Pedagogical Practices and Collaborative Conversations: Teacher Candidates' Approaches for Supporting Students' Motivation in Writing

Michelle M.Z. Ohanian
Mount St. Mary's University, ohanian@msmary.edu

Ernest Solar
Mount St. Mary's University, solar@msmary.edu

Kara J. Brady
Mount St. Mary's University, k.j.brady@msmary.edu

Carolyn Cook
Mount St. Mary's University, cook@msmary.edu

Barbara Marinak
Mount St. Mary's University, marinak@msmary.edu
Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte

Part of the Higher Education and Teaching Commons

Pedagogical Practices and Collaborative Conversations: Teacher Candidates' Approaches for Supporting Students' Motivation in Writing

Michelle M.Z. Ohanian, *Mount St. Mary's University*
Ernest Solar, *Mount St. Mary's University*
Kara J. Brady, *Mount St. Mary's University*
Carolyn Cook, *Mount St. Mary's University*
Barbara Marinak, *Mt. Saint Mary's University*

Introduction

Writing is a multi-layered personal endeavor that is difficult to master. In learning to write, the first layer an individual acquires are the technical strategies of constructing words, sentences, and paragraphs from thoughts formulated within his or her brain. The second layer is an emotional investment of writing. The writer is putting forth constructed thoughts and he or she may ask themselves self-concept or expectancy type questions, "Am I a good writer?". Or they may ask themselves value type questions, "Is writing important?". The third layer is the willingness to share his or her writing with the public. However difficult writing may be for an individual, teaching writing may be an even more challenging endeavor.

The Motivation to Write Profile – College (MWP-C) (Solar, Mucci-Guido, Cook, & Marinak, 2019) was developed to assess the self-concept and value of writing of undergraduate and graduate students. Based on the expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), the researchers

explored the writing motivation of college students to better understand how to instruct college students in the classroom. The instrument was validated and tested for reliability with teacher candidates at a small private, liberal arts university in the Mid-Atlantic region. Following validation, the researchers used several of the MWP-C items as a means to further explore the writing motivation of teacher candidates.

The researchers examined teacher candidates' beliefs about writing and how writing influences their ability to provide writing instruction (See Appendix A) (Daisey, 2009; Norman & Spencer, 2005; Solar et al., 2019). Utilizing a qualitative design, the researchers administered four prompts from the MWP-C. The four prompts were based on the two constructs of expectancy value theory (Eccles, 1983); value of writing and self-concept as a writer. The prompts contained hypothetical answers from students who self-reported low motivation to write. The teacher candidates provided written responses to each prompt providing insights into how teacher candidates might approach writing instruction when in the classroom. By examining the teacher candidates' reflective approaches to writing instruction, the researchers believed teacher preparatory programs can reflect on the focus and type of writing instruction provided to teacher candidates. The purpose of this article is to examine the proposed approaches reported by teacher candidates when faced with student responses reflecting low writing motivation.

Literature Review
Writing Instruction and Motivation

Teacher preparation programs design methods courses to support teacher candidates' instructional development with writing strategies that focus on skill, content, and craft. This objective aligns with the assessment criteria in the Common Core's College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing (2010), which requires students to demonstrate specific abilities in writing for a variety of academic purposes and formats. Whereas, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Standards (2013) articulate the expectations for teacher performance, but do not state specific objectives for writing outcomes. Nonetheless, the InTASC standards do include self-motivation as a feature for an inclusive learning environment. Teacher candidates need to be knowledgeable of approaches that promote students' motivation along with the more commonly used instructional strategies for writing (Bruning & Horn, 2000). Otherwise, teachers will enter the profession

without a pedagogical practice aimed at developing motivation behaviors as well as skills.

It has been twenty years since Bruning and Horn (2000) issued the call to action for researchers to address the knowledge gap in how teachers act as role-models for "student writing beliefs and feedback providers" (p. 35). Bruning and Horn (2000) identified four concepts for understanding students' motivation to write "nurturing functional beliefs about writing, fostering student engagement through authentic writing goals and contexts, providing a supportive context for writing, and creating a positive emotional environment" (p. 25). Bruning and Horn (2000) posited that self-concept as a writer is necessary for writing motivation. Teachers can express their self-concept in writing through their beliefs, which may cultivate their students' self-concept in writing. In a study that examined teacher candidates' attitudes towards writing, Hall and Grisham-Brown (2011) found that they were more likely to foster positive beliefs about their writing if they had a teacher who published or featured the teacher candidates' work. The teacher candidates included positive instructor feedback, a choice in topics, and interesting assignments as instructional practices that fostered their beliefs about writing. It is upon reflection that teacher candidates may examine how their experiences inform their instructional practices and their students' self-concept in writing.

