences during this time and assisted one student with developing a story concept. The writing process lasted between 40 minutes and one hour.

Unscripted Teacher D used different strategies for instruction. Teacher D did not have a set schedule she followed for instruction, so no "typical day" ensued. While Teacher D taught teacher-directed reading on a daily basis, complete with reading comprehension skill instruction, her lessons were longer than Teacher B's lessons, featured more student talk, and often included group projects to reinforce student understanding of the text. Group projects included the actual task (e.g., create a poster to "sell" the book to other students, design a machine to solve a common present problem, and identify positive character elements in the story) and rubrics for self- and group-reflection on cooperative group processes and personal behavior within a group. Teacher-directed lessons thus ranged from 40 minutes to over an hour. Teacher D was inconsistent about guided reading instruction. During my five days' observation time, I observed one guided reading lesson with the high-level readers only. Teacher D pretaught vocabulary, had the students read aloud from the text, and taught sequencing during the 20-minute lesson. During this time, other students completed the one writing process task that was assigned during the observation period. Spelling occurred daily for 15 minutes, featuring a variety of team-organized games. No spelling instruction was witnessed. Much instruction in Teacher D's classroom was not discrete to a single topic area; instead, Teacher D utilized a more mixed approach to literacy instruction than Teacher B.

These differences in lesson construct between the scripted teachers and unscripted teachers were supported by each school's principal.

Student Participants

Five student participants were solicited in each second grade classroom. Each participating student had to be on grade level in reading. Further, the participating students needed to be proficient in English, since the student motivation questions required metacognitive verbalization. See Table 5 for a breakdown of student participants per classroom.

Table 5

Student Participants Per Classroom

Scripted School	Teacher A	5 students	African-American male
			African-American female
			Hispanic-American female
			African-American male
			Hispanic-American male
	Teacher C	4 students	African-American male
			African-American male
			African-American male
			African-American male
Unscripted School	Teacher B	5 students	African-American male
			Asian-American female
			Hispanic-American male
			African-American male
			Hispanic-American female
	Teacher D	4 students	African-American & Caucasian female
			African-American female
			Hispanic-American female
			Hispanic-American female

Therefore, five second grade students in each of the four classrooms were randomly selected from those second grade students whom the teacher reported were reading at grade level, were proficient at English, and whose parents had given

permission to participate. One permitted student elected not to participate, leaving just four participants. Another classroom only had four students at grade level, due to a high proportion of English language learners. Therefore, there were a total of 18 participating students from the four classrooms, nine students from the scripted classrooms and nine from the unscripted classrooms.

The racial and ethnic makeup of the selected students was generally representative of the overall school and classroom demographics.

Procedures

Two general procedures were employed: the intervention and observation schedule. Each will be discussed in this section.

The Intervention

A "soft" coaching intervention was used (Sparks, 2002). The focus of the coach with the unscripted teachers was to help them understand how task openness is valuable for student learning (Collins & Collins, 2004; Fullan, 2003; Sparks, 2002). The intervention was not necessary with the scripted participants since tasks are mandated by the script.

The intervention was delivered to the unscripted participants two afternoons prior to data collection. I shared the task openness form (Appendix A) with the participants and began a conversation with them concerning the value of open and high-challenge tasks to student motivation (Miller, 2003; Miller & Meece, 1997, 1999; Thornburg, 2005; Turner, 1995). This conversation was intended to begin a "soft" coaching relationship (Collins & Collins, 2004; Crane, 2007; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990) in which the teachers and

researcher analyzed and revised tasks collaboratively to infuse open tasks (Parsons, 2008) into instruction. The "soft" coaching proceeded as follows. The teacher and researcher/coach:

- examined the task rubric (see Appendix A) and discussed each of the five categories and how they evidenced themselves in the teacher's plans.
- talked about how to alter lessons and tasks to ensure higher scores on the task rubric.
- revised lessons to reflect teacher-led decisions to increase the task rubric values.

This process was completed during two one-on-one hour-long conferences. Since there was a week between the conferences, the two participating unscripted teachers planned some literacy lessons collaboratively while using the task rubric to ensure their lessons included desired elements.

The process was done to facilitate the adoption of open tasks (National Research Council, 2000; Mathey, Meyer, Tripp, & Walter, 2004).

The coaching intervention highlighted important task elements (Collins & Collins, 2004; Poglinco & Bach, 2004; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990). First, I emphasized research in the discussion, noting that five task elements produce higher student motivation and positive literacy achievement gains (Duke et al., 2006/2007; Miller, 2003; Miller & Meece, 1999, 1997; Thornburg, 2005; Turner, 1995; Turner & Paris, 1995; Turner & Patrick, 2004). Next, the participants and coach/researcher discussed how the different elements (authenticity, collaboration, word level, student-centeredness, and

sustained activity) related to their instructional styles and the learning needs of their students. This was a problem-solving conversation about how tasks could be altered or created to score highly on the rubric. This meeting initially lasted one hour.

There was a continuing coaching relationship throughout the research period. While the coaching relationship varied from teacher to teacher, the following examples illustrate it:

- One unscripted teacher asked for ways to improve her class science fair entry. Using the task rubric, we discussed how to create an authentic, student-centered, collaborative experiment that featured choice and paragraph-level writing, and was sustained over time. We created an experiment featuring bubble-gum taste-testing in which students compared the flavors, "bubble-bility," pliability, amount of time flavor lasted, and cost.

- A teacher asked how she could bring cooperative problem-solving into her math lessons. We created math teams for the problems of the day, where students had to group problem-solve and shared the responsibility for writing up the solution.

Observation Schedule

Observations spanned the literacy block of instruction for five days over a designated two-week period in each classroom. Prior to data collection in any classroom, I spent time in the classroom to become a familiar sight to the students. This was especially important because my ethnicity was different from many of the student

participants, making trust something to be earned. The students were eager to participate and relaxed in my presence after only 2 observation sessions, on average.

I observed each teacher for a total of five instructional days, usually spread over two weeks. During data collection, I observed Teacher A (scripted classroom) from October 8-19. During the next two weeks, Teacher B (unscripted classroom) was observed from October 22-November 1. Teacher C (scripted classroom) was observed from November 5-November 20. This observation period required three weeks due to participant absence. Finally, Teacher D (unscripted classroom) was observed from November 23 until December 15. The extended time for Teacher D was due to schedule conflicts and the holidays.

I collected data Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays in all four classrooms. Every attempt was made to ensure that schedules did not conflict. For instance, when one class was going on a field trip during the expected data collection time, another teacher's data collection time was switched so that all teachers were observed for the same number of times. This observation schedule was created to align as much as possible with that of Turner's 1995 study, in which Turner observed for a complete week. Since I taught for two days each week, the schedule was modified to include five days over two weeks.

Across the four teachers, there were a total of 20 literacy block observations, 20 teacher interviews, and 38 student interviews.

Observation Procedures

Two methods were used to collect classroom data. First, the entire literacy block was audiotaped. These recordings supplemented field notes, in which I noted adaptations

to the lesson and the interactions immediately following the adaptations (Duffy et al., 2007).

The day's process was as follows:

- Entered classroom, greeted teacher, copied lesson plans for literacy block, etc. Discussed timing of interview (non-instructional time, planning time, after school, etc.), set appointment.

- Set tape recorder to zero; field tested sound pickup quality.

- Read through lesson plans; highlighted what appeared to be written tasks.

- When literacy block instruction began, I was seated in a non-interfering corner with the tape recorder actively recording, making field notes of adaptations in focused observations (Spradley, 1980). I recorded the number on the tape where adaptations occurred, as a marker in case the teacher's memory needed refreshing during the teacher interview.

- Obvious teacher adaptations that were noted included the teacher:
  - providing a response to an unanticipated student question or action; or
  - diverging from the lesson plan, or
  - making a statement about a change of plan;

and, in which the action:
  - was non-routine, proactive, thoughtful and invented; and
  - included a change in the professional knowledge or the professional practices the teacher was using; and

- o was done to anticipate the needs of students or instructional situations (Duffy et al., 2008).

- When written tasks were assigned, I made note of such activities.

- I collected and either photocopied or photographed the day's written literacy work from the participants (choice depends on size of artifact). Work was immediately returned to the teacher or students after copying. Copying occurred outside of the literacy block. At times, students' written work was not complete when it was collected. However, since that was the sum of the student work, it was regarded as complete to initiate the interview.

- The five students were interviewed twice over the course of the two weeks during non-instructional time. When the student completed a task or tasks that day, the child could be interviewed. Two students were typically interviewed for each day of observation. There was some variability to this schedule due to students not completing tasks or absence from the classroom. The interviews persisted no longer than five minutes each and were tape-recorded and transcribed. The student's completed task was used as a reference for the below-listed questions during the student interview:

Strategic Reading:

- o What were you supposed to learn from the task you just did? (Turner, 1995)

- o What were you thinking about when you did this task? (Turner, 1995)

Persistence:

- o What was the hardest part about the task for you? (Turner, 1995)

- o How did you handle the hard parts? (Turner, 1995)

Volitional Control:

- o How did you get the work done? (adapted from Turner's [1995] observation protocol)

- o What did you tell yourself as you completed the work? (adapted from Turner's [1995] observation protocol)

Rephrasing or repeating of the prompts was sometimes required due to interview interruptions, off-task participants, or students not understanding the question.

- I interviewed the teachers about obvious thoughtful adaptations from the days' instructions. The teacher was asked if the event was an adaptation, different from normal classroom instruction and not planned (Duffy et al., 2007). The interviews were during non-instructional time on the day of the observations in all cases. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. The questions I asked the teachers were:

  - o When I saw you _____ during the lesson, was that a spontaneous change, something you had not planned? (Duffy et al., 2007)
  - o Why did you make that change? (Duffy et al., 2007)
  - o What were you thinking when you made that change? (Duffy et al., 2007)

At some points, the teachers listened to the audiotapes of lesson segments and read field notes to understand the situation in which the adaptation occurred. Rephrasing of the prompts was sometimes required due to interview interruptions or off-task participants.

- After the adaptation portion of the interview, I asked the teacher to describe the motivation of two or three of the students I had interviewed earlier. The teachers looked at student work samples to prompt their recall of student behaviors exhibited during literacy instruction that day. The teacher interview questions were as follows:

  o Which reading strategies did you notice _____ using? (strategic)
  o Which learning strategies did you notice _____ using? (strategic)
  o How persistent did you notice _____ was? (persistence)
  o What actions did _____ take to aid his/her concentration? (volitional control)

Each of the above-listed teacher interview questions was created by the researcher based on Turner's (1995) motivated literacy components.

Sometimes, due to the naturalistic environment in which the research was taking place, deviations from the above procedures did occur and adjustments had to be made. For instance, one student was interviewed during after school daycare, not during recess, since she had been to the eye doctor during that time.

Data Collection

This was a mixed methods study. Qualitative information was collected from teachers and from students in the form of interviews, observations, lesson plans, and district mandates. Descriptive statistics, in the forms of percentages and frequency counts, were collected for adaptations, rationales, and tasks.

Different elements of the research project address the research questions. This crosswalk demonstrates which measures addressed each variable:

Table 6

The Crosswalk of Data Sources

	Field notes of instruction	Collecting of student tasks	Student interviews	Teacher interviews	Lesson plans	District/school policy
Teacher Adaptations	**X**			**X**		
Teacher Rationales				**X**		
Tasks	**X**	**X**			**X**	
Motivation			**X**	**X**		
Context	**X**				**X**	**X**

To collect information on tasks, field notes, completed student tasks, and lesson plan data were used. I used field notes, lesson plans, and teacher interviews to highlight teacher adaptations. Motivation information was gathered through student and teacher interviews. Lesson context was derived from district and school policy information, lesson plans, and field notes. Teacher rationales were only yielded from the teacher interviews.

It was not possible to triangulate subsets of motivation and teacher rationales (see chart). Motivation and teacher rationales are solely cognitive and not ever fully known beyond what the participants tell us.

All other variables were able to be triangulated through data collection

Data Collected from Teachers

Teachers provided their lesson plans and teacher interviews about adaptations, rationales, and student motivation.

Data Collected from Students

Students provided their completed work and student interviews to yield their motivation for completing the tasks.

Data Analysis

A five-member research team analyzed thoughtful adaptations and rationales on three related research projects according to the established protocol reviewed in Chapter II.

Case by Case

Overall, the data analysis for this study went through a series of procedures. First was the development of a case for one teacher. The first teacher was Teacher A of the scripted program. Teacher A's confirmed adaptations were coded with complete agreement by at least three members of the research team according to the protocol beginning on p. 18. Next, rationales for the adaptations were coded with complete agreement by at least three members of the research team according to the rationale data analysis found on p. 21. The next step was for the researcher to score tasks according to the protocol found on p. 26. A critical friend reviewed each task and its rating, requiring no changes to the task ratings.

Next, motivation data were analyzed according to each student participant in Teacher A's class. First, to determine the strategic reading involved with the students, the student interview for the first student was coded. Then, the teacher interview data for this student was coded. Codes were combined for the student and teacher interviews. Next, persistence was examined. Student interview data per question was coded. Then, teacher

interview data for the persistence questions were coded. Since the persistence questions did not lend themselves to combining the codes, codes were transferred to matrices for different pieces of the persistence characteristic. Next, student interview data was coded for volitional control responses. Last, teacher interview data for volitional control was coded and added to the corresponding student interview codes. This process was then repeated for each of the remaining participant students.

This overall process was repeated for each teacher and set of students in the study.

Case by Case Analysis within a Question

The case by case within a question data analysis proceeded according to research questions. First, I drew a conclusion about Teacher A according to each of my research questions. The conclusion was determined by following the case by case process described above.

This process was followed for Teachers B, C, and D in the same order listed above, so it was possible to compare Teachers A and C (scripted teachers) and Teachers B and D (unscripted teachers).

