Date of submission: August 10, 2016
Date of acceptance: October 11, 2016

NOVITAS ROYAL
RESEARCH ON YOUTH AND LANGUAGE

SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY AND DAY AND BAMFORD'S PRINCIPLES FOR EXTENSIVE READING

ÖZ-BELİRLEME KURAMI VE DAY VE BAMFORD'IN KAPSAMLI OKUMA HAKKINDAKİ İLKELERİ

Gönül TÜRKDOĞAN[1] & John SIVELL[2]

Abstract: Day and Bamford's ten principles for promoting second-language (L2) extensive reading (ER) have been commended for their highly applicable practicality. However, for various reasons, assuring successful ER instruction can remain a challenging task. This surprising contrast may in part be clarified by examining the relationship between Day and Bamford's recommendations and the factors highlighted in the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) of motivation. Day and Bamford's ten recommendations incorporate features that can be viewed as exemplifying one or more of the three SDT components – competence, autonomy, and relatedness – which, SDT argues, should all be present in an ideally motivational environment. However, a mixed-method study of 9 adult ESL instructors (Likert scale questionnaires, plus follow-up interviews) suggested that selective adherence to some but not all dimensions of Day and Bamford's guidance may allow SDT constituents to be unwittingly underrepresented. We therefore advise that Day and Bamford's principles for ER instruction should be explicitly associated with the SDT framework, in order to draw practitioners' attention as directly as possible to the full range of motivational resources available. Implications are proposed for pre-service teacher education, institutional planning, and in-service professional development.

Keywords: Extensive reading, Self-Determination Theory, motivation, teacher decision-making, teacher practices

Öz: İkinci dilde kapsamlı okumayı geliştirmek için Day ve Bamford tarafından belirlenen on ilke özellikle uygulanabilirlikleri açısından önemli bulunmuştur fakat birçok sebepten dolayı başarılı bir kapsamlı okuma yönergesi verebilmenin zorlukları da bilinmektedir. Day ve Bamford'ın önerileri ile motivasyonun Öz-Belirleme Kuramında altı çizilen faktörler arasındaki ilişki incelenerek açıklığa kavuşturulabilir. Day ve Bamford tarafından belirlenen on öneri, Öz-Belirleme Kuramının üç ögesinden – yeterlik, özerklik ve ilintililik –, ki Öz-Belirleme Kuramı bunların hepsinin motive edici ideal bir ortamda bulunması gerektiğini ileri sürmektedir, bir veya daha fazlasını örneklendiren özellikleri içermektedir. Ancak, 9 yetişkin İkinci Dil Olarak İngilizce (ESL) okutmanının katılımıyla gerçekleştirilen bu karma-yöntemli çalışmanın sonuçları Day ve Bamford rehberliğinin tüm katmanlarını değil de bir kısmını seçici olarak takip etmenin mümkün olduğunu göstermektedir. Uygulayıcıların dikkatini motivasyonla ilgili kaynakların tümüne dikkat çekmek için, kapsamlı okuma yönergeleriyle ilgili Day ve Bamford tarafından belirlenen ilkelerin Öz-Belirleme Kuramı ile ilişkilendirilmesini öneriyoruz. Aday öğretmen eğitimi, kurumsal planlama ve hizmet içi mesleki gelişim için öneriler de bu makalenin içeriğinde sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kapsamlı okuma, Öz-Belirleme Kuramı, motivasyon, öğretmenlerin karar vermeleri, öğretmen uygulamaları

[1] Instructor, School of English Language Studies, Niagara College, Ontario, Canada, gonul2002@gmail.com
[2] Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics, Brock University, Ontario, Canada, jsivell@brocku.ca

1. Introduction

Day and Bamford's (2002) influential paper was written in the context of earlier work on extensive reading (ER) by the same authors (e.g. Bamford & Day, 1997; Day & Bamford, 1998), although the ten core principles for ER instruction were first advanced as such in 2002; they are:

1) The reading material is easy.
2) A variety of reading material on a wide range of topics must be available.
3) Learners choose what they want to read.
4) Learners read as much as possible.
5) The purpose of reading is related to pleasure, information and general understanding.
6) Reading is its own reward.
7) Reading speed is usually faster rather than slower.
8) Reading is individual and silent.
9) Teachers orient and guide their students.
10) The teacher is a role model of a reader.