Another element in Bruning and Horn's (2000) framework for motivation in writing is to create opportunities for students to engage in authentic writing. As found in the work of Hall and Grisham-Brown (2011), the teacher candidates indicated they valued writing on topics of choice and personal interest. West and Saine (2017) made similar conclusions in their study on teacher candidates who mentored students in a multigenre writing project. In a collaborative model, the teacher candidates guided students toward "having choice of a valued topic, writing for impact, and receiving feedback that centered on expression rather than conventions created an authentic writing experience" (p. 637). West and Saine asserted that teacher candidates need these types of encounters to create authentic writing experiences. Furthermore, it broadens the teacher candidate's conception of an engaging writing environment beyond their personal experiences in school and breaks the cycle of teaching the way one was taught.

Writing is a series of complex tasks, and it becomes increasingly challenging as students matriculate through school and delve into composing and revising discipline specific forms of writing (ILA, 2017). The third element in Bruning and Horn's (2000) motivation to write is for teachers to systematically break down the writing process, so students can set manageable goals and apply

strategies for feedback and monitoring progress. Teacher candidates need to understand the relationship between their students' ability to manage writing tasks successfully and their expectancy for writing successfully (Solar et al., 2019). Koenig, Eckert, and Hier (2016) examined performance feedback and goal setting as effective writing interventions for fluency with third grade students. They found that performance feedback was significantly associated with participants demonstrating improved fluency. Koenig et al. further asserted that, "school-based practitioners should be aware that the greatest intervention effects may not be obtained by simply using repeated practice in writing" (2016, p. 289). This leads to the premise that more writing will not lead to improvements in students' skills. Conversely, Koenig et al. (2016) did not find similar outcomes with goal setting and improved writing fluency, which they posited could be associated with a limited explanation of goals setting with students. The findings of Koenig et al. (2016) contribute to addressing the knowledge gap between writing instruction and motivation, thus indicating the need for future research on promising classroom structures.

The fourth element in the framework from Bruning and Horn (2000) concentrates on necessary conditions to construct a positive emotional environment for students. These instructional practices include modeling of a positive attitude, positive self-talk, and acknowledgment of affective factors in writing. Enjoying writing is correlated with positive writing experiences in middle school and high school (Daisey, 2009). Research on teacher candidates' experiences and associated attitudes toward writing found that those who expressed "high writing enjoyment" also had, "positive writing experiences in middle school and high school including teachers who enjoyed writing and were a positive influence" (Daisey, 2009, p. 160). Daisey advocated for teacher education programs to guide their teacher candidates in, "nontraditional writing experiences that promote construction of knowledge and ownership; so that they in turn may walk their future students through them" (2016, p. 168). In effect, positive attitudes for writing are cultivated through experiential learning.

Positive experiences around writing tasks promote one's motivation to write. Bruning and Horn (2000) asserted that motivation to write can be developed through instructional practices that include choice, goal setting, metacognition, and a supportive environment. These factors are constructs in expectancy-value theory, which examines the value or motivation and the self-concept related to a task, such as writing (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Expectancy Value Theory

For decades, achievement motivation theorists have attempted to explain choice, persistence, and vigor related to achievement task completion. Expectancy-value theory argues that individuals' choice, persistence, and performance can be explained by their self-efficacy or ability related to the task and the extent to which they value the activity (Henk, Marinak, & Melnick, 2012; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Ability beliefs are defined as an individual's perception of his current competence at a given ability. Achievement values are described as the importance of doing well on a given task leading to a willingness to spend time and effort to engage in that task regularly or in the future (Henk, Marinak, & Melnick, 2012; Eccles, 1983).

Expectancy-value theory has been used as the theoretical model for numerous achievement investigations. Eccles (1983) demonstrated that students could differentiate interest, importance, and usefulness related to mathematics. Eccles, Wigfield, Harold, and Blumenfeld (1993) found that competence and task values could be reliably assessed for mathematics, literacy, sports, and music by first, second, and fourth grade students.