The next step was to combine the data for the scripted teachers as their own merged case and combine the data for the unscripted teachers and compare them in order. These comparisons followed the single teacher cases.

Finally, the overall comparison or case understanding was examined of both sets of participants. This final data analysis was handled in the same order as the previous cases. Six cases were thus developed for each research question:

- Case 1: Teacher A (scripted)
- Case 2: Teacher B (unscripted)

- Case 3: Teacher C (scripted)
- Case 4: Teacher D (unscripted)
- Case 5: Teachers A and C (scripted)
- Case 6: Teachers B and D (unscripted)

Trustworthiness

Since this study is a continues the teacher adaptation research of Duffy and colleagues (2008), and a combination of Turner's (1995) research, Thornburg's (2005) study, and Miller and Meece's work (1997, 1999), many of the validity and replication concerns are supported by prior research. Thoughtful adaptations, rationales, and quality ratings of each are deemed trustworthy by over 35 prior case studies, recursive grounded theory analysis with code-recode strategy, and team data analysis. There is also a preponderance of evidence that task challenge is connected to student motivation and student learning (Duke et al., 2006/2007; Miller & Meece, 1997, 1999; Thornburg, 2005; Turner, 1995). Last, student motivation codes were established by grounded theory analysis in Turner's 1995 study, and were used in the replication of her questions and methods.

How This Study is Different from Turner's (1995) Work

This mixed-method study was originally intended to be a replication and modification of Turner's (1995) study on basal and whole language classrooms. During her research, Turner analyzed the context of the classroom, task types, and the motivated literacy of students. In this study, the context has changed and several pieces were added or substantially revised. Eventually, this study emerged as a new study, based upon Turner's work, among others. However, since its genesis was as a replication with

variations, research decisions were made with the intent of replicating. Therefore, this section examines the justifications made for the deviations from Turner's (1995) study.

This study was similar to Turner's 1995 work in these ways: data was collected over five days; field notes were taken during instruction; students were interviewed about tasks; and samples of student tasks were collected. The study differs from Turner's work in these ways: participant size and grade level, type of classroom, timing and duration of study, no student observations, and field notes and teacher interviews about teacher adaptations. A major difference is the way motivation is measured. Turner used observations and interview data to yield motivated literacy; however, since I was limited in resources, observing the teacher and students at the same time was impossible. Thus, I used just the interview portion of Turner's methods to investigate student motivation. Like Turner, I interviewed the student and teacher about students' motivation. Further, I used all of Turner's interview questions and the subsequent codes for each question. I did invent the two student interview questions since Turner only measured volitional control through observation. These questions were based on Turner's observational protocol, thick description, and analytical codes. Similarly, I created two codes when the data (a) did not fit the given codes; and (b) was a large portion of the responses. These created codes directly related to the idea that some tasks were not difficult for the participant students. Next, I created the strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control questions for the teacher. The teacher persistence question produced three codes: quite, moderate, and not at all persistent. To code the interview answer as "quite," teachers made these statements, among similar others:

- "He was very persistent. He concentrated on his work and ignored all the others."

- "She kept at it until it was time to leave. She wasn't happy to get one wrong."

To code the persistence interview answer as "moderate," teachers made these statements, among similar others:

- "_____ was persistent. He completed the game and then chose a book to read."

- "She took a bit of time to get started writing, but once she did, she went with it."

To code the persistence interview answer as "not at all," the teacher made this statement:

- "Well, _____ was having a really hard day. He was still upset about a problem yesterday. I know his mind was on that and not on his work. Look, he didn't finish a single worksheet."

Turner selected seven average students to evaluate student motivation. Her student participants were in middle-class Michigan classrooms in the 1990s, which allowed for a large class size. However, in this study's primary classrooms, the legislature demanded low student numbers per classroom. With the migrant worker and non-native English speaker population growth in the state, most classrooms have numerous English language learner students. It would thus be difficult to have selected seven participants per classroom using the stated selection criteria.

Turner (1995) observed 12 teachers full-time with a half-day research assistant assisting in data collection over the same period of time. For one researcher, part-time, four participants proportionately equaled Turner's work.

This study was therefore a modified replication of Turner's (1995) research on open tasks and student motivation across instructional contexts, with the added features of instructional adaptations and rationales. These features demonstrated how and of what quality adaptations were implemented in classrooms. The relationships between task openness, adaptations and rationales, and student motivation were also explored. The above-listed modifications to Turner's (1995) protocol are also stated in Table 7.

. While Turner's study was comprehensive and well-suited to helping further explore the connections between task openness, student motivation, and teacher adaptations and rationales, changes were necessary to ensure that a solo researcher could collect the necessary data. The largest changes were to the student motivation data collection and analysis. The smallest of these changes was the addition of inquiry into teacher adaptations and rationales.

Conclusion

This mixed methods study utilized data collections and analytical practices already established in Chapter II with the thoughtfully adaptive teaching research team in regards to adaptations and rationales. The task rubric use and analysis replicated Parsons' (2008b), Scales' (2009), and Davis' (2009) research studies. Last, the student motivation data collection was modified from Turner's (1995) study. Coding of the data was

replicated with Turner's codes, when available; however, new codes were added, and the analysis method of the data was new in this study.

These were now used to determine the relationships between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness and student motivation in two different contexts.

Table 7

A Comparison of Turner (1995) with This Study

Turner (2 researchers, FT)	Kear (1 researcher, PT)
Participants	
2 districts, many schools (basal vs. whole language districts)	1 district, 2 schools (scripted vs. unscripted classrooms)
Middle-class predominantly white	Title 1 predominantly diverse
12 first grade teachers	4 second grade teachers
Seven "average" students per classroom	Five grade-level students per classroom
Intervention	
-	Unscripted classrooms – purposeful coaching and explanation of high and low challenge tasks, share rubric, informal conversations about how to design (1 hour)
Data Collection	
Literacy block observations (up to 3 hours a day, 5 days)	
5 days a week for 1 week, in Spring	5 days over 2 weeks, in Fall
Field notes during whole class instruction	Field notes during whole class instruction, audio recording of instruction to get all language (TA)
Structured Observational instrument for time sampling 3/6/9 minute student observations	No recorded student observations
Student interviews	
Samples of tasks and field notes about instructional context, tasks, and literacy environment, copies of teacher lesson plans for observed days	
-	Field notes about TA incidents (per established criteria) including instructional context, prompt, response, did it work?
-	Teacher interview about TA (semi-structured from Spring study), tape-recorded during non-instructional time, 1 per day

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This mixed methods study was conducted to examine the interaction of thoughtful adaptations and rationales and student motivation of students in two contexts, where it would be assumed tasks would be different.

Research Questions

Each of the following research questions (1-6) will be answered in turn:

1. What frequency, type, and quality of teacher adaptations are made in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
2. What frequency, type, and quality of rationales for adaptations are made in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
3. What openness level of literacy tasks are found in:
   c. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   d. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
4. What motivation is evidenced in the interview portion of Turner's student motivation in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
5. What is the relationship between task openness and students' responses to the interview portion of Turner's student motivation in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?
6. What is the relationship between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and students' responses to the interview portion of Turner's student motivation in:
   a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
   b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

Answer to Research Question #1

This question addresses the frequency, type, and quality of adaptations made in scripted and unscripted teachers' classrooms during literacy instruction in the 5-day research period. In regards to their adaptations, teachers will be presented alone, compared by group (scripted and unscripted) and compared overall.

What frequency, type, and quality of teacher adaptations are made in:

a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

To answer this question, each teacher's thoughtful adaptations were analyzed separately by at least three members of the five member research team. The two scripted teachers' adaptations were similarly rated; then, the two unscripted teachers' adaptations were similarly rated to examine the thoughtfulness of instructional adaptations of scripted and unscripted teachers. Last, the adaptations of scripted and unscripted teachers were compared all together.

As shown in Table 8, scripted Teacher A produced eight adaptations, of which all required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to adapt. An example of such a minimal adaptation was the teacher's suggestions to a child to find a sentence within the cited story that looked similar to the one on his worksheet, then to use that sentence to fill in the blanks on his task. This adaptation, while it was in response to student needs, required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to create.

Scripted Teacher C produced eight adaptations, of which one was a thoughtful adaptation and seven required minimal metacognitive thought. The thoughtful adaptation consisted of this scenario:

The child was beginning to answer a question in which he was supposed to circle where you place a clean sock. There were four choices of which the correct answer was a bureau. The teacher stopped the child, asked him to pretend the sock was a fork, and then asked him, "Where does Mommy put the fork after she has washed and dried it?" The child stated a drawer. The teacher then asked the student to find which picture had a drawer in it and circle that answer. The child was able to find and correctly select the bureau (Teacher C, Day 5, Task 12)

Table 8

Scripted vs. Unscripted Adaptation Frequency Counts

Teacher		Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total	Average
		Adaptations—Frequency Counts				
Scripted	A	0	0	8	8	Minimal
	C	0	1	7	8	Minimal
Total Scripted		0	1	15	16	Minimal
Unscripted						
	B	0	10	25	35	Minimal-Thoughtful
	D	1	19	18	38	Thoughtful
Total Unscripted		1	29	43	73	Thoughtful

The thoughtfulness required to produce this adaptation was such that the teacher had to access the student's prior knowledge and teach beyond the direct objective of the lesson. Instead of teaching to strictly a correct answer, the teacher was teaching to a larger goal.

Unscripted Teacher B produced 35 adaptations, of which ten were rated as thoughtful and 25 required a minimal level of metacognitive thought. An example of Teacher B's thoughtful (medium) adaptations involved the teacher spontaneously creating a game for students in which they had to find the two original words involved with creating their contraction spelling words. She was teaching to the higher purpose beyond the lesson of just learning to spell the words; instead, Teacher B was teaching to student understanding of how contractions are constructed.

Unscripted Teacher D produced 38 adaptations, of which one was rated considerable, 18 were thoughtful, and 19 were rated as requiring a minimal amount of metacognitive thought. In the considerable-rated adaptation, the teacher *threw out* a lesson activity and created a new one on the spot. The students were supposed to be continuing with the Teacher Directed Reading lesson about a new book they were reading, Balto. The original lesson's activity was to independently find the big ideas in the story and create a graphic organizer. However, the teacher developed a task in which the students worked in cooperative groups to create posters to persuade other students to read the story Balto. They had to follow cooperative group guidelines, write using persuasive language, and share the task so that all members contributed. After the poster was created, the children were then required to rate their group performance on cooperation and work habits.

This adaptation required considerable metacognitive thought to create. It meant the teacher was striving for a larger goal than the intended task required; in fact, in creating the task as she did, the teacher still required students to find the big ideas in the story. However, instead of finding these ideas as solitary units, they then had to be connected together into a persuasive argument to convince future readers of the worth of the story. This activity required the teacher to spontaneously mesh several factors together into a seamless lesson construction, which is why it is rated as requiring a considerable level of metacognitive thought.

There are more and higher-rated adaptations in the unscripted classrooms compared to the low-rated scripted classroom adaptations.

Overall, scripted teachers produced 16 adaptations, whereas unscripted teachers produced 73 adaptations. All but one of the scripted teachers' adaptations required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. Over half of the unscripted teachers' adaptations required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. The remaining 30 adaptations required thoughtful (medium) or considerable levels of metacognitive thought to produce. Table 9 shows the breakdowns of the adaptations for scripted Teacher A according to adaptation type and quality.

Table 9

Teacher A Adaptations Frequency Count

Teacher A – Scripted	Adaptations – Frequency Count			
Adaptation Types	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Modifies lesson objective	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Changes means by which objectives are met	0	0	7	7 (88%)
Invents an example or analogy	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Inserts a mini-lesson	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Suggests a different way to deal with situation	0	0	1	1 (13%)
Omits (not due to time) or inserts an activity or assignment	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Changes planned order of instruction	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Total	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)

Out of eight adaptation incidences in the scripted classroom, Teacher A changed the means by which her objective was met seven out of eight times. On just one occasion, this scripted teacher suggested a different way for her student to handle a situation, which was to ask if he had read the passage again. All of Teacher A's adaptations required minimal metacognitive thought. Scripted Teacher A thus produced eight instructional adaptations, of which all required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce and seven altered the way the instruction was met (i.e., change of instruction).

Instructional adaptations for scripted Teacher C are broken out according to adaptation type and quality in Table 10.

Table 10

Teacher C Adaptation Frequency Count

Teacher C – Scripted	Adaptations – Frequency Count			
Adaptation Types	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Modifies lesson objective	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Changes means by which objectives are met	0	0	6	6 (75%)
Invents an example or analogy	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Inserts a mini-lesson	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Suggests a different way to deal with situation	0	1	0	1 (13%)
Omits (not due to time) or inserts an activity or assignment	0	0	1	1 (13%)
Changes planned order of instruction	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Total	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	7 (88%)	8 (100%)

Scripted Teacher C evidenced similar adaptations to Teacher A. In this case, six of the eight adaptations were changing the means by which the objective was met. One time the teacher added an instructional activity when students finished their assigned tasks early. On one other occasion, the teacher suggested a different way for the student to deal with the situation. This one adaptation was thoughtful, whereas the other seven adaptations required a minimal level of metacognitive thought.

Scripted Teacher C thus produced eight instructional adaptations, of which all but one required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. For six adaptations Teacher C altered the way the instruction was met (i.e., change of instruction). One adaptation required a thoughtful level of metacognitive thought to produce. This adaptation involved the teacher mediating the knowledge of her student with the answer required on the worksheet.

The instructional adaptations for unscripted Teacher B are broken out according to adaptation type and quality in Table 11. Unscripted Teacher B had 25 adaptations of which 15 were to change the means by which the objective was met, 11 were to invent an example or analogy, and 5 adaptations were to omit or insert instruction. This teacher had ten thoughtful adaptations and 25 minimal adaptations.