(Day & Bamford, 2002, pp. 137-141)

Since that time, the article has been very influential. For instance, Nation and Macalister (2010) specifically drew attention to the ten principles (p. 52), and Grabe and Stoller (2013) recommended them as a checklist for "better understanding of … extensive reading practices" within an institution (p. 267). Indeed, a July 2016 Google Scholar search turned up more than 360 citations of Day and Bamford (2002) and, in a recent survey of 44 articles on ER programs, Day (2015) found that each of the 10 principles was mentioned from 8 to 38 times.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1. ER and Motivation

Because ER takes place individually, without direct supervision, strong motivation becomes crucial for "unlocking the all-important taste for foreign language reading among students" (Day and Bamford, 2002 p. 136). This is important because, through increased participation in ER, students may achieve gains in vocabulary, reading proficiency, reading rate, writing proficiency, grammatical development, oral fluency, and positive views towards reading overall (Asraf & Ahmad, 2003; Bell, 2001; Coady & Huckin, 1997; Cho & Krashen, 1994; Elley, 1991; Hafiz & Tudor, 1989; Horst, 2005; Mason, 2006; Mason & Krashen, 1997; Piagada & Schmitt, 2006; Robb & Susser, 1989; Yu, 1993).

In some cases, students spontaneously engage in voluminous ER (de Morgado, 2009) and readily perceive the value of ER, even for the rigours of advanced-level study (Macalister, 2008). Green (2005) warns that "few language learning initiatives have generated more hope initially and more disappointment ultimately than extensive reading schemes." (p. 306; likewise, Wong, 2001). This difficulty may partly relate to background factors such as heavy student workloads (Camiciottoli, 2001; Huang, 2015), potential difficulties in justifying classroom time for silent reading in competition with other L2 teaching demands (Macalister, 2010), limited first-language (L1) ER experience (Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009), differing cultural contexts (Robb, 2002; Green, 2005), or learners' inclination to read only for course requirements (Robb, 2002), but it can also stem from the nature of ER itself: the unfavorable contrast of laborious second language (L2) as compared to L1 ER (Takase, 2007) or, above all, the daunting process of dealing with unfamiliar vocabulary (Asraf & Ahmad, 2003; Powell, 2005; Pino-Silva, 2006; Shen, 2008; Fuisting, 2014). Hence, teachers' willingness and ability to inspire for ER is also crucial (Grabe, 2009).

2.2. Day and Bamford in the Context of SDT

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) has been suggested as a useful lens through which to examine the development of "intrinsic motivation" for reading (Grabe, 2009, p. 179), which "many motivation researchers argue … is more beneficial to reading development than extrinsic motivation" (Mori, 2015, p. 133). Certainly, in addition to Grabe and Mori, multiple sources have attended to intrinsic motivation specifically for L2 ER (Fox, 1990; Gee, 1999; Mori, 2002; Nishino, 2007; Judge, 2011; Kirchhoff, 2013; Komiyama, 2013; Ro, 2013; Edy, 2015; Hardy, 2016). This is consistent with Day and Bamford's (2002) focus on encouraging students to practice ER "independently, without the help of a teacher" (p. 137). Also, it mirrors SDT's emphasis on promoting conditions that arouse intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). SDT argues that through identifying a given activity as "inherently interesting or enjoyable" (Ryan & Deci, 2000b, p. 55) intrinsic motivation can bring long-term benefits (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009), whereas extrinsic motivation is only temporary (Ryan & Deci, 2000b). Still, we know of no study that focuses directly on the relationship between Day and Bamford's (2002) ten principles and SDT. Significantly, rather like Day and Bamford's (2002) ten principles for ER, SDT postulates multiple factors for intrinsic motivation, which encompass the experience of competence, autonomy and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). These basic needs are defined as:

> *Competence:* the need "to engage optimal challenges and experience mastery or effectance in the physical and social worlds"
> *Relatedness:* the need "to seek attachments and experience feelings of security, belongingness, and intimacy with others"
> *Autonomy:* the need "to self-organize and regulate one's own behavior"
>
> (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 252)