Consequently, for the purpose of this study, writing motivation was defined by expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 1983; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Specifically, writing motivation was defined based on the two constructs of expectancy-value theory: self-concept and value. This theoretical model, applied to this investigation, posits that motivation is composed of the expectancy that one will be successful with writing tasks (self-concept) and that the individual places value on accomplishing writing tasks.

This model of motivation was selected because it has been theoretically and pedagogically shown to explain motivation behaviors. More importantly, numerous investigations have clearly demonstrated the model's efficacy explaining the relationship between motivation and academic achievement in subject specific disciplines (Henk, Marinak, & Melnick, 2012; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Method
Expectancy-Value Prompts

The MWP-C is a brief, self-report instrument designed to assess self-concept as a writer and value of writing. Recognizing that the writing motivation of teachers, or lack thereof, will influence what they learn about writing and how they deliver writing instruction, MWP-C can be used to assess, and potentially

intervene on behalf of writing motivation during teacher preparation programs (Pajares, 2003).

Therefore, in order to gain insight into the teacher candidates' approaches to writing instruction, four items from the Motivation to Write Profile-College (Solar et al., 2019) were provided to each participant (See Appendix A). They included two self-concept about writing and two value of writing items. In order to invite teacher candidates' reflections regarding writing instruction, the prompts took the form of hypothetical student responses.

- Prompt 1: I have used feedback to improve my writing. (value)
- Prompt 2: I talk with others about my writing process. (self-concept)
- Prompt 3: I do not like to write because of negative experiences in the past. (value)
- Prompt 4: I like to share my writing with others. (self-concept)

Procedures

Teacher candidates were given four prompts inviting them to respond through the lens of a classroom teacher. The participants were asked to provide written responses to a hypothetical student whose self-reported responses reflected low motivation on four items on the MWP-C (Solar et al., 2019). Specifically, a low motivation response to "I have used feedback to improve my writing" (value) was "strongly disagree". A low motivation response to "I talk with others about my writing process (self-concept) was also strongly disagree". A low motivation response to "I do not like to write because of negative experiences in the past" (value) was "strongly agree". And a low motivation response to "I like to share my writing with others (self-concept) was "strongly disagree".

Teacher candidates were asked to reflect on how they would approach the student's perceptions toward writing. The written responses were collected and transcribed into a single document for further analysis.

Internal Validity. The research team, comprised of five investigators, allowed the data analysis to shape the response to the research question (Merriam & Tisdale, 2015). Following an iterative process for meaning making, two investigators were assigned to code one of the four prompts. They discussed their analysis with each other and the larger group to determine if their findings were supported and reasonable (Maxwell, 2013). According to Maxwell (2013), feedback is one means for validity testing that may identify discrepancies and uncover bias in the coding analysis. The discussions also provided the space for

investigators to take a reflexive stance in their position and critically examine their role in the research process (Glesne, 2016). The research team continued to take a multiple perspectives approach to examine potential themes across the data sets (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Glesne, 2016). Furthermore, the research team sought to validate their analysis of themes until there was consensus. In this manner, the research team made sense of and validated the data as they interpreted the responses (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Response Analysis. The researchers examined the teacher candidates' written responses to the four hypothetical student responses from the MWP-C (Solar et al., 2019). These prompts related to perceptions of self-concept about writing and value of writing.

- Prompt 1: I have used feedback to improve my writing. (value): Strongly disagree
- Prompt 2: I talk with others about my writing process. (self-concept): Strongly disagree
- Prompt 3: I do not like to write because of negative experiences in the past. (value): Strongly agree
- Prompt 4: I like to share my writing with others. (self-concept): Strongly disagree

The thematic analysis was a two-step process examining the teacher candidates' reflections when responding to value of writing and self-concept as a writer items. First, the data were interpreted line by line for patterns that informed categories for coding (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Glesne, 2016; Merriam & Tisdale, 2015). Then, by employing a constant comparison approach to the coding across prompts, three themes emerged reflective of the teacher candidates' knowledge of practices to support writing motivation (Glesne, 2016; Maxwell, 2013). The first theme was pedagogical practice. This theme revealed that the teacher candidate suggested a strategy or directive related to the production of writing versus a strategy linked to the motivation to write. An example of an instructional response was: "*Student's must turn in a rough draft and correct errors on a final draft. If they do not, their grade will be lower*" (Teacher candidate, Prompt 1). This type of response offers direction on the performance of writing. However, it is not an informed response to address the student's intrinsic motivation.