Unscripted Teacher B thus produced 35 instructional adaptations, of which 72% required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. The remaining 29% of Teacher B's adaptations required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought to produce.

Table 11

Teacher B Adaptation Frequency Count

Teacher B – Unscripted	Adaptations – Frequency Count			
Adaptation Types	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Modifies lesson objective	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Changes means by which objectives are met	0	3	12	15 (43%)
Invents an example or analogy	0	3	8	11 (32%)
Inserts a mini-lesson	0	3	0	3 (9%)
Suggests a different way to deal with situation	0	0	1	1 (3%)
Omits (not due to time) or inserts an activity or assignment	0	1	4	5 (15%)
Changes planned order of instruction	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Total	0 (0%)	10 (29%)	25 (72%)	35 (100%)

The instructional adaptations for unscripted Teacher D are provided according to adaptation type and quality in Table 12. Unscripted Teacher D had similar adaptations to Teacher B. She had a total of 38 adaptations of which there were 19 thoughtful adaptations and 18 required a minimal amount of metacognitive thought to produce. While Teacher D had more thoughtful adaptations and thus fewer minimally-rated adaptations, she had a similar distribution of types to those of Teacher B.

Table 12

Teacher D Adaptation Frequency Count

Teacher D – Unscripted	Adaptations – Frequency Count			
Adaptation Types	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Modifies lesson objective	0	1	0	1 (3%)
Changes means by which objectives are met	1	2	5	8 (22%)
Invents an example or analogy	0	7	6	13 (35%)
Inserts a mini-lesson	0	3	0	3 (8%)
Suggests a different way to deal with situation	0	3	3	6 (16%)
Omits (not due to time) or inserts an activity or assignment	0	3	3	6 (16%)
Changes planned order of instruction	0	0	1	1 (3%)
Total	1 (3%)	19 (50%)	18 (48%)	38 (100%)

Unscripted Teacher D thus produced 38 instructional adaptations, of which 48% required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. One adaptation (3%) required a considerable level of metacognitive thought to produce. The remaining 50% of Teacher B's adaptations required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought to produce.

In Table 13, the type and quality of instructional adaptations for scripted Teachers A and C are combined. Together, 13 of the scripted teachers' 16 adaptations were changing the means by which an objective is met, while two were suggestions on how to deal with a problem and one was to insert an activity. Only one adaptation was thoughtful

and the remaining 15 adaptations were rated as requiring a minimal level of metacognitive thought.

Table 13

Scripted Teachers Adaptation Frequency Count

Scripted	Adaptations—Frequency Count			
Adaptation Types	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Modifies lesson objective	0	0	0	0
Changes means by which objectives are met	0	0	13	13
Invents an example or analogy	0	0	0	0
Insets a mini-lesson	0	0	0	0
Suggests a different way to deal with situation	0	1	1	2
Omits (not due to time) or inserts an activity or assignment	0	0	1	1
Changes planned order of instruction	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	15	16

Together, the scripted teachers produced 16 instructional adaptations of which all but one required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. The remaining adaptation was rated as thoughtful.

In Table 14, the type and quality of instructional adaptations for scripted Teachers B and D are combined. The unscripted teachers presented a total of 73 adaptations. Twenty-four of the adaptations involved inventing an example or analogy and 23

changed the means by which the objective was met. Eleven adaptations involved omitting

or adding activities to the instructional plan. Further, there were numerous other

adaptations throughout their lessons.

Table 14

Unscripted Teachers Adaptation Frequency Count

Unscripted	Adaptations—Frequency Count			
Adaptation Types	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Modifies lesson objective	0	1	0	1
Changes means by which objectives are met	1	5	17	23
Invents an example or analogy	0	10	14	24
Insets a mini-lesson	0	6	0	6
Suggests a different way to deal with situation	0	3	4	7
Omits (not due to time) or inserts an activity or assignment	0	4	7	11
Changes planned order of instruction	0	0	1	1
Total	1	29	43	73

Together, the unscripted teachers produced 73 instructional adaptations of which all over

half required a minimal level of metacognitive thought to produce. One adaptation was

rated as requiring a considerable level of metacognitive thought to produce. The

remaining 29 adaptations were rated as thoughtful.

Table 15 shows all teachers' adaptation percentages. One hundred percent of Teacher A's adaptations required a minimal level of cognitive thought. Thirteen percent of Teacher C's adaptations required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought, with the remaining 88% of the adaptations being rated requiring a minimal level of metacognitive thought. Overall, 94% of the adaptations implemented by scripted teachers required a minimal level of metacognitive thought. Just 7% of the total scripted adaptations required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought.

Table 15

Scripted vs. Unscripted Adaptation Percentages

Teacher		Adaptations—Percentages of Adaptations			Average
		Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	
Scripted	A	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	Minimal
	C	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	7 (88%)	Minimal
Total Scripted		0 (0%)	1 (7%)	15 (94%)	Minimal
Unscripted					Minimal
	B	0 (0%)	10 (29%)	25 (72%)	Thoughtful
	D	1 (3%)	19 (50%)	18 (48%)	Thoughtful
Total Unscripted		1 (2%)	29 (40%)	43 (59%)	Thoughtful

In the unscripted school, 29% of Teacher B's adaptations required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought and the remaining 72% of adaptations required minimal level of metacognitive thought. Three percent of Teacher D's adaptations were rated as requiring a considerable level of metacognitive thought and 50% of her adaptations required thoughtful (medium) levels of metacognitive thought. Forty-eight percent of Teacher C's adaptations required a minimal level of metacognitive thought.

In sum, there are a higher percentage of considerable and thoughtful levels of adaptations in unscripted classrooms compared to scripted classrooms.

Overall (see Tables 9-15), the answer to Research Question #1 is that the scripted teachers produced fewer and lower quality adaptations than the unscripted teachers.

Answer to Research Question #2

This question addresses the frequency, type, and quality of rationales made in scripted and unscripted teachers' classrooms during literacy instruction in the 5-day research period. In regards to their rationales, teachers will be presented alone, compared by group (scripted and unscripted) and compared overall.

What frequency, type, and quality of rationales for adaptations are made in:

a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

To answer this question, each teacher's rationales for adaptations were analyzed separately. The two scripted teachers' rationales were rated by at least three members of the five member research team; then, the two unscripted teachers' rationales were similarly rated to examine the thoughtfulness required of the scripted and unscripted teachers. Last, the rationales of scripted and unscripted teachers were compared all together.

In Table 16, scripted Teachers A had eight rationales to match her eight adaptations. All eight rationales required a minimal level of metacognitive thought. Three of the rationales why this teacher implemented her adaptations were because the original objective was not met. She responded to the "why" question with "because they just weren't getting it." The remainder of Teacher A's rationales were spread throughout

different reasons, but with such a small *n* there is no opportunity to analyze the

information further.

Table 16

Teacher A Rationale Frequency Counts by Quality

Teacher A-Scripted Rationale Codes	Rationales—Frequency Counts Per Category			
	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Because the objectives are not met	0	0	3	3 (38%)
To challenge or elaborate	0	0	0	0 (0%)
To teach a specific strategy or skill	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To help students make connections	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Uses knowledge of student(s) to alter instruction	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To check students' understanding	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Anticipation of upcoming difficulty	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To manage time	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To promote student engagement	0	0	1	1 (13%)
Total Rationales	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)

Scripted Teacher A's 8 rationales all demonstrated a minimal level of

metacognitive thought. Three of her adaptations were created because the objective was

not met and the remainder of her rationales was spread throughout the various other

reasons to adapt.

In Table 17, scripted Teacher C had eight rationales to match her eight

adaptations. Seven rationales required a minimal level of metacognitive thought, whereas

one rationale used a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought. Three of the

rationales why Teacher C performed her adaptations were because the original objective

was not met. Teacher C's thoughtful rationale focused on understanding the prior

knowledge the student had based on the student's home life. The remainders of Teacher

C's rationales were spread throughout different rationales.

Table 17

Teacher C Rationale Frequency Counts by Quality

Teacher C-Scripted Rationale Codes	Rationales—Frequency Counts Per Category			
	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Because the objectives are not met	0	0	3	3 (38%)
To challenge or elaborate	0	0	0	0 (0%)
To teach a specific strategy or skill	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To help students make connections	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Uses knowledge of student(s) to alter instruction	0	1	1	2 (25%)
To check students' understanding	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Anticipation of upcoming difficulty	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To manage time	0	0	1	1 (13%)
To promote student engagement	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total Rationales	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)

All but one of scripted Teacher C's 8 rationales demonstrated a minimal level of

metacognitive thought. One rationale demonstrated a thoughtful reason to adapt.

In Table 18, unscripted Teacher B had a total of 35 rationales to match her 35 adaptations. Four rationales required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognition, whereas the remaining 31 rationales required a minimal level of metacognitive thought.

Table 18

Teacher B Rationale Frequency Counts by Quality

Teacher B-Unscripted Rationale Codes	Rationales – Frequency Counts per category			Total
	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	
Because the objectives are not met	0	3	11	14 (40%)
To challenge or elaborate	0	1	2	3 (9%)
To teach a specific strategy or skill	0	0	2	2 (6%)
To help students make connections	0	0	3	3 (9%)
Uses knowledge of student(s) to alter instruction	0	0	3	3 (9%)
To check students' understanding	0	0	0	0 (0%)
Anticipation of upcoming difficulty	0	0	6	6 (18%)
To manage behavior	0	0	1	1 (3%)
To manage time	0	0	1	1 (3%)
To promote student engagement	0	0	2	2 (6%)
Total Rationales	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	31 (89%)	35 (100%)

The vast majority of rationales focused on "because of the objective was not met." Teacher B, in a minimal level rationale, noted, "I was trying to show him that he couldn't pick up the ball if I didn't put it down yet." It was a rationale that noted the child was unable to get the correct understanding and the teacher adapted to help him understand. Six of the rationales anticipated future difficulty by the students for learning, so the

teacher was proactively trying to head off the difficulty. All six of the rationales required a low level of metacognitive thought.

The two scripted teacher thus produced 16 rationales, of which 15 were rated requiring a minimal level of metacognitive thought as a reason to adapt. The one remaining rationale was rated as thoughtful.

Eighty-nine percent of unscripted Teacher B's 35 rationales demonstrated a minimal level of metacognitive thought. Four rationales demonstrated a thoughtful reason to adapt.

In Table 19, unscripted Teacher D had a total of 38 rationales to match her 38 adaptations.

Table 19

Teacher D Rationale Frequency Counts by Quality

Teacher D—Unscripted Rationale Codes	Rationales—Frequency Counts per category			
	Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Because the objectives are not met	0	1	13	14 (37%)
To challenge or elaborate	0	1	1	2 (6%)
To teach a specific strategy or skill	0	1	1	2 (6%)
To help students make connections	0	2	4	6 (16%)
Uses knowledge of student(s) to alter instruction	0	2	3	5 (14%)
To check students' understanding	0	0	1	1 (3%)
Anticipation of upcoming difficulty	0	1	0	1 (3%)
To manage behavior	0	1	0	1 (3%)
To manage time	0	0	2	2 (6%)
To promote student engagement	0	2	2	4 (11%)
Total Rationales	0	11 (29%)	27 (71%)	38 (100%)

Of the 38, 11 rationales were rated as thoughtful (medium) level rationales and the remaining 27 rationales were rated requiring a minimal level of metacognitive thought. Teacher D, similar to Teacher B, focused her rationales on "objective not met." The other frequent rationales chosen were helping students make connections and using knowledge of students to guide adaptations. Making connections was often used as a rationale when defining or explaining vocabulary.

Twenty-seven of unscripted Teacher D's 38 rationales demonstrated a minimal level of metacognitive thought. Eleven rationales demonstrated a thoughtful reason to adapt.

In Table 20, all teachers' rationales are combined in table form. One hundred percent of Teacher A's rationales required a minimal level of cognitive thought. One of Teacher C's rationales was rated as thoughtful. Overall, 94% of the adaptations implemented by scripted teachers were paired with a minimal rated rationale.

Table 20

Scripted vs. Unscripted Rationale Frequency Counts by Quality

Teacher		Rationales—Frequency Counts			
		Considerable	Thoughtful	Minimal	Total
Scripted	A	0	0	8	8 (50%)
	C	0	1	7	8 (50%)
Total Scripted		0	1 (6%)	15 (94%)	16 (100%)
Unscripted	B	0	4	31	35 (48%)
	D	0	11	27	38 (53%)
Total Unscripted		0	15 (21%)	58 (80%)	73 (100%)
Total Overall		0	16 (18%)	73 (82%)	89 (100%)

In the unscripted school, four of Teacher B's rationales required a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought and the remaining 31 rationales were rated as minimal. Eleven of Teacher D's rationales for adaptations were rated as requiring a thoughtful level of metacognitive thought and 27 of her rationales to adapt were rated as minimal.

Overall, 16% of the 16 scripted teachers' rationales were rated as thoughtful reasons to adapt, whereas 94% required minimal levels of metacognitive thought. Of the 73 unscripted teachers' rationales, 21% were rated as thoughtful reasons to adapt and 82% required minimal levels to metacognitive thought.

In sum, the answer to Research Question #2 was that the unscripted teachers demonstrated more thoughtful rationales than scripted teachers. Since there are so few adaptations, and thus so few rationales, in the scripted classrooms, there is little foundation for comparison of rationale types between the two contexts.

Answer to Research Question #3

This question addresses the openness of literacy tasks made in scripted and unscripted teachers' classrooms during literacy instruction in the 5-day research period. In regards to their tasks, teachers will be presented alone, compared by group (scripted and unscripted) and compared overall.