SDT argues that the three basic psychological needs are cultural universals (Deci & Ryan, 2008) and also that they must all receive attention if intrinsic motivation is to be fully achieved. For example, Ryan and Deci (2000a) state that fulfilling the drive for relatedness is ineffective in isolation (p. 71). Similarly, Ryan and Deci (2000a) argue that "feelings of competence will not enhance intrinsic motivation unless accompanied by a sense of autonomy" (p. 70), and Brooks and Young (2011) hypothesize that, along with autonomy, "learners are more motivated when their needs for competence and relatedness are met" (p. 49). This insistence on fulfillment of all three psychological needs calls to mind Day and Bamford's implied recommendation that all ten of their principles could potentially help ER instructors teachers "examine … the ways they teach foreign language reading" (pp. 136-7), but their cultural universality has been questioned (Robb, 2002) and, in fact, Mori (2015) has observed that ER teachers may tend not to give equal attention to all of Day and Bamford's principles. Mori specifically suggests that more "strictly observing principles 5 and 6" (p. 133) could lead to increased intrinsic motivation. However, our view is that the phenomenon of unequal implementation is too complex to be understood through consideration of only two of the ten principles.

In particular, we posit that insight into the selective implementation of Day and Bamford's (2002) ten principles may be available through specific consideration of parallels with SDT. It is possible to map SDT's three basic needs onto Day and Bamford's (2002) ten principles for ER. Although the correspondence is not always one-to-one, it can be seen that each of Day and Bamford's practical strategies reflects one or more components of SDT:

Principle 1: "The reading material is easy." (Day & Bamford, 2002, p. 137)

- Can reflect autonomy in that being allowed to select materials that are "within their reading comfort zone" frees students from the obligation to tackle overly difficult texts (p. 137).

Principle 2: "*A variety of reading material on a wide range of topics must be available.*" (p. 137)

- Can reflect autonomy in that, rather than teachers' compelling participation, texts themselves can "encourage a desire to read" (p. 137).
- Can reflect relatedness because the materials include a global range of familiar text types as found everywhere: "books, magazines, newspapers, fiction, non-fiction" and so on (p. 137).

Principle 3: "*Learners choose what they want to read."* (p. 137).

- Can reflect autonomy in that readers not only "select texts" for themselves but "also [are] free to … stop reading texts that they do not find enjoyable" (p. 137).

Principle 4: "*Learners read as much as possible."* (p. 138)

- Can reflect competence because students accustomed to shorter intensive reading texts learn to handle book-length materials, which in turn lead to reading assignments that typically span "a week" (p. 138).

Principle 5: "*The purpose of reading is usually related to pleasure, information and general understanding."* (p. 138).

- Can reflect competence in that the students experience reading "in the same ways as… first-language readers", which implies overcoming the challenge of new and unfamiliar cultural elements (p. 138).
- Can reflect relatedness to a global reading culture in that L2 readers are "encouraged to read for the same kinds of reasons… first-language readers." (p. 138).

Principle 6: "Reading is its own reward." (p. 138).

- Can reflect relatedness in that readers can express "their experience of reading" through sharing such information as "the best or worst book they have read" (p. 138).

Principle 7: "*Reading speed is usually faster rather than slower*" (p. 138).

- Can reflect competence in that students "practice such strategies as guessing at or ignoring unknown words or passages,… and being comfortable with a certain level of ambiguity" (p. 139).

Principle 8: "*Reading is silent and individual.*" (p. 139).

- Can reflect autonomy because readers "work at their own pace," and have a chance for individually "discovering how foreign language reading fits into their lives" (p.139).

Principle 9: "*Teachers orient and guide their students."* (p. 139).

- Can reflect competence in that teachers can help students learn to deal with occasional challenging linguistic features in ER texts by realizing that "a general, less than 100%, understanding of what they read is appropriate" (p. 139).

Principle 10: "*The teacher is a role model of a reader."* (p. 139).

- Can reflect relatedness in that "effective extensive reading teachers are themselves readers, teaching *by example* the attitudes and behaviors of a reader"; they "discuss books with students" and establish a "community … where students and teachers experience together the value and pleasure" of reading (p. 140).

2.3. Research Questions

This study aimed to cast light on ESL teachers' commitment to Day and Bamford's (2002) ten principles for ER as a reflection of fulfilling the three basic needs specified by SDT. That goal was operationalized as two research questions:

1) Framed as implementation of Day and Bamford's principles, what are the levels of ESL teachers' engagement in promoting ER by supporting students' experience of each of the three basic psychological needs (competence, autonomy, and relatedness)?
2) What reasoning underlies those levels of engagement?