Collaborative conversations (Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992) emerged as the second theme. This theme revealed evidence of a nurturing response to promote an intrinsic motivation to write. An example of collaborative conversations follows: *"Have a conversation with [the] student to find out what the negative*

experiences were [and] then come up with a way to support the student's writing so it is no longer a negative experience" (Teacher candidate, Prompt 3).

The third and final theme contained general comments that conveyed personal experiences or opinions on writing. These comments were not analyzed and will not be discussed in the findings. Table 1 provides a summary of the coding process resulting in three overarching themes.

Table 1
Data Coding

Coding	Collapsed Themes
• Strategy use • Writing topics • Grouping for instruction	Pedagogical Practice
• Ask questions • Talk with students • Encourage students	Collaborative Conversation
• Personal comment	General Comments

Results

The teacher candidates' responses on the MWP-C to prompts 1 and 3 for the value of writing, favored a collaborative conversation approach (n= 89) to a pedagogical practice (n=51) for supporting students' writing. The teacher candidates' responses to prompts 2 and 4 on self-concept as a writer favored a pedagogical practice (n=87) to one that was a collaborative conversation (n=53) with students. Responses categorized as general comments were similar for prompts on value of writing (n=30) as those for self-concept as a writer (n=33).

Table 2
Response Comparison

		Teacher Candidates	
Prompt 1 (value)	Pedagogical Practice	18	21.5%
	Collaborative Conversation	48	57 %

	General Comment	18	21.5%
	Total Response	84	
Prompt 3 (value)	Pedagogical Practice	33	38%
	Collaborative Conversation	41	48%
	General Comment	12	14%
	Total	86	
Prompt 2 (self-concept)	Pedagogical Practice	42	49%
	Collaborative Conversation	26	30%
	General Comment	18	21%
	Total	86	
Prompt 4 (self-concept)	Pedagogical Practice	45	52%
	Collaborative Conversation	27	31%
	General Comment	15	17%
	Total	87	

Pedagogical Practices

In the analysis of teacher candidates' responses, the theme of pedagogical practice emerged from their emic statements. When a response spoke to a pedagogical practice such as implementing a teacher directed strategy, assigning a writing topic, or grouping students for instruction, this indicated the teacher candidate's pedagogical practice to support the students' motivation to write.

Value of Writing. Prompt 1 and Prompt 3 generated teacher candidates' reflection on value of writing. Prompt 1 stated, "I have used feedback to improve my writing - strong disagree." Of the 84 responses received on Prompt 1, 21.5% gave a pedagogical practice response. A representative statement of this position was, *"I would spend a day (or more), during writing period teaching about the importance of feedback. Then following lessons would consist of peer-to-peer feedback, going back and revising, and then feedback from the instructor with a grade. This would then be compared to previous graded work without feedback."* This type of pedagogical practice compels student to use feedback without understanding why the student does not use it. Using feedback to improve one's writing is part of the editing processing and a learning opportunity for the student to become a stronger writer. The following response also indicates a pedagogical practice to value of writing, *"I would create a lesson/lecture on the importance of the editing/draft process of writing and provide my students with activities in taking feedback and using it effectively."* Even though the teacher candidate may have good intentions in providing more opportunities for the student to use feedback, the teacher candidate may erode the student's intrinsic motivation to write through an activity the students do not find beneficial.

Prompt 3 stated, "I do not like to write because of negative experiences in the past -strongly agree." Sharing a piece of writing with an individual is part of the editing process and a learning opportunity for growth. If a writer receives negative criticism from parents, teachers, or peers, the value of written communication may be perceived as unworthy of the effort. From the 86 responses to this prompt, 38% indicated a pedagogical practice. A representative example of this stated, *"We can discuss those experiences but say in my classroom we are judgment free. We shouldn't dwell on past experiences, but rather gain new experiences. You shouldn't be afraid to show your work."* The following quote represented a belief in this theme, *"To get a little more information from students who have answered this question in a similar way, I would use writing prompts that would allow students to answer the "reasons" or negative experiences."* Creating environments that continue to force a reluctant student to share his or her writing, without understanding past negative experiences may continue to erode his or her intrinsic motivation to continue to engage in the writing process. The responses indicating a pedagogical practice as a means for supporting students' value of writing was less frequent (*n*=51) than using collaborative conversations (*n*=89).