What openness level of literacy tasks are found in:

    a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
    b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

To answer this question, each teacher's data was analyzed separately by the researcher. Tables 21-24 list each teacher's tasks, the rating categories from the task

rubric (Appendix A), and the overall rating. First, the two scripted teachers' tasks were rated. Next, the two unscripted teachers' tasks were rated to examine the openness of literacy tasks of scripted and unscripted classrooms. Last, the literacy tasks of scripted and unscripted teachers were compared all together.

All task ratings were reviewed by a critical friend. No tasks had to be rescored due to errors.

In Table 21, scripted Teacher A required students to complete 10 tasks during the 5-day observation period. Each task scored lowest in each category, resulting in an average rating of closed. Students completed two tasks per day. "Take Home" assignments and tests are two-page worksheets with fill-in-the-blanks for reading comprehension questions.

Scripted Teacher A required a total of 10 tasks, of which all 10 received the most closed score on each of the 5 characteristics of task openness, a 5. All tasks were thus rated as closed.

In Table 22, scripted Teacher C required students to complete 13 tasks during the 5-day observation period. Each task scored lowest in each category, resulting in an average rating of closed. Students completed between two and three tasks per day. The Reading Mastery program mandates two tasks each day; however, Teacher C also utilized ancillary Reading Mastery materials to provide three of the remaining tasks.

Scripted Teacher C required a total of 13 tasks, of which all 13 received the most closed score on each of the five characteristics of task openness, an overall rating of five. All tasks were thus rated as closed.

Table 21

Scripted Teacher A Task Ratings

Scripted Teacher A Task Ratings							
Task	Authenticity	Collaboration	Word Level	Student Directed	Sustained	Total	Rating
A1 Take Home 148	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A2 Take Home 149	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A3 Take Home 152	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A4 Take Home 153	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A5 Take Home 156	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A6 Take Home 157	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A7 Take Home 158	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A8 Take Home 159	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A9 Lesson 160 Test	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
A10 Take Home 1	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
Total Task Ratings	10	10	10	10	10		
Average Task Ratings	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed

Table 22

Scripted Teacher C Task Ratings

Scripted Teacher C Task Ratings							
Task	Authenticity	Collaboration	Word Level	Student Directed	Sustained	Total	Rating
C1 Take Home 57	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C2 Take Home 58	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C3 Lesson 60 Reading Test	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C4 Take Home 61	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C5 Take Home 62	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C6 Take Home 63	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C7 Take Home 64	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C8 Take Home 69	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C9 Lesson 69 Word Search	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C10 Lesson 70 Sentence Completion	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C11 Take Home 70	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C12 Take Home 101	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
C13 Take Home 102	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
Total Task Ratings	13	13	13	13	13		
Average Task Ratings	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed

The tasks used in scripted classrooms were predominantly at the word-level, requiring students to recount specific words used in the text to answer questions. For example, the text included a story about a train. The accompanying worksheet task (C4) included the question; "What did Sandy like to do?" followed by a single word blank. The students were expected to answer the question with a single word (count). Out of the 14 fill-in blanks on Task C4, only two allowed for multiple words. In each case, two words were required for these blanks. No sentence-level writing was required for the task. No consultation with peers was allowed by Teacher C. The task did not involve student direction and it was a primarily school-oriented type of task, completed in one sitting.

The scripted teachers required a total of 23 tasks, of which all 23 received the most closed rating on each of the five characteristics of task openness, an overall rating of five. All tasks were thus rated as closed.

Compared to the scripted teachers, the unscripted teachers assigned tasks of varying levels of task openness in their classrooms. In Table 23, Teacher B required her students to complete a mixture of open, moderately open, and closed tasks. There were 14 total tasks of which two were open tasks, five were moderately open, and seven tasks were closed. Teacher B required on average sentence- and paragraph-level writing and allowed for more student direction. The average task rating for Teacher B was 9.28, resulting in her tasks being rated moderately open.

Table 23

Unscripted Teacher B Task Ratings

Task	Authenticity	Collaboration	Word Level	Student Directed	Sustained	Total	Rating
B1 Writing Process	2	2	3	3	3	13	Open
B2 Literature Response Journal	2	2	3	3	1	11	Mod. Open
B3 List of Things That Start with C	1	1	3	2	1	8	Closed
B4 Onset/ Rime Game	1	3	1	1	1	7	Closed
B5 Spelling Game	1	2	1	2	1	7	Closed
B6 Sequencing Story Steps	1	1	1	1	1	5	Closed
B7 Writing Process	2	2	3	3	3	13	Open
B8 Literature Response Journal	2	2	3	3	1	11	Mod. Open
B9 Journal	3	1	3	3	1	11	Mod. Open
B10 Journal	3	1	3	3	1	11	Mod. Open
B11 Venn Diagram	1	3	2	2	1	9	Mod. Open
B12 Story from List of C Words	1	1	3	2	1	8	Closed
B13 Book Reports	1	2	2	2	1	8	Closed
B14 Literature Response Journal	1	2	2	2	1	8	Closed
Total Task Ratings	22	25	33	32	18		
Average Task Ratings	1.57	1.78	2.35	2.28	1.28	9.28	Mod. Open

Unscripted Teacher B assigned a total of 14 tasks, of which two were rated as open, five were rated as moderately open, and seven were rated as closed. These tasks scored an average of 9.28 on the task openness rating, which means that Teacher B's 14 tasks were rated as moderately open.

In Table 24 on the following page, unscripted Teacher D also had higher task ratings than the scripted teachers. Teacher D required nine tasks throughout the data collection period, of which three were open, five were moderately open, and one was closed. Teacher D's tasks were on average collaborative, student-directed, and required sentence- and paragraph-level writing. The average rating for Teacher D's tasks was 10.66, which resulted in a rating of moderately open tasks for Teacher D.

Unscripted Teacher D assigned a total of nine tasks, of which three were rated as open, five were rated as moderately open, and one was rated as closed. These tasks scored an average of 10.66 on the task openness rating, which meant that Teacher D's nine tasks were rated as moderately open.

The unscripted teachers combined required 23 tasks, of which five were rated as open, ten were rated as moderately open, and eight were rated as closed. These tasks scored an average of 9.82 on the task openness rating. The 23 unscripted teachers' tasks were thus rated as moderately open.

The more open tasks required by the unscripted teachers are described. Task D8 was required of all of Teacher D's students. The students wrote letters to favorite people. This authentic task replicated out-of-school activity and allowed for minimal student collaboration throughout the assignment.

Table 24

Unscripted Teacher D Task Ratings

Tak	Authenticity	Collaboration	Word Level	Student Directed	Sustained	Total	Rating
Unscripted Teacher D Task Ratings							
D1 Venn Diagram & Thankful Hearts	2	3	1	2	1	9	Mod. Open
D2 Placemat Writing/ Thankful	2	2	2	2	2	10	Mod. Open
D3 Letter to Favorite Person(s)	1	2	2	3	2	10	Mod. Open
D4 Story Word Choice	1	2	2	2	1	8	Closed
D5 Journal	3	1	3	3	1	11	Mod. Open
D6 Thanks-giving Traditions	1	3	2	3	1	10	Mod. Open
D7 Writing Process	2	1	3	3	3	12	Open
D8 Write Letter to Family	3	2	3	3	3	14	Open
D9 Imaginary Invention Poster	2	3	2	3	2	12	Open
Total Task Ratings	17	19	20	24	16		
Average Task Ratings	1.88	2.11	2.22	2.66	1.77	10.66	Mod. Open

It required paragraph-level writing with much student-direction. Since the letter was developed through the writing process, it took 3 or more days to complete. The task was scored using the task openness rubric as a 14, making it an open task.

Another open task also used the writing process. Task B1 was required of all of Teacher B's students. Teacher B used a specific protocol for story writing in her classroom: all students had created lists of story ideas at the beginning of the month. These ideas ranged from what was so interesting about their homes to favorite pets to character education traits. Students then selected story ideas from their lists to develop during the writing process time in Teacher B's classroom. Therefore, there was no set topic for the writing; instead, each student wrote to his or her own prompts. Due to the nature of the process, Task B1 mimicked out-of-school tasks but retained features of school-based activities. Minimal collaboration was allowed during the paragraph-level, student-directed, sustained writing process. The task was scored a 13 on the task openness rubric, making it an open task.

Task B13 is a closed task from unscripted Teacher B. This task required students to complete a story map-type book report on their sustained silent reading books. It was a strictly school-type activity, completed in one sitting, with minimal collaboration allowed. Sentence-level writing was required and while the students had choices, these choices had minimal influence on the task. The task was scored an eight on the task openness rubric, making it a closed task.

From the examples highlighted above, the unscripted teachers utilized more student collaboration, higher word-level writing, and more student-direction with their tasks than the scripted teachers.

In Table 25, Teacher A, a scripted teacher, required ten tasks of her students. All ten tasks were closed tasks, per the rubric in Attachment A. Thus, the average rating for Teacher A's tasks was closed. Teacher C, another scripted teacher, required 13 tasks of her students. All 13 tasks were rated closed. Thus, the average rating for Teacher C's tasks was closed. The average scripted teacher task rating was thus closed.

Table 25

Scripted vs. Unscripted Task Openness Frequency Counts

Teacher		Task Ratings—Frequency Counts				Average Rating
		Open (12-15)	Moderately Open (9-11)	Closed (5-8)	Total	
Scripted	A	0	0	10	10	Closed
	C	0	0	13	13	Closed
Total Scripted		0	0	23	23	Closed
Unscripted	B	2	5	7	14	Moderately Open
	D	3	5	1	9	Moderately Open
Total Unscripted		5	10	8	23	Moderately Open

Teacher B, an unscripted teacher, required her students to complete 14 tasks of which two were rated open, five were rated being moderately open, and the remainder were closed. The average task rating for Teacher B was moderately open. Teacher D, the

other unscripted teacher, required her students to complete nine tasks, of which three were open, five were moderately open, and the one remaining task was closed. The average task rating for Teacher D was moderately open. The average unscripted teacher task rating was thus moderately open.

Overall, the scripted teachers required 23 total tasks, with all rated closed. Unscripted teachers also required 23 tasks, with an average task rating of moderately open. In the scripted classrooms, all students completed the 23 tasks. In the unscripted classrooms, some tasks were centers or guided reading activities; therefore, not all students were required to complete all tasks.

The scripted teachers required a total of 23 tasks which were rated as closed. The unscripted teachers required a total of 23 tasks which were rated as moderately open.

Table 26 demonstrates the relative percentage of assigned tasks for scripted and unscripted teachers in each openness rating. In the scripted school, 100% of Teacher A's ten assigned tasks were rated closed. Similarly, 100% of her Teacher C's 13 assigned tasks were closed. However, in the unscripted school, there was more variability of task openness. Half of Teacher B's eleven assigned tasks were closed; however, 15% of the tasks were rated open and 36% were moderately open tasks. Only assigned 11% of Teacher D's eight assigned tasks were closed. An overwhelming majority of Teacher D's assigned tasks were rated moderately open and a third of the total tasks were open.

Therefore, of the 23 total scripted tasks, 100% were closed while of the 23 total unscripted tasks, 35% were rated closed, 44% were rated moderately open, and 22% were open.

Table 26

Scripted vs. Unscripted Task Openness Percentages

| Teacher | | Task Ratings—Percentages of Tasks | | | |
		Open (12-15)	Moderately Open (9-11)	Closed (5-8)	Average Rating
Scripted	A	0%	0%	100%	Closed
	C	0%	0%	100%	Closed
Total Scripted		0%	0%	100%	Closed
Unscripted	B	15%	36%	50%	Moderately Open
	D	34%	55%	11%	Moderately Open
Total Unscripted		22%	44%	35%	Moderately Open

In answer to Research Question #3, scripted teachers required the same number of tasks as unscripted teachers; however, scripted teachers required tasks rated as closed, whereas unscripted teachers required tasks rated as moderately open.

Answer to Research Question #4

This question addresses the student motivation while completing the tasks assigned in scripted and unscripted teachers' classrooms during literacy instruction in the 5-day research period. In regards to student motivation, each aspect of student motivation will be presently separately. Strategic reading is presented first, followed by the three parts to persistence, followed by the results for volitional control. Students and teachers were each interviewed and their interviews were analyzed by Turner's (1995) codes, combined with researcher-created codes for one characteristic (persistence parts 1, 2, and 3). The results for teachers will be presented alone, compared by group (scripted and

unscripted) and compared overall by characteristic part or whole motivation characteristic.

What motivation is evidenced in the interview portion of Turner's motivated literacy in:

a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

To answer this question, each teacher's data was analyzed separately according to each component of student motivation. The two scripted teachers' students' student motivation factors were analyzed; then, the two unscripted teachers' students' student motivation were rated to examine student motivation of scripted and unscripted classrooms. Last, the student motivation results of scripted and unscripted teachers were compared all together. A critical friend checked student and teacher interview answers and verified that they were coded appropriately according to Turner's (1995) motivated literacy codes, according to each strand of motivation: strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control. The critical friend also agreed with the selection of the "other" code for unusual, unpredicted answers for which there was no other code. There were no patterns for answers coded "other," which was verified by the critical friend.

Strategic Reading

For the strategic reading characteristic of motivation, two questions were asked of students with regards to their tasks twice over the research period and two questions were asked of the teacher per student interview. The interviews were coded using Turner's (1995) codes.

In the scripted school, students and teachers tended to indicate that the reading (i.e., story) was the intended goal for that lesson. As one student said, "I was supposed to learn about the train and how many train cars [there were]." Another student stated that she had to learn how the purple stripes could be erased from the character's body.

Very few students and teachers in the scripted school indicated that self-improvement was the goal of the task. The one student who did think he was supposed to improve said, "(So) that I can read better and faster". Thirteen students mentioned that learning to read, including how to sound out a word, was what they were supposed to learn.

Twelve students mentioned thinking about other things while completing the task. These 'other' thoughts included not wanting to vomit, calling the police in the event of a robber, wanting to go in the warm sun, and playing basketball.