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The participants in the study were English as Subsequent Language (ESL) teachers in a pre-university, non-credit ESL program at an Ontario (Canada) university. A total of 9 participants, 4 males and 5 females, responded to an initial questionnaire, after which a sub-set took part in follow-up interviews. Although the nine were a convenience sample, all participants had broadly comparable qualifications: 1 or 2 years' teaching experience that included extensive reading; a minimum of a BA in Applied Linguistics TESL (or a BA in a different area, plus a TESL Certificate); and qualification for TESL Ontario Accreditation in Adult ESL. For the follow-up interviews, Participants 4, 5 and 6 were selected from among the 9 on the basis of patterns in their questionnaire responses.

3.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix for all items, with corresponding ER Principles and STD components) comprised 15 Likert scale items presenting statements about ER pedagogy: 5 items for each of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (ordered randomly throughout the instrument). Each questionnaire item was divided into 3 sub-queries that depicted behaviours consistent with a particular SDT component, so as to elicit the participant's a) level of *belief* in the statement, b) assessment of the *feasibility* of enacting the statement, and c) actual *enactment* of statement. For each sub-query, participants could indicate their level of agreement through a Likert scale of 1-7, where 1-3 indicated degrees of disagreement with the statement, 4 indicated neither agreement nor disagreement, and 5-7 indicated degrees of agreement. This instrument was designed to address the first research question, regarding the level of engagement in promoting competence, autonomy and relatedness.

3.3. Follow-up Interviews

Overall patterns in the questionnaire data were explored using ANOVA, after which insights based on the SD among participants facilitated selection of individuals for follow-up interviews to probe more deeply into the potential meaning of the quantitative results. The interviews were semi-structured – focusing on sample items, including the separate sub-queries – through broad WH questions augmented by requests for explanations or examples. Face-to-face interviews were conducted separately for each selected participant, in different settings according to the interviewees' preference or availability.

The length of the interviews ranged from 35 to 40 minutes, chiefly dependent on the number and nature of follow-up questions that proved appropriate. All interviews were recorded and then transcribed. Interviewees could explain and expand on the meanings of their questionnaire responses, thus providing qualitative illustrations to illuminate the quantitative data. The

interviews were designed to address the second research question, regarding the reasoning underlying ER teachers' levels of engagement.

4. Results

4.1. Questionnaire Results

As noted above, each item was divided into three sub-queries, to collect a response regarding participants' a) level of belief in the statement, b) assessment of the feasibility of enacting the statement, and c) actual enactment of statement. Since SDT argues that diminution of any one element is liable to negatively impact encouragement of intrinsic motivation, and since responses could range from 1-3 (relative disagreement), to 4 (neither agree nor disagree), up to 5-7 (relative agreement), ideally the mean global response for each of competence, autonomy and relatedness would fall well within the positive 5-7 range. However, this was not the result.

Results for competence (items 2, 4, 8, 11, 12), autonomy (items 1, 3, 5, 7, 15) and relatedness (items 6, 9, 10, 13, 14) are presented in Tables 1-3 respectively (see also Appendix for all items). As can be observed, for each of competence (M = 5.17) and autonomy (M = 5.84) the mean response is above but close to the floor of the positive range; moreover, the mean response for relatedness is just inside the neutral range: 4.96. Additionally, this trend towards surprisingly low responses is even more evident when considering specifically the aspect of enactment (sub-query c), where the mean responses are 4.7, 4.2 and 3.39 for competence, autonomy, and relatedness respectively.

Table 1
Competence: Participants' scores on items 2, 4, 8, 11, 12

Partic	Items															Mean
	2A	2B	2C	4A	4B	4C	8A	8B	8C	11A	11B	11C	12A	12B	12C	
1	6	5	6	6	6	5	4	4	4	7	7	7	6	5	4	5.47
2	5	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	4	7	7	5	6	5	4	5.33
3	6	6	6	3	3	3	5	5	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	5.60
4	7	7	7	5	7	7	7	5	5	7	7	7	6	7	6	6.47
5	5	3	3	1	1	1	6	5	1	7	7	7	1	1	1	3.33
6	5	4	2	7	7	6	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	7	5.00
7	5	5	4	4	5	3	7	5	4	7	6	4	7	7	6	5.27
8	6	6	6	4	2	2	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	3	4.93
9	7	6	6	5	6	5	5	4	5	7	5	6	4	3	3	5.13
Mean	5.78	5.33	5.00	4.44	4.78	4.11	5.56	4.89	4.00	6.67	6.33	5.89	5.22	5.00	4.56	