Self-Concept as a Writer. Prompt 2 on the MWP-C stated, "I talk with others about my writing process - strongly disagree." Of the 86 responses received from teacher candidates, 42 (49%) gave a pedagogical practice response, which was greater than the number indicating a collaborative conversation approach (*n*=26, 30%). A representative statement was, *"I would start doing more peer work with writing. Students could peer edit a partner's work after completing a writing piece. It could also be as simple as doing a small group activity to practice writing. Hearing what peers have to say could help a student identify what he/she is doing right or wrong."* The following response further illustrates a pedagogical practice to promote self-concept, *"I would remind them that discussing their writing process with others could help them gain different perspectives or may aid them in clarifying confusion. As a teacher, I could implement peer discussions following the creation of outlines before the final draft process begins."* Creating environments that continue to force a reluctant student to share his or her writing process may only continue to erode his or her intrinsic motivation for engaging in the writing process.

In Prompt 4, "I like to share my writing with others – strongly disagree" responses, again, more frequently supported a pedagogical practice (*n*=45, 52%) than a collaborative conversational approach (*n*=27, 31%). The pedagogical practice theme was noted in statements such as, *"I would start [by] asking if they were comfortable with me hanging up their work in the hallway or having them read their stories in front of the class or even to a small group."* Another type of response indicated forced sharing, *"Do peer reviews: get them to share.", "Students must turn in a rough draft and correct errors ..."* or *"Students during class will form small groups ...."* While possibly well intentioned, creating classroom environments that force a reluctant student to share his or her writing will continue to erode his or her intrinsic motivation to engage in the writing process. Another indication that the teacher candidate was implementing an pedagogical practice as pedagogical practice were opening responses with "students", such as, *"Students must turn in a rough draft and correct errors ..."* or *"Students during class will form small groups ..."*.

There was evidence of pedagogical practice responses, which suggested encouragement such as, "*I would encourage/implement more pair-share ...", "Design some think-pair-share activities to give a low-stress opportunity ...",* or *"I would make writing or writers workshop a safe place with positive encouragement."* From these indicators of encouragement, the teacher candidates appear to take into account the student's disposition, and they exhibit an attitude of caring about the student becoming a better writer.

In summary, from analysis of the prompts in the MWP-C, teacher candidates more often demonstrated a pedagogical practice to support students' self-concept as a writer rather than for students' value of writing.

Collaborative Conversations

The theme of collaborative conversations arose from the teacher candidate's responses that indicated a student-centered, personal dialogue. Statements related to asking questions, talking, and encouraging students reflected an individual approach to support a student's motivation to write.

Value of Writing. Prompt 1 and Prompt 3 generated teacher candidates' reflection on value of writing. Prompt 1 stated, "I have used feedback to improve my writing - strongly disagree." More teacher candidates' responses (n=45, 57%), reflected a collaborative conversation response. A statement that characterized this approach was, *"Sit down and talk with the student to learn why he or she has not used feedback. Then I would meet with the student to discuss the feedback whenever I hand back writing assignments."* This type of action encourages a student's intrinsic motivation to write because the teacher is taking the time to learn why the student does not use feedback by having a conversation with him or her. The following representative quote of a collaborative conversation approach demonstrates how the teacher may foster intrinsic motivation. *"I would meet with the student one-on-one to discuss why they do not incorporate feedback into their writing process. The issue could be discomfort with sharing, or a reluctance to adapt and improve, or a dislike of writing. It is important to understand the root of the problem first."* This comment highlights the importance of talking and listening to the student about a possible lack of value in the effort to improve one's writing.