In the unscripted school, 21 responses to the strategic reading questions were for student self-improvement. These responses included statements about wanting to learn, using the information to build a birdfeeder, and being motivated to improve comprehension.

No unscripted students replied "Don't know" to what the intended learning goal was, whereas 19 students talked about word parts, such as chunking and syllabication. Fifteen students said they were supposed to learn how to do something, which was coded 'procedures.' This response included learning the rules of the game or figuring out which step of the writing process he was on.

Overall, the most noted strategic reading code was content. More students were focused on learning the reading material itself than being strategic. The code with the second highest response was 'learn to read'. This response basically generalized the reading process, and the students did not specify anything strategic.

Table 27

Scripted vs. Unscripted Strategic Reading Frequency Counts

Strategic Reading
Student question 1: What were you supposed to learn from the task you just did? Student question 2: What were you thinking about when you did this task? Teacher question 1: What reading strategies did _____ use today? Teacher question 2: What learning strategies did _____ use today?

Teacher	Learn to read	Learn new words	Word parts	Con-tent	Proce-dures	Self Improve-ment	Get it right	Other	Don't know	Total
A	6	2	1	10	1	0	9	2	0	29
C	7	3	3	15	2	1	3	7	4	34
Total Scripted	13	5	4	25	3	1	12	9	4	63
B	9	1	9	5	8	9	4	3	0	45
D	8	2	10	14	7	12	2	4	0	55
Total Un-scripted	17	3	19	19	15	21	6	7	0	100

To compute whether one set of classrooms was "more motivated" than the other set, I totaled all the code categories for scripted students (except for "don't know"), then totaled all the code categories for unscripted students (except for "don't know"), and compared whether one was 20% more than the other.

Since the scripted students had a total of 63 strategic reading codes, the twenty percent threshold the definition required for unscripted students to be more motivated was 76 codes for the unscripted students. Unscripted students amassed 100 strategic

reading codes. By using the rules cited in Chapter III, the unscripted students were "more motivated" than their scripted peers in regards to the strategic reading component.

Persistence

The persistence characteristic of motivation was answered in three parts. The first part asked the student what the hard part of the task was. The second part asked how the student attacked the hard parts. Last, in the teacher interview, the teacher talked about the persistence shown by the student that day. The interviews were analyzed using Turner's (1995) codes, except for "it wasn't hard" in part one, "unable to answer because it wasn't hard" in part two, and all of part three. The first two codes were added because (a) Turner's codes do not include such code types; and (b) there were enough of these answers to merit new codes. Part three codes were developed because Turner (1995) did not interview teachers about their perceptions of student persistence at tasks. The codes were developed based on the thick description describing Turner's observations.

In Table 28, students had different ideas on what were the hard parts of tasks. Multiple answers to the question were possible.

Turner's (1995) codes were as follows:

- Sounding out, which pertained to reading and writing;
- Following directions, meaning that it was difficult figuring out what the directions said to do or how to follow them;
- Specific difference, which was indicated when students said things like "It wasn't like ___, where we had to do ____. This time, I had to do ____ and that was tough to do." This could also refer to one part of a task being different from another part of the task.
- Comprehension, meaning the student had trouble comprehending the content (not directions).

'It wasn't hard,' meaning there was no hard part to the task, was added to Turner's (1995) codes when there were so many such answers by students.

Table 28

Scripted vs. Unscripted Persistence Frequency Counts (Part 1 of 3)

Persistence (Part 1 of 3)							
Student question: What was the hardest part about the task for you?							
	Sounding out	It wasn't hard	Following directions	Specific difference	Compre-hension	Other	Total
Teacher A	2	6	1	7	4	0	14
Teacher C	5	2	3	1	2	2	13
Total Scripted	7	8	4	8	6	2	27
Teacher B	10	1	3	4	2	2	21
Teacher D	3	0	6	1	1	4	15
Total Unscripted	13	1	9	5	3	6	36

In the scripted classrooms, the students presented varied answers across the coded areas. Eight scripted students said the work wasn't hard, whereas eight students said the things they got wrong were the hard parts, which was coded a 'specific difference.' The students also had difficulty with sounding out words, comprehending the material, and following directions.

In the unscripted classrooms, however, the students primarily mentioned two categories. First, a vast majority felt that sounding out, or chunking, new words were difficult. Next, the students felt that following directions was hard. An example of this was a student saying, "Getting along with Cody! He didn't want to draw [on] the poster." On this occasion, the students were working in cooperative groups and had to include all

group members in the decision-making process. Figuring out how to follow the teacher's directions and negotiate the interpersonal relationship with Cody vexed the student. Only one unscripted student felt the work was not difficult.

This first set of questions is important in that nine students felt the work was not hard, eight of whom were in the unscripted classrooms. Thus, 22% of the time, the scripted students felt the work they completed was not at all hard. Thus, they were unable to answer the following question: How did you handle the hard parts?

Of the codes found with this first question, "it wasn't hard" is not counted towards the total number of codes, since it does not identify a difficult part of the task. Therefore, the total figure is derived from the number of times the original Turner codes were used.

To compute whether one set of classrooms was "more motivated" than the other set, I totaled all the code categories for scripted students (except for "it wasn't hard"), then totaled all the code categories for unscripted students (except for "it wasn't hard"), and compared whether the result for one set of students was 20 percent more than the other.

The scripted students had 27 persistence codes for Question 1 of 3. The twenty percent threshold for this amount is 33. Since the unscripted students accumulated 36 codes, they were "more motivated" than the scripted students for this part of the persistence question.

In Table 29, students were asked how they solved difficulties when completing tasks. Since students had indicated various hard parts of the tasks in part one of

persistence, their methods of solving the hard parts varied as well. Turner's codes (1995) were:

- Used strategies
- Asked for help
- Guessed/did it
- Used more effort
- Other

Since there were a number of students who indicated that their work was not hard, I added a category for students who were unable to answer this question of attacking the hard parts.

Table 29

Scripted vs. Unscripted Persistence Frequency Counts (Part 2 of 3)

Persistence (Part 2 of 3)						
Student question: How did you handle the hard parts?						
	Used strategies	Asked for help	Guessed/ Did it	Used more effort	Other	Unable to answer because it wasn't hard	Total
Teacher A	3	3	6	4	1	6	17
Teacher C	8	9	1	1	2	2	21
Total Scripted	11	12	7	5	3	8	38
Teacher B	12	1	3	0	2	2	18
Teacher D	9	3	8	2	0	0	22
Total Unscripted	21	4	11	2	2	2	40

The scripted students predominantly relied upon asking for help and using strategies to solve their difficulties. Many students would ask the teacher for assistance, although in many cases the teachers re-read the instructions and did not help the students

as the students intended. By using strategies, many respondents read back in their text, looked for similar sentences, and chunked the unknown words. Eight students were unable to answer the question.

The unscripted students relied heaviest on using strategies for solving their problems. Most referred back to the text or used a word wall. Two of these students mentioned a specific reading strategy, guess and check, to guess the difficult word and then read the read of the sentence to check it at the end. Eleven students either guessed at the hard part or went ahead and completed the work, even though it was difficult. One student remarked, "I just did it. I know it's hard but I've done hard things before and I'll learn more if I figure it out myself."

To compute whether one set of classrooms was "more motivated" than the other set, I totaled all the code categories for scripted students (except for "unable to answer"), then totaled all the code categories for unscripted students (except for "unable to answer"), and compared whether the result for one set of students was 20% more than the other.

Using the rules established in Chapter III for data analysis of the motivation components, the scripted students had a total of 38 codes for persistence, part 2 of 3. Since the scripted students did not collect 20% more codes, or 46 codes, they were not more motivated than the unscripted students. Thus, neither group was "more motivated" than the other regarding Question 2 of persistence.

As seen in Table 30, this last part of persistence is the teacher perception of how persistent the child was on the day of the teacher interview. Teachers were interviewed

twice about each student over the five observation days. While the teachers were not asked specifically about a rating, these codes were apparent from the words the teachers used. In instances in which the teacher indicated the child was on task, yet nothing was overtly stated about being more than the middle, it was regarded as a "moderate" level of persistence. An example of this instance is Teacher A stating, "Oh yes, Jaman was persistent today." When "very," "quite," and other synonyms were given, these responses were coded as "quite" persistent.

Table 30

Scripted vs. Unscripted Persistence Frequency Counts (Part 3 of 3)

Persistence (Part 3 of 3)			
Teacher question: How persistent was _____ today?			
	Quite	Moderate	Not at all
Teacher A	2	6	0
Teacher C	4	5	1
Total Scripted	6	11	1
Teacher B	8	2	0
Teacher D	7	1	0
Total Unscripted	15	3	0

In the scripted classrooms, most children demonstrated a "moderate" level of persistence in the classroom, followed by those who were "quite" persistent. Only one child was "not at all" persistent and his behavior was cited by the teacher as being poor that day. All students worked independently on all tasks.

In the unscripted classrooms, most students were "quite" persistent. Fifteen students altogether were "quite" persistent. In fact, in Teacher B's classroom, students

were engaged in literacy centers while the teacher was occupied in guided reading groups. In Teacher D's classroom, students were placed in cooperative groups on whole-class activities. Just three students were perceived as demonstrating a "moderate" level of persistence in their tasks in the unscripted classrooms.

To compute whether one set of classrooms was "more motivated" than the other set, I totaled all the code categories for scripted students, then totaled all the code categories for unscripted students, and compared whether the result for one set of students was 20 percent more than the other.

According to the rules established in Chapter III, the scripted students were "quite" persistent only on six occasions. To meet the twenty percent threshold for unscripted students to be more persistent than their peers, the unscripted students had to exceed eight counts. Unscripted students were "quite" persistent 11 times, exceeding the required amount. Thus, unscripted students were perceived by their teachers to be "more motivated" than their unscripted peers in regards to persistence.

Overall, considering all three persistence parts, since the unscripted students were "more motivated" than the scripted students for two of the three questions, they are deemed to have been more persistent (and thus "more motivated") than their scripted peers.

Volitional Control

For the volitional control characteristic of motivation, two questions were asked of students with regards to their tasks twice over the research period and one question

was asked of the teacher per student interview. The interviews were analyzed using Turner's (1995) codes.

Students' answers to the question of getting work done fell into one of five codes for data analysis. These codes were:

- Strategy used, which means the student used a strategy for getting the work done. Included in the 'strategy used' code were thinking about the work, circling words as she came to them, looking back in the book, reading the material, figuring out answers, and spelling words right. In each case, the student is stating that the method he used to get the work done was an attack of the problem in some way.

- Did it, which means that the student just completed the work without a specific tactic or strategy to assist her. The statement of "I just did it" was often accompanied by a shrug with raised eyebrows.

- Teacher help refers to asking the teacher for assistance in completing the task.

- I don't know refers to the student not being aware of any metacognitive self-talk in determining how to attack the task. It differs from 'did it' in the sense that the student is not aware of focusing his attention on the act of completion; instead, the student does not have, or lacks the ability to state, the awareness of the thoughts involved.

- Other includes working with a group to problem solve, repeating the procedures, going fast, and taking her time. These are mainly single-use words and do not have enough incidences to yield a defined enough pattern to code.

In Table 31, the scripted students and their teachers determined that students mostly used strategies to get the work done. For instance, Teacher C indicated that Student 1 read back over the reading to answer the questions for the task. 'Strategy used" was selected 15 times. "I did it" and "I don't know" were the next most frequent selections, each category being chosen nine times. This means that children were equally aware of getting the work done, with no specific metacognitive self-talk, as they were of having no specific self-talk at all. In six cases for each category, the scripted students received teacher help or were coded as "other."

Table 31

Scripted vs. Unscripted Volitional Control Frequency Counts

Volitional Control						
Student question 1: How did you get the work done? Student question 2: What did you tell yourself as you completed the work? Teacher question: What actions did _____ take to aid his/her concentration?						
	Strategy used	Did it	Teacher help	I don't know	Other	Total
Teacher A	6	3	1	4	4	13
Teacher C	9	5	5	5	2	16
Total Scripted	15	9	6	9	6	29
Teacher B	6	3	0	0	3	12
Teacher D	5	4	3	1	2	15
Total Unscripted	11	7	3	1	5	27

The unscripted students and their teachers had a similar selection of using strategies. They used strategies to get their work completed 11 times. The students were cited as "just did it" seven times and as "other" five times. Notably, the unscripted

students did not ask for help often (*n*=3) nor did they not know how they completed the work (*n*=1).

Overall, the scripted students and unscripted students both used strategies to attack the work most often, followed closely by just doing the work. The groups were also quite similar in the number of "other" answers. The two groups of students vary in their volitional control uses in that scripted students asked the teacher for help more often and answered "I don't know" more frequently than the unscripted students.

Two codes were not used in the total accounting of codes for volitional control: "I don't know" and "teacher help." These codes were discounted for the same reason. Volitional control is how children "maintain engagement in order to control their own and others' intentions and impulses during academic learning" (Turner, 1995, p. 420). Since seeking teacher help is neither "spontaneous talk" nor "inner speech" that a child would use to control his own or others' actions, it is not counted as a volitional control strategy. Similarly, having an absence of "inner speech" by not knowing what he is thinking, this code is not counted either.

To compute whether one set of classrooms was "more motivated" than the other set, I totaled all the code categories for scripted students (except for "I don't know" and "teacher help"), then totaled all the code categories for unscripted students (except for "I don't know" and "teacher help"), and compared whether the result for one set of students was 20% more than the other.

According to the rules established in Chapter III, there is therefore no discernible difference between scripted and unscripted students regarding volitional control, since neither group exceeded the other's accumulated code tally by more than twenty percent.

To answer Research Question #4, all three student motivation indicators were combined to get an understanding of the motivation of the students. Generally, students in scripted classrooms read for content, focused on getting tasks correct, and thought they were supposed to learn to read. They thought their work wasn't hard or that one answer/part was more difficult than another. These students asked for the teacher's help or used strategies to complete tasks and exhibited a "moderate" level of persistence during data collection. Sometimes they just did the work without really thinking about it.

Unscripted students exhibited a different understanding about their tasks. These students read for self-improvement, for content, and used word parts to figure out unknown words. They thought they were supposed to learn the story content, procedures and practices, and how to read. They sounded out words to attack the hard parts and also used following directions to help them understand. By using strategies and guessing or just completing their work, the students stayed on target with task completion. Unscripted students were generally deemed "quite" persistent by their teachers.

By using the rules established in Chapter III, there are mixed results for motivation overall. Unscripted students were "more motivated" than scripted students regarding strategic reading and persistence. With volitional control, however, there were no differences between scripted and unscripted students. Therefore, if all components to motivation are regarded equally, there is a small amount of difference between scripted

and unscripted students. This difference is found in strategic reading and persistence but not volitional control.

Thus, there is no certain definitive answer to Research Question #4. Instead, unscripted students are "more motivated" than their scripted peers regarding strategic reading persistence; however, since the two context groups are equal in volitional control, no group can be seen as "more motivated" overall, as motivation is being measured here in this study. The answer to Research Question #4 is thus ambiguous or inconclusive.

Answer to Research Question #5

This question addresses the relationship between task openness and student motivation in scripted and unscripted teachers' classrooms during literacy instruction in the 5-day research period. By combining the information found in Research Questions #3 and #4, we are able to understand the relationship between task openness and student motivation in each classroom.

What is the relationship between task openness and students' responses to the interview portion of Turner's student motivation in:

    a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
    b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

In the unscripted classrooms, the task openness was rated moderately open and the scripted classrooms' tasks were rated as closed. Neither group was "more motivated" than the other, as it was defined. The student motivation of the two groups of students is ambiguous using the methods and analysis in this study.

Therefore, the answer to Research Question #5 is that there is no relationship between task openness and student motivation.

Incidentally, rearrangement of the factors will not help to answer the question. Motivation is task dependent in this study. The tasks in the scripted classrooms were all rated closed, but tasks in the unscripted classrooms varied between open, moderately open, and closed. The data was then rearranged to separate closed tasks (and the motivation associated with those tasks) from open and moderately tasks (and the motivation associated with those tasks), regardless of the relative scriptedness of the classroom. Out of the 18 unscripted student interviews, only one student was interviewed about a closed task. By removing that one task (and the motivation answers associated with it), I had a clear picture of the motivation students exhibited when confronted with open and moderately open tasks. Therefore, the 17 remaining unscripted student and teacher interviews were about open and moderately open tasks. There are thus no differences between open and closed tasks and student motivation, regardless of the relative scriptedness of the teacher.

Answer to Research Question #6

This question addresses the relationship between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation in scripted and unscripted teachers' classrooms during literacy instruction during the research period. By combining the information found in Research Questions #1, #2, #3 and #4, we are able to understand the relationship between these factors.

What is the relationship between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and students' responses to the interview portion of Turner's student motivation in:

    a. Two scripted second grade classrooms?
    b. Two unscripted second grade classrooms?

The scripted teachers produced fewer and lower rated adaptations than their unscripted peers. The scripted teachers' rationales were rated as requiring more minimal levels of metacognitive thought than the unscripted teachers. Scripted tasks were rated as closed, whereas unscripted tasks were rated as moderately open. Scripted students produced ambiguous student motivation results, as did unscripted students. Since neither scripted nor unscripted classrooms demonstrated "more motivation," as it is defined in this study, there is thus no relationship between the factors.

The answer to Research Question #6 is that while there is a relationship between teacher adaptations and rationales and task openness (i.e., more open tasks are associated with more and higher quality teacher adaptations), since motivation analysis yielded ambiguous results, there is no relationship between these teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness and student motivation.

Conclusion

Since this study focused on teacher's instructional adaptations and rationales and student motivation during two instructional contexts that set forth task differences, some things are known. First, the unscripted teachers produced far more instructional adaptations, which required more metacognitive thought than those adaptations produced by the scripted teachers. The unscripted teachers' rationales for their adaptations required more metacognitive thought than the rationales produced by the scripted teachers. Next, task openness was quite different between the participating scripted and unscripted classrooms. Notably, the unscripted classrooms required more open tasks than the

completely closed tasks found in scripted classrooms. However, the motivation felt by scripted and unscripted students to complete their required tasks was ambiguous and thus was inconclusive.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study explored the relationships between teachers' instructional adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation. I observed four second-grade teachers, two in scripted classrooms and two in unscripted classrooms, where it was assumed that task openness would be different, during literacy block instruction over the course of five days per teacher. I also performed teacher and student interviews to gather data on student motivation and teacher adaptations and rationales. This mixed methods study was a modified replication of Turner's (1995) research about task openness and motivation. Research questions were asked about (a) teachers' adaptations, (b) teachers' rationales for adaptations, (c) task openness, (d) student motivation, (e) relationship between task openness and student motivation, and (f) relationship between teachers' adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation.

Frequency, Type, and Quality of Adaptations

This study's initial focus was the frequency, type, and quality of teacher adaptations in the classroom. My expectations for the research will be followed by a summary of the findings about adaptations. Finally, I will discuss the findings.

Expectations for the Research

I expected that scripted teachers would exhibit fewer and lower quality instructional adaptations than unscripted teachers, based upon the initial research results

from Duffy and colleagues (2007). This research hinted at such an adaptation relationship between scripted and unscripted instruction. Adaptations were also expected to spread throughout the adaptation types somewhat evenly, based upon Duffy and colleagues' research (2007, 2008).

Summary of Findings

The unscripted teachers exhibited three times the number of adaptations as the scripted teachers. The unscripted teachers' adaptations were of a higher quality, requiring more metacognitive thought to produce, than those of the scripted teachers.

Discussion of Adaptations Results

I expected that scripted teachers would exhibit fewer and lower quality instructional adaptations than unscripted teachers, because their instructional materials were designed so that children experienced new and unknown aspects on a careful stair-step of exposure. The materials were tightly controlled, with a transitional alphabet at the beginning of the Reading Mastery Module 2 series (see for example, Cummins, 2007; Gorman, 1997; Shannon, 2007; Wiltz & Wilson, 2005-06). All words and ideas in the task materials were already pretaught during the direct-teaching portion of the lesson. There was only so much room for students to be unsuccessful with this format; likewise, there were only so many situations in which students experienced an unknown. Further, there was an established protocol for many aspects of instruction in the Reading Mastery classroom. When children asked questions about the task, the teacher re-read the directions to the child. These responses were consistent between the two scripted classrooms.

I also expected there would be more adaptations in the unscripted classrooms because with more open tasks there was more opportunity for students to encounter uncertainty. For instance, one thoughtful level task involved students writing a literature response after reading a book. One student in an unscripted classroom found it very difficult to answer his chosen question for literature response since he had read an informational text, yet had selected a literature response question that focused on character development. Thus, unscripted instruction when student choice plays a role in the decision making has a potential for mismatch between the task and the student's experiences or abilities.

Most of the scripted adaptations involved the teacher changing the instructional means by which the objective was learned, which makes sense with our present understanding that all children do not learn the same things at the same time by the same means.

There were 13 instances in which the unscripted teachers invented examples or other illustrations about words or concepts. Since the unscripted teachers engaged in guiding reading instruction, in which the text is instructional level, these sorts of adaptations make sense.

Therefore, the scripted teachers exhibited fewer and lesser quality adaptations than the unscripted teachers, which was in line with my expectations.

Frequency, Type, and Quality of Rationales

The focus of this section was on the frequency, type, and quality of teacher rationales about adaptations in the classroom. My expectations for the research will be

followed by a summary of the findings about rationales. Finally, I will discuss the findings.

Expectations for the Research

I anticipated that unscripted teachers would have more and higher quality teacher rationales than scripted teachers, since I expected that they would have more and higher quality adaptations. This expectation originated in the reasoning that a considerable-level adaptation is constructed with so much metacognitive thought that the accompanying rationale must surely also require an increased level of thought. Further, since scripted teachers would only be able to deliver minimal-rated adaptations, surely their rationales would not require much metacognitive thought. I did not have any expectations about the types of rationales, since our understanding about rationale types is still developing.

Summary of Findings

The unscripted teachers had more and higher quality rationales than scripted teachers. All but one of the scripted teachers' rationales involved a minimal level of metacognitive thought. In the unscripted classrooms, 80% of the rationales were rated as requiring a minimal level of metacognitive thought with the remaining 15 rationales being rated as requiring a thoughtful (medium) level of metacognitive thought. No rationales in either scripted or unscripted classrooms required a considerable level of metacognitive thought.

Discussion of the Findings

My expectations were partially borne out. The scripted teachers had lower quality rationales than the unscripted teachers, for the most part matching their own lower quality

adaptations. However, the unscripted teachers did not exhibit the expected higher level of metacognitive thought in their rationales. There was no considerable-level rationale to match the one instructional adaptation which also had that ranking. Instead, there were fewer thoughtful (medium) rated rationales compared to thoughtful adaptations, and more minimal level rationales than minimal level adaptations in the unscripted classrooms.

Thus, the scripted classrooms demonstrated my expectancies: low level adaptations are based upon low levels of metacognitive thought for the rationale. However, when teachers devised adaptations that required medium and considerable levels of metacognitive thought, their rationales may have required less metacognitive thought to create.

Thus, although unscripted teachers' rationales were more and of a higher quality than their scripted peers' rationales, they did not quite match the quality level of their matching adaptations.

<div align="center">**Task Openness**</div>

This section focuses on the openness of tasks required in scripted and unscripted classrooms. My expectations for the research will be followed by a summary of the findings about task openness. Last, I will discuss the findings.

Expectations of the Findings

I expected that task openness would be different between the two contexts, given that I provided unscripted teachers with the intervention on how to create open tasks.

Summary of the Findings

Between scripted and unscripted classrooms, task openness did differ greatly. The scripted classrooms' 23 tasks were all closed and of the unscripted classrooms' 23 tasks, five were rated as open, 10 tasks were rated as moderately open, and eight tasks were closed. Briefly, the scripted classrooms had closed tasks and the unscripted classrooms contained moderately open tasks, a substantial difference.

Discussion of the Findings

The expectation that the unscripted classrooms would have more open tasks than those required during scripted instruction was borne out. When considered that scripted instruction used closed task worksheets (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005), and that the unscripted teachers were coached in how to provide open tasks, unscripted teachers should have and did create tasks that scored higher on the rubric than the scripted teachers, who used tasks provided to them.

Since this study was developed on the assumption that scripted and unscripted instruction require tasks of differing openness, the finding that unscripted classrooms require more open tasks was not surprising.

Student Motivation

This section focuses on the student motivation attached to the tasks referenced above. My expectations for the student motivation research will be followed by a summary of the findings. Last, I will discuss the student motivation findings.

Expectations about Student Motivation

I expected that the students in unscripted classrooms would exhibit higher student motivation (as defined herein). I anticipated that the unscripted students would be "more motivated" than their scripted peers since their tasks would be more open, leading to increased student motivation.

Summary of the Findings

Students in unscripted classrooms were "more motivated" than students in scripted classrooms with regard to strategic reading, one of the aspects of student motivation. In fact, in this one category, the difference between the classrooms was well over the 20 percent more required threshold set forth in the definition for "more motivated." Students in the unscripted classrooms were also "more motivated" than their scripted peers with regards to the persistence questions. However, students in the unscripted and scripted classrooms were roughly equal with regards to their volitional control. Therefore, according to the definition for "more motivated" established in Chapter I, neither set of students was "more motivated" in regards to volitional control. Since there are two incidences of "more motivated" (strategic reading and persistence), yet the students are equal with regards to volitional control, the overall motivation finding is thus ambiguous or inconclusive.

Discussion of Findings

I expected that the students in unscripted classrooms would exhibit higher student motivation (as defined herein) because previous research says students are more motivated by open and high-challenge tasks (Miller, 2003; Miller & Meece, 1999;

Thornburg, 2005; Turner, 1995). By contrasting reasoning, therefore, students in the scripted classrooms, which are known to be worksheet-driven (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005), would exhibit lower student motivation than their peers. The results are not in line with my expectations. However, the scripted students did not differ from the unscripted students as much as I had anticipated. Further discussion about student motivation results will be found in the following section: Discussion—What Does It All Mean?

The student motivation involved in this study did not bear out findings found by other researchers. Therefore, this will be a topic of conversation later in this chapter.

Relationship between Adaptations and Task Openness

This section focuses on the relationship between adaptations and task openness. My expectations for this relationship will be followed by a summary of the findings. Last, I will discuss the findings.

Expectations about the Relationship

I anticipated that during instruction with more open tasks, there would be more adaptations, of which more metacognitive thought was required, than with closed tasks.

Summary of the Findings

The scripted teachers required students to complete closed tasks and had 16 adaptations, of which all but one required a minimal level of metacognitive thought. By contrast, the unscripted teachers required students to complete an average of moderately open tasks. These teachers performed 73 adaptations, of which 41% required a thoughtful (medium) or considerable level of metacognitive thought.

Discussion of the Findings

Not only were there considerably more adaptations in the unscripted classrooms, but the metacognitive thought required to devise those adaptations was higher than the adaptations devised by the scripted teachers. This was completely in line with my expectations. Duffy and colleagues' pilot study research (2007) hinted at such a relationship and it was found to be true. The low quality of the scripted teachers' adaptations was in line with expectations since the teachers were strongly encouraged not to adapt the script (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007).

Since the study was devised with a difference in task openness being expected between scripted and unscripted classrooms, the results upheld the expectation that unscripted teachers would require more open tasks than scripted teachers and that open tasks would produce more and better-quality teacher adaptations.