Prompt 3 was, "I do not like to write because of negative experiences in the past -disagree." Whereas, 48% of the responses were centered on collaborative conversation with the student. For example, *"I'm so sorry to hear that! I can understand those sentiments, and it must not feel too great. Individual experiences have a lot of bearing on who we become in the future. With some caution, I would like to encourage you to keep trying. Maybe even write about the experiences that make you feel this way? It can be freeing to get those bad emotions out."* Or, *"Tell me about your negative experiences. You can't change the past, but we have some control about the future. If we make writing a positive experience, it won't be a constant worry hanging over you."* These types of empathetic responses may break down barriers for a student who does not like to share his or her writing and help them find the value in writing.

Self-Concept as a Writer. Prompt 2, "I talk with others about my writing process –strongly disagree," indicates that the student may have a low self-concept about themselves as a writer. Having a low self-concept as a writer may prevent a student from sharing about his or her writing process. Regardless of the student's skills, he or she may believe their suggestions would not be beneficial to a peer. In Prompt 2, 26 (30%) of the 86 responses referred to a collaborative conversation approach with the student. Representative examples included, *"I would discuss ways to build their confidence so they are able to talk with other about their writing." or "I would explore alternate methods of discussion, such as sticky notes, or personal journaling about their writing. I would also offer a more private opportunity to talk when other students are engaged with their own work."* These responses shed light on the teacher candidates' use of dialogue as a tool for building their students' beliefs and confidence as writers.

Prompt 4 stated, "I like to share my writing with others - strongly disagree." The student may have a low self-concept as a writer and is nervous of judgement, which hinders him or her from sharing writing with peers. Only 27 (31%) of the responses reflected a collaborative conversation approach with the students. Examples included, *"I would relate to the student because I also do not like to share my writing. I would ask the student what I might do to change the environment so they are more comfortable sharing,"* and, *"I would try to find out the reasons why they do not want to share. I would work on finding other methods of sharing that the student would be comfortable with. Acknowledging the feelings and working to provide [a] positive experience to gain trust."*

From close examination of the collaborative conversation comments in Prompt 4, common phrases emerged, that included: *"I would ask the student …", "First ask the student …", "I would have a conference with the student.",* or *"Have a conversation …"* These opening statements encourage a one-on-one dialogue with the student, which may lead to an understanding of the student's motivation to write. Overall, from the analysis of the four prompts in the MWP-C, the teacher candidates were more likely to use collaborative conversations to support students' value of writing than their self-concept as writers.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that teacher candidates express distinct approaches for supporting students' motivation to write by means of their value of writing or their self-concept as a writer. On one hand, teacher candidates were more likely to favor collaborative conversations when they were concerned about

a student's value of writing based on statements related to their past use of feedback or negative experiences with writing. On the other hand, teacher candidates indicated a greater number of responses for a pedagogical practice with students who did not share about their writing process nor liked to share their works with others.

To meet the criteria in the Common Core's College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing (2010) to prepare teachers who can implement instructional strategies as well as the InTASC standards (2013) which include self-motivation as a piece of an inclusive environment, the results of this study may provide some insights. Teacher preparation programs need to provide instructional strategies as well as modeling, guidance, and encouragement in writing that will foster their teacher candidates' understanding of motivation in writing. Moreover, this needs to be broken down into distinct factors of motivation, value of writing and self-concept as a writer.

An experiential, authentic approach to writing would nurture teacher candidates' empathy towards students with a limited motivation to write (Bruning & Horn, 2000). If teachers are knowledgeable about approaches that nurture the intrinsic motivation to write, rather than a singular skills-focused approach, they can more effectively support more comprehensive growth in writing. The findings of this study indicate that teacher candidates were more likely to demonstrate value for writing through collaborative conversations. In particular, most teacher candidates would engage in a collaborative conversation with their students who expressed a negative value towards feedback as a tool for writing. Feedback is one of the factors for developing motivation to write (Bruning & Horn, 2000, Hall & Grisham-Brown, 2011). Most teacher candidates in the study chose a collaborative conversation as a pedagogical approach for students who had negative writing experiences and a negative value for writing. As found by Daisey (2009), positive experiences with writing will foster a motivation to write. It is a promising practice for teacher candidates to create a positive environment for students with the aim to improve their value for writing (Bruning & Horn, 2000).