Relationship between Task Openness and Student Motivation

This section focuses on the relationship between task openness and student motivation. My expectations for the relationship between task openness and student motivation will be followed by a summary of the findings. Last, I will discuss the findings.

Expectations about the Relationship

I expected that there would be a relationship between task openness and student motivation.

Summary of the Findings

The unscripted classrooms demonstrated more open tasks than the scripted classrooms. However, the student motivation was inconclusive between the classrooms. While the types of classrooms differed a bit on specific subsets of motivation, they did not offer any trend that could substantiate the research that open tasks produce higher student motivation. There is therefore no observable relationship between task openness and student motivation, as motivation is being measured in this study.

Discussion of the Findings

I expected that there would be a relationship between task openness and student motivation because previous research says students are more motivated with open, or high challenge, tasks than closed tasks (Miller & Meece, 1999; Turner, 1995). Since open tasks are the bedrock of the task measurement, the motivation aspect should parallel task openness. The higher the task openness, the more motivated students should appear.

This expectation was developed with the assumption that the scripted classroom would have closed tasks and that the unscripted classroom would naturally have a mixture of task types. Further, I delivered a soft coaching intervention to the unscripted teachers. Should the teacher then want to please me, she would then produce more open tasks during the research times. While prior research has shown that professional development must persist over time before the concepts are internalized into the teacher's activities (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990), surely there would be a natural difference in task openness even without the intervention.

The fact that the findings did not bear out with my expectations are a concern; however, student motivation will be discussed further in this chapter.

Relationship between Teacher Adaptations and Rationales, Task Openness, and Student Motivation

This section focuses on the relationship between task openness and student motivation. My expectations for the relationship between task openness and student motivation will be followed by a summary of the findings. Last, I will discuss the findings.

Expectations about the Relationship

I expected there to be a relationship between task openness, teacher adaptations, and student motivation. As mentioned in Chapter II, we found in a pilot study that there seemed to be more adaptations when tasks were open (Duffy et al., 2006). Further, we know that open tasks yield higher student motivation. Therefore, the assumption was made that open tasks would produce more and better quality teacher adaptations and higher student motivation.

Summary of the Findings

The scripted teachers produced fewer and lower rated adaptations than their unscripted peers. Scripted tasks were rated as closed, whereas unscripted tasks were rated as moderately open. Scripted students produced ambiguous student motivation results, as did unscripted students. Since neither scripted nor unscripted classrooms demonstrated "more motivation," as it is defined in this study, there is thus no relationship between the factors.

Discussion of the Findings

Unfortunately, the expectation that a relationship exists between teacher adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation was not realized in this study. Although there was a significant relationship between teacher adaptations, rationales, and task openness, there is no relationship between these factors and student motivation. Simply put, higher task openness did not result in increased student motivation, as defined in this study. There is at present no way of determining the relationship between the teacher adaptations and student motivation, primarily because teacher adaptations occurred at any time within the literacy block but student motivation was only measured attached to the task. If there was no task during the time of the adaptation, motivation could not be correlated.

Since three of the four factors were found to have a relationship, and the fourth factor has been found to be contrary to prior research, the finding of a lack of a relationship is suspect. Student motivation will be addressed in the next section.

The above-listed sections addressed the researcher expectations and a summary and discussion of the findings for each of the following areas of research, based on the research questions: (a) teachers' adaptations, (b) teachers' rationales for adaptations, (c) task openness, (d) student motivation, (e) relationship between task openness and student motivation, and (f) relationship between teachers' adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student motivation.

Discussion—What Does It All Mean?

There are three main topics of discussion with the research project. First, there is a clear connection between open tasks and more and higher quality adaptations. Next, the measurement of student motivation used in this study does not support the research. Why does it not? Last, a true replication of Turner's (1995) work was not possible. There were some effects of this issue. These three topics will be discussed on the following pages.

First, prior research on adaptive instruction has indicated that open tasks and unscripted instruction might allow for more teacher adaptations (Duffy et al., 2007). This study bolsters that argument, since the unscripted teachers used more open tasks than the scripted teachers and the unscripted teachers produced more and higher quality adaptations than the scripted teachers. When this information is then compared to findings on effective teachers, it raises questions. Do effective teachers use more open tasks than their ineffective counterparts? Since effective teachers have been found to adapt their instruction (Allington & Johnson, 2002; Bransford, Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Pressley et al., 2001), perhaps these adaptations are occurring during open tasks. Further, perhaps open tasks are a natural precursor to adaptations, due in part to the amount of risk, for the learner and the teacher, which is present in the task to make it open. After all, teachers in the preactive phase of instructional planning are not be able to predict student talk well enough to be able to plan all responses. Further, the more students are able to choose their work assignments, the more likely there will be unforeseen, and thus unplanned, aspects. With work sustained over time, it is more likely that teachers will encounter novel situations that need attention, particularly since project-

and process-based tasks may look less at getting correct answers and more at how the work is accomplished. Thus, with the uncertainty and risk-taking involved with open tasks, teachers need to be able to think adaptively when using these tasks.

This study does not support the belief that more open tasks will yield higher student motivation. The measurement of motivation of scripted and unscripted students was found to be inconclusive, as it was being measured in this study. This can be considered in several ways. First, it may be a function of the definition of motivation or because Turner's procedures were not replicated exactly. Turner's (1995) definition of motivation, motivated literacy, focused just on three parts: strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control. However, these are narrow understandings of motivation. There are other aspects to motivation which could have been used in this study and might have upheld the open task/high motivation understanding. For instance, student engagement or time on task measures might have produced vastly different results during the same instructional period.

While Turner effectively showed that open tasks provided increased motivated literacy, with the changes I made, the three elements of strategic reading, persistence, and volitional control yielded inconclusive results. This ambiguousness was likely due to the method and analysis used. In the end, motivated literacy is such a narrow measurement of motivation that it may not have readily shown how motivated students were, when you consider the larger understanding of the term (see Chapter II).

Third, there was also a resources issue with this study. Turner had more data collectors and had the ability to interview more students and watch as students completed

their tasks. In my case, I had to watch the teacher during task completion to gather data on adaptations. I thus substituted Turner's 7 students with 5, and eliminated Turner's student observation component, relying upon just the interview portion of her student motivation component. This may have impeded the data collection. Further, by using four teachers to Turner's twelve teachers, Turner had a greater n for data analysis of student motivation. Instead of analyzing the work as Turner had done, I had to develop another analysis schematic.

The following topics were discussed above: the connection between open tasks and instructional adaptations, student motivation measurement, and resource issues.

Implications

There are three sets of implications that have emerged from this research: implications for future research, K-12 education, and teacher education. These will be examined in the subsequent pages.

Implications for Future Research

This research line needs to be continued. There are four implications for future research, centering on the idea of change to the research path. The student measurement, participant selection, definition of adaptations, and definition of tasks should be altered to more fully understand the relationships between teachers' adaptations and rationales, task openness, and student effects.

As has been made clear in the preceding pages, the measurement and analysis of motivation that has been used in this study was flawed enough to yield ambiguous findings, when they should have produced positive student motivation results for open

tasks. Thus, any future adaptation research should seek to connect adaptations with student motivation or achievement. One such manner might be measurement of valuing as an aspect of student motivation. Valuing involved, "embedding what is to be read in a situation where the reader pursues action worthy of effort, "transforms" text meaning in terms of the particulars of the task" (Duffy, Miller, Howerton, & Williams, in press), which leads the child to develop agency regarding this situation. For example, the work of Duke and colleagues (2006/2007) cited authenticity of tasks as something that made work more open. The more schoolwork is like out-of-school lives, Duke and colleagues posit that students will value it more, leading to higher student motivation to complete the tasks. This is just one way the aspect of valuing could tie more clearly to the work at hand than the present measurement of student motivation.

Another aspect of this work is to more narrowly define the participants. In this study, I was limited to a convenience sample of teachers because I was working with a specific grade level and type of instruction. Were I to use teachers who teach across a spectrum of grade levels, and narrow their selection not by instructional type (i.e., scripted and unscripted classrooms) but instead through expertise as a teacher, I might more fully understand how teaching ability affects both task openness and student motivation. For instance, do exemplary teachers adapt more often than those not so designated, as the research suggests may occur (Allington & Johnston, 2002; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Wharton-McDonald, Pressley, & Hampston, 1998)?

A third area for this line of research is the expansion of what we mean by adaptation. When the research team was coding adaptations, we were often struck by the

idea that the action could not be a routine or an action done previously. Beginning teachers would therefore have markedly more adaptation ability than experienced teachers because there is so much out there pedagogically that is new to the more novice teacher. Continuing this idea, experienced teachers have fewer aspects of instruction (and thus adaptation) which can be considered new or non-routine. A teacher may have done X with student Y three months hence. Does that mean that when the teacher does X (with a slight change perhaps) with student Z that this is not new? Thus, are the adaptation parameters perhaps privileging novice teachers to experience more and better quality adaptations than experienced teachers because of their very newness to teaching? If so, how do we rationalize the many studies (see for example, Bransford, Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Pressley et al., 2001; Taylor, Pressley, & Pearson, 2002) which state that exemplary teachers, of whom many are experienced, adapt during instruction? At present, the research team is still grappling with the meanings and understanding of the criteria used to identify adaptations, specifically with regards to the "non-routine" and "improvisational" requirements.

A fourth avenue for this line of research is the definition of tasks. While the definition of tasks discriminated between unscripted and scripted instruction in this study, it may still be necessary to revisit the definition of task. In this study, task was defined as written student work. Other studies have noted that many classroom tasks do not produce a written product. For instance, guided reading consists of many oral tasks and few, if any, written products. The task definition is thus too narrow to adequately capture all literacy instruction and assignment of tasks, since literacy encompasses the various acts

of reading, writing, viewing, speaking, and listening. Expansion of the tasks definition might produce an even greater task openness difference between scripted and unscripted classrooms.

Therefore, there are four areas in which future research should delve. First, a better motivation measurement or analysis should be implemented. Next, research should be designed so that participants can be more carefully selected to avoid the convenience sample. Third, the research team needs to reexamine the adaptation criteria in light by considering how to look at data from more experienced teachers. Last, a more inconclusive definition of tasks should be examined.

Implications for K-12 Education

One finding of this study is that open tasks provide room for more adaptations that require increased metacognitive thought than closed tasks. Next, unscripted teachers may naturally produce more open tasks than scripted teachers. There are two implications for K-12 education, centering on the link between open tasks and greater frequency and higher quality of adaptations. These two implications for K-12 education are 1) encouraging scripted teachers to adapt to meet the needs of their students; and, 2) encouraging scripted teachers to use open tasks.

The Reading Mastery external coaches strongly advise high levels of adherence to the scripts (R. Tate, personal communication, September 24, 2007). Since 13 of the 16 adaptations scripted teachers made changed how the objective was met (i.e., changed the instruction involved), it can be assumed that they made these changes to better meet the instructional needs of their students. If the scripted teachers were not advised such close

adherence to the script, would they have adapted more often? Would they have felt comfortable making such instructional decisions based on the needs of their students? Based on the findings of this study, encouraging the teachers to adapt might increase scripted teachers' frequency, type, and quality of adaptations.

Next, if scripted teachers are encouraged to alter the instruction or tasks to meet student needs, open tasks may emerge. Since we know that in the prior literature, open tasks produce higher student motivation than closed tasks, perhaps the motivation of these students might increase. Simply, students in low-performing schools are often the targeted populations to receive scripted instruction (Cummins, 2007). Increasing their motivation for literacy tasks might provide the stimulation necessary to improve their literacy achievement. An ancillary benefit to adding open tasks in to the scripted program instruction is that as open tasks are present, more and higher quality instructional adaptations may occur. Thus, with this one suggestion alone, adaptations may improve with increased student motivation.

By encouraging scripted teachers to adapt scripted instruction and to use open tasks during instruction, more and higher quality teacher adaptations may occur with increased student motivation.

Implications for Teacher Education

There are two implications for teacher education instruction: adaptations during scripted instruction and instruction in how to adapt.

First, our students need to understand how to adapt during scripted instruction. The two teachers I studied produced very few adaptations during their lessons, of which

93% were low quality. The lone medium-quality adaptation demonstrated the teacher's knowledge of the student's prior experiences and vocabulary. She properly scaffolded the questions to guide him to the correct answer on his worksheet. Since many of our teacher candidates will begin their teaching careers in high needs schools, and since scripted instruction is growing in that one sector of schools (Cummins, 2007; Wiltz & Wilson, 2005-06), our future teachers will encounter scripted instruction. I would prefer them to be able to adapt as well as the teacher mentioned above. Thus, we need to help them understand how and why to adapt.

A second implication for teacher education instruction is the development of the adaptation itself. Since we have three levels of adaptations, it makes sense that we should teach them through modeling or case analysis about those which are rated as requiring a considerable-level of metacognitive thought. Perhaps this would assist our future teachers in understanding when, why, and how a teacher adapts. Further, by exploring rationales with our teacher education students, they can develop understandings of the complexity of decisions when adapting. This would support teacher education's notion that preservice teachers develop reflection-in-action skills and become metacognitive about those decisions (Bransford, Derry, et al., 2005; Risko et al., 2005).

This research implicates that we need to teach students (a) how to adapt scripted instruction to meet student needs and (b) how to develop adaptations during instruction.

This section discussed the four implications of this study: future research, K-12 education, and teacher education.