In terms of self-concept as a writer, the teacher candidates adopted a pedagogical approach for students who strongly disagreed that they would talk about or share their writing with others. Rather than nurture self-concept in a collaborative setting for writing, a pedagogical approach focuses on the individual adhering to the teacher's expectation. Taken as negative feedback, a pedagogical approach could discourage a positive attitude in writing, which suppresses motivation (Hall & Grisham-Brown, 2011). West and Saine (2017) assert that sharing writing is one feature of an authentic writing experience for students to

see themselves in partnership with their classroom community. In order to provide teacher candidates with the knowledge for nurturing students' value and self-concept in writing, teacher education programs are challenged to create collaborative, experiential writing communities while teaching appropriate instructional strategies.

These findings suggest a possible relevant connection related to the writing motivation of teacher candidates, which may have an impact on how writing instruction is provided in teacher education programs and thus to their future students. When one's self-concept as a writer is elevated, correspondingly writing is viewed as valuable. Therefore, engaging and conversing about writing is deemed to be an enjoyable activity. Perhaps then, considerations should be given to the coursework provided at universities to teacher candidates by nurturing their self-concepts as writers through abundant dialogues focused on the writing process. Research suggests that classroom discussions centered on writing, may have a positive impact on a student's desire to improve his or her writing (National Writing Project, 2003).

Bruning and Horn (2000) state that motivation to write can be developed through instructional practices such as choice, goal setting, metacognition, and a supportive environment. In addition, knowing how to use collaborative conversations (Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992) with writing strategies would nurture intrinsic motivation to write. Fittingly, this qualitative study's finding warrants important future considerations for university teacher preparation programs, regarding the writing courses teacher candidates are offered to positively influence their writing motivation.

References

Bruning, R., & Horn, C. (2000). Developing motivation to write. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 25-37. DOI: 10.1207/S15326985EP3501_4

Common Core State Standards (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects*. http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/

Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Daisey, P. (2009). The writing experiences and beliefs of secondary teacher candidates. *Teacher Education Quarterly, Fall*, 157-172.

Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp.75-146). San Francisco: Freeman.

Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Harold, R., & Blumenfeld, P. (1993). Age and gender differences in children's self- and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development,* 64**,** 830–847.

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.

Hall, A.H., & Grisham-Brown, J. (2011). Writing development over time: Examining preservice teachers' attitudes and beliefs about writing. *Journal of Early Childhood Education. 32*, 148–158.

Henk. W.A., Marinak, B.A., & Melnick, S.A. (2012). Measuring the reader self-perceptions of adolescents: Introducing the RSPS2. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *56*(4), 311–320.

In Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (April 2013). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A resource for state dialogue.* Washington, D.C.

International Literacy Association (2017) Content area and disciplinary literacy: Strategies and frameworks. https://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/where-we-stand/ila-content-area-disciplinary-literacy-strategies-frameworks.pdf?sfvrsn=e180a58e_6

Koenig, E. A., Eckert, T. L., & Hier, B. O. (2016). Using performance feedback and goal setting to improve elementary students' writing fluency: A randomized controlled trial. *School Psychology Review*, *45*(3), 275–295.

Maxwell, J. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Merriam, S.B., & Tisdale, E.J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Norman, K., & Spencer, B. (2005). Our lives as writers: Examining preservice teachers' experiences and beliefs about the nature of writing and writing instruction. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(1), 25-40.

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 19*(2), 139-158.

Solar, E., Mucci-Guido, A.M., Cook, C., and Marinak, B. (2019). The motivation to write profile-college: A tool to assess the writing motivation of teacher candidates. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*. *7*(1). 1-17.

West, J. A., & Saine, P. (2017). The mentored mulmtigenre project: Fostering authentic writing interactions between high school writers and teacher candidates. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *60*(6), 629–641.

Wells, G., & Chang-Wells, G. L. (1992). *Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy.* Heinemann.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. *Developmental Review*, *12*(3), 265-310.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 68-81.

Appendix A

Figure A

Motivation to Write Profile-College Writing Prompts

If your students took the Motivation to Write Profile and responded as follows, what would you do?

1. I have used feedback to improve my writing.	**<u>Strongly Disagree</u>**	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. I talk with others about my writing process.	**<u>Strongly Disagree</u>**	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. I do not like to write because of negative experiences in the past.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	**<u>Strongly Agree</u>**
4. I like to share my writing with others.	**<u>Strongly Disagree</u>**	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Write a short response to each of the statements above on what you would do:

1.

2.

3.

4.