Conclusion

The expected findings of instructional adaptations, rationales and task openness, and the unexpected findings of ambiguous student motivation findings have several implications. By changing the measurement of student motivation, this research may have important impact on teacher and K-12 education and policy regarding scripted programs. However, until we further the understandings included here by replicating the work on a broader participant base, and attach the findings to one another in a more solid fashion, this research is limited in its impact. Simply, I need better selected participants, a more discrete measurement of student motivation, and for the research team to continue to develop our understanding of our definitions and criteria. However, the value of this research should not be diminished: it has produced some intriguing findings in the motivation subsets (specifically, strategic reading and persistence) which should be investigated further. While the findings are interesting, and may hold up with a larger n, I need to begin data collection on a grander scale with more revised techniques.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allington, R. L. & Johnston, P. (2002). *Reading to learn: Lessons from exemplary fourth-grade classrooms.* New York: Guilford Press.

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. *Elementary School Journal, 79,* 193-223.

Anderson, L. M., Stevens, D., Prawat, R. S., & Nickerson, J. (1988). Classroom task environments and students' task-related beliefs. *The Elementary School Journal, 88*(3), 281-295.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: W. H. Freeman.

Barab, S., Bransford, J. D., Greeno, J. G., & Gee, J. P. (2007, April). *Embodied cognition: A more meaningful ontological unit.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Blumenfeld, P. C., & Meece, J. L. (1988). Task factors, teacher behavior, and students' involvement and use of learning strategies in science. *The Elementary School Journal, 88*(3), 235-250.

Borko, H., & Shavelson R. J. (1990). Teacher decision making. In B. F. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.), *Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction* (pp. 311-346). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bransford, J., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). Learning: From speculation to science. In J. Bransford, A L. Brown, & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *How people learn:*

Brain, mind, experience, and school (pp. 3-27). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 1-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bransford, J., Derry, S. Berliner, D., Hammerness, K., & Beckett, K. L. (2005). Theories of learning and their roles in teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 40-87). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brophy, J. E. (1999). Toward a model of the value aspects of motivation in education: Developing appreciation for particular learning domains and activities. *Educational Psychologist, 34*(2) 75-85.

Buchanan, B., & Fernandez, J. (2005, July 20). School sanctions to bring tutoring, transfers. *Greensboro News & Record*. Retrieved March 24, 2008, from http://www.news-record.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050720/ NEWSREC0101/50720001.

Clark, C., & Joyce, B. R. (1981). Teacher decision making and teacher effectiveness. In B. R. Joyce, C. C. Brown, & L. Peck (Eds.), *Flexibility in teaching: An excursion into the nature of teaching and training* (pp. 228-234). New York: Longman.

Clark, C. M., & Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). Conversation as support for teaching in new ways. In C. Clark (Ed.), *Talking shop: Authentic conversation and teacher learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005a). The AERA panel on research and teacher education: Context and goals. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 37-68). Washington: AERA.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005b). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69-109). Washington: AERA.

Collins, D., & Collins, A. (2004). *Advancing reading achievement: Becoming effective teachers of reading through collective study*. Tallahassee, FL: SERVE.

Corno, L. (2008). On teaching adaptively. *Educational Psychologist, 43*(3), 161-173.

Crane, T. (2007). *The heart of coaching*. San Diego: FTA Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Crutchfield, R. S. (1962). Conformity and creative thinking. In H. E. Gruber, G. Terrell, & M. Wertheimer (Eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Creative Thinking* (pp. 136-154). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1977). *Beyond boredom and anxiety.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cummins, J. (2007). Pedagogies for the poor? Realigning reading instruction for low-income students with scientifically-based reading research. *Educational Researcher, 36*(9), 564-72.

Davis, S. G. (2009). *Case studies of two teachers: The knowledge teachers draw upon to adapt*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Diener, E., & Srull, T. K. (1979). Self-awareness, psychological perspective, and self reinforcement in relation to personal and social standards. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 413-423.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. *Review of Educational Research, 53,* 159-199.

Duffy, G. G. (1991). What counts in teacher education? Dilemmas in educating empowered teachers. In J. Lutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Learner factors/teacher factors: Issues in literacy research and instruction, 40th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 1-18). Chicago: NRC.

Duffy, G. G. (2005). Developing metacognitive teachers: Visioning and the expert's changing role in teacher education and professional development. In C.Block, S. Israel, K. Kinnucan-Welsch, & K. Bauserman (Eds.), *Metacognition and literacy learning: Theory, assessment, instruction, and professional development* (pp. 299-314). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Duffy, G. G., Davis, S., Kear, K., Parsons, S., Williams, B., & Miller, S. D. (2007, December). Literacy teachers' thoughtfully adaptive actions and the effect on

students' comprehension and motivation. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

Duffy, G. G., Miller, S. D., Kear, K., Parsons, S., Davis, S., & Williams, B. (2008). Teachers' instructional adaptations during literacy instruction. In Y. Kim, V. J. Risko, D. L. Compton, D. K. Dickinson, M. K. Hundley, R. T. Jimenez, K. M. Leander, & D. W. Rowe (Eds.), *57th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. Oak Creek, IL: National Reading Conference, Inc.

Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Rackliffe, G. (1986). How teachers' instructional talk influences students' understanding of lesson content. *The Elementary School Journal, 87*(1), 3-16.

Duffy, G. G., Webb, S., Kear, K., Leiphart, R., Parsons, S. & Miller, S. (2006, December). *Does thoughtfully adaptive teaching exist? First steps in a longitudinal study of literacy teaching and literacy education.* Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Duffy, G. G., Miller, S. D., Howerton, S., & Williams, B. (in press). Comprehension instruction: Merging two historically antithetical perspectives. In D. Wyse, R. Andrews, & J. V. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of English, language, and literacy teaching.* London: Routledge-Taylor Francis.

Duke, N. K., Purcell-Gates, V., Hall, L. A., & Tower, C. (2006/2007). Authentic literacy activities for developing comprehension and writing. *The Reading Teacher, 60*(4), 344-355.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Fullan, M. (2003). *Change forces with a vengeance.* London: RoutledgeFarmer.

Glaser, B. J., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gorman, A. J. (1997). The 15% solution: Literacy and learning disabilities. *American Libraries, 28,* 52-3.

Greene, M. (2001). Reflections on teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 82-89). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

Guthrie, J. T. & Wigfield, A. (2000). Effects of integrated instruction on motivation and strategy use in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(2), 331-341.

Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M. & Zeichner, K. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, D. C. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.

Kear, K. (2008). Beginning teachers' rationales for adaptive decisions about text use. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Leinhardt, G., & Greeno, J. G. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78,* 75-95.

Lin, X., Schwartz, D. L., & Hatano, G. (2005). Toward teachers' adaptive metacognition. *Educational Psychologist, 40*(4), 245-255.

Maloch, B. (2004). On the road to literature discussion groups: Teacher scaffolding during preparatory experiences. *Reading Research and Instruction, 44,* 1-20.

Marland, P. W. (1977). *A study of teachers' interactive thoughts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Marx, R. W., & Walsh, J. (1988). Learning from academic tasks. *The Elementary School Journal, 88*(3), 207-219.

Mathey, K., Meyer, K., Tripp, L. & Walter, A. (2004, December). *Growing a teacher coaching program.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Staff Development Council, Vancouver.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative & qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, S.D. (2003). How high- and low-challenge tasks affect motivation and learning: Implications for struggling learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19,* 39-57.

Miller, S. D., & Faircloth, B. S. (2009). Motivation and reading comprehension. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Reading Comprehension* (pp. 307-346). New York: Routledge.

Miller, S. D., & Meece, J. L. (1997). Enhancing elementary students' motivation to read and write: A classroom intervention study. *The Journal of Educational Research, 90*(5), 286-299.

Miller, S. D., & Meece, J. L. (1999). Third graders' motivational preferences for reading and writing tasks. *The Elementary School Journal, 100*(1), 19-35.

National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school* (Expanded ed.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nicholls, J. G. (1983). Conceptions of ability and achievement motivation: A theory and its implications for education. In S. G. Paris, G. M. Olson, & H. W. Stevenson (Eds.), *Learning and motivation in the classroom* (pp. 211-237). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Paris, S. G., & Paris, A. H. (2001). Classroom applications of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist, 36*(2), 89-101.

Paris, S. G., Byrnes, J. P., & Paris, A. H. (2001). Constructing theories, identities, and actions of self-regulated learners. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Parsons, S. A. (2008a). Providing all students ACCESS to self-regulated literacy learning. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(8), 628-635.

Parsons, S. A. (2008b). *Case studies of four teachers: The openness of the tasks they implement, the adaptations they make, and the rationales they offer for adapting.*

Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Perry, N. E. (1998). Young children's self-regulated learning and contexts that support it. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(4), 715-729.

Pressley, M., Allington, R. L., Wharton-McDonald, R., Block, C. C., & Morrow, L. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first-grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford.

Poglinco, S. M. & Bach, A. J. (2004). The heart of the matter: Coaching as a vehicle for professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 8*(5), 398-400.

Reading Mastery Classic. (2003). Columbus, OH: SRA/McGraw-Hill.

Risko, V. J., Roskos, K., & Vukelich, C. (2005). Reflection and the self-analytic turn of mind: Toward more robust instruction in teacher education. In C. Block, S. Israel, K. Kinnucan-Welsch, & K. Bauserman (Eds.), *Metacognition and literacy learning: Theory, assessment, instruction, and professional development* (pp. 315-349). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Roehler, L., Duffy, G. G., & Warren, S. (1988). *Adaptive explanatory actions associated with teaching of reading strategies.* In J. Readance & S. Baldwin (Eds.), *Dialogues in literacy research* (pp. 339-346). 37th Yearbook of National Reading Conference. Chicago, National Reading Conference.

Rohrkemper, M., & Corno, L. (1988). Success and failure on classroom tasks: Adaptive learning and classroom teaching. *The Elementary School Journal, 88*(3), 281-295.

Sawyer, R. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative improvisation. *Educational Researcher, 33,* 12-20.

Scales, R. Q. (2009). *Teaching adaptations as they are related to academic task and student engagement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shannon, P. (2007). The complicated mess of the Reading First Initiative. *Journal of Reading Education, 32*(3), 5-11.

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51,* 455-498.

Snow, C. E., Griffin, P., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Knowledge to support the teaching of reading: Preparing teachers for a changing world.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sparks, D. (2002). *Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals.* Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1990). Models of staff development. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (234-250). New York: Macmillan.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt-Brace Jovanovich.

Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade reading instruction in low-income schools. *Elementary School Journal, 101*(2), 121-166.

Taylor, B. M., Pressley, M., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Research-supported characteristics of teachers and schools that promote reading achievement. In B. M. Taylor & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Teaching reading: Effective schools, accomplished teachers* (pp. 361-373). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thornburg, A. W. (2005). *The effects academic tasks have on student motivation and understanding.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

Turner, J. C. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(3), 410-441.

Turner, J. C., & Paris, S. G. (1995). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 48*(8), 662-673.

Turner, J. C., & Patrick, H. (2004). Motivational influences in student participation in classroom learning activities. *Teachers College Record, 106*(9), 1759-1785.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies.* New York: The Free Press.

Wharton-McDonald, P., Pressley, M., & Hampston, J. (1998). Literacy instruction in nine first grade classrooms: Teacher characteristics and student achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 99*(2), 101-128.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. (2002). *Development of achievement motivation.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Willems, J. (1981). Problem-based (group) teaching: A cognitive science approach. *Instructional Science, 10,* 5-21.

Williams, B. (2009). *What were you thinking: Exploring the cognitive processes of middle grades language arts teachers engaged in thoughtfully adaptive teaching & the effect that thoughtfully adaptive teaching has on students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.

Wiltz, N., & Wilson, G. P. (2005-6). An inquiry into children's reading in one urban school using SRA Reading Mastery (direct instruction). *Journal of Literacy Research, 37*(4), 493-528.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1990). *Reflective teaching: An introduction.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' characteristics: Research on the indicators of

    quality. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher*

    education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education (pp.

    157-260). Washington: AERA.

Appendix A

Academic Task Rubric

Date:

Describe the task and its product:

Authenticity (adapted from Duke et al., 2006/7)

1 – The task is limited to activities that are completed primarily in school.

2 – The activity mimics outside-of-school tasks, but still has features of school-based activities.

3 – The activity closely replicates tasks completed in people's day-to-day lives outside of school.

Collaboration (adapted from Miller & Meece, 1999)

1 – Students work alone on the activity.

2 – Students collaborate minimally in the activity.

3 – Students collaborate throughout the activity.

Word Level (adapted from Miller & Meece)

1 – The task requires letter- or word-level writing.

2 – The task requires sentence-level writing.

3 – The task requires paragraph-level writing.

Student Directed

1 – The students have no input on the task.

2 – The students have input, but the choices have minimal influence on the task.

3 – Students have input into many substantial aspects of the activity.

Sustained (adapted from Miller & Meece)

1 – The task takes place within one sitting.

2 – The task takes place within one or two day.

3 – The task spans over three or more days.

Appendix B

Observation Protocol

Teacher:

Date:

Time/Lesson:

Running field notes of tasks and adaptations/responses:

Appendix C

Teacher Interview Protocol

Adaptations and Rationales:

- When I saw you _____ during the lesson, was that a spontaneous change, something you had not planned?
- Why did you make that change?
- What were you thinking when you made that change? (Duffy et al., 2007)

Student motivation:*

- Which reading strategies did you notice _____ using?
- Which learning strategies did you notice _____ using?
- How persistent did you notice _____ was?
- What actions did _____ take to aid his/her concentration?

*These questions were asked just about the student participants we were discussing that day. Student participants were interviewed twice in the five days; therefore, on the days in which the student was interviewed, the teacher was interviewed about that student.

Appendix D

Student Interview Protocol

Student Motivation (accompanied by task):

- What were you supposed to learn from the task you just did? (Turner, 1995)
- What were you thinking about when you did this task? (Turner, 1995)
- What was the hardest part about the task for you? (Turner, 1995)
- How did you handle the hard parts? (Turner, 1995)
- How did you get the work done?
- What did you tell yourself as you completed the work?