Global Mean for Competence: 5.17
Mean specifically for enactment subqueries re Competence: 4.70

Table 2
Autonomy: Participants' scores on items 1, 3, 5, 7, 15

Partic	Items															Mean
	1A	1B	1C	3A	3B	3C	5A	5B	5C	7A	7B	7C	15A	15B	15C	
1	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	5	7	5	5	6.27
2	5	3	4	6	6	5	7	7	5	7	7	5	6	5	4	5.47
3	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	7	7	6	6	6	5	3	1	5.87
4	7	7	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	7	6	7	7	6.67
5	7	7	7	5	5	4	7	7	7	7	5	7	1	1	1	5.20
6	7	7	4	7	7	4	7	7	4	7	7	4	7	7	7	6.20
7	6	7	6	6	6	4	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	6	5	6.20
8	5	5	5	7	5	5	6	5	5	6	6	5	6	5	3	5.27
9	7	5	5	5	5	5	7	6	7	5	6	5	5	5	4	5.47
Mean	6.33	6.00	5.56	6.33	6.11	5.11	6.89	6.67	6.22	6.11	6.33	5.44	5.56	4.89	4.11	

Global Mean for Autonomy: 5.84
Mean specifically for enactment subqueries re Autonomy: 4.20

Table 3
Relatedness: Participants' scores on items 6, 9, 10, 13, 14

Partic	Items															Mean
	6A	6B	6C	9A	9B	9C	10A	10B	10C	13A	13B	13C	14A	14B	14C	
1	3	3	4	7	6	6	4	4	3	5	7	5	5	6	5	4.87
2	7	7	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	7	7	6	7	5	4	5.33
3	1	1	1	6	6	6	5	5	2	7	7	7	7	7	2	4.67
4	7	7	7	7	7	7	1	3	1	7	7	7	6	6	4	5.60
5	7	7	7	1	1	1	3	5	2	7	7	1	4	1	1	3.67
6	7	7	6	6	6	4	7	7	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	6.40
7	6	6	3	7	6	5	4	4	2	7	5	5	7	4	3	4.93
8	6	6	5	6	6	5	6	6	3	7	7	1	5	5	1	5.00
9	3	4	1	6	6	6	4	3	1	6	6	5	5	5	2	4.20
Mean	5.22	5.33	4.33	5.67	5.33	4.89	4.22	4.67	2.33	6.67	6.67	4.89	5.89	5.11	3.22	

Global Mean for Relatedness: 4.96
Mean specifically for enactment subqueries re Relatedness: 3.39

Looking further, ANOVA comparison of the global mean responses for each of competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Table 4) seems initially to indicate statistically significant differences in the levels of support for each SDT component ($F = 3.887$, $p = 0.028$*). On that basis, it might be suggested that – even among these at best quite tepid expressions of acceptance – attention to the three basic needs varies somewhat, with competence receiving the greatest support and relatedness the least.

Table 4
ANOVA analysis of Competence vs. Autonomy vs. Relatedness

SS	df	MS	F	p	
Between	6.372	2	3.186	3.887	0.028*
Within	34.428	42	0.820		
Total	40.800	44			

However, individual ANOVA comparisons for each of autonomy vs competence, autonomy vs relatedness, and competence vs relatedness (Table 5) reveal that, although the first two pairs of means remain significantly different, the competence vs relatedness contrast does not ($F = 0.336$, $p = 0.567$).

Table 5
ANOVA analysis of individual pairs of basic needs

Autonomy vs. Competence					
	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between	3.408	1	3.408	5.994	0.021*
Within	15.918	28	0.568		
Total	19.326	29			
Autonomy vs. Relatedness					
	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between	5.828	1	5.828	6.255	0.019*
Within	26.085	28	0.932		
Total	31.913	29			
Competence vs. Relatedness					
	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between	0.323	1	0.323	0.336	0.567
Within	26.853	28	0.959		
Total	27.175	29			

Thus, a conservative assessment would be that the questionnaire items relating to each of the three motivational mechanisms elicited expressions of teacher engagement that were on average all about equally lower than ideal.

Follow-up interviews could help explore the reasoning behind responses contributing to this sub-optimal pattern. In particular, it would be interesting to understand the thinking of a sample of participants who influenced the mean by expressing either a noticeably more positive or more negative view of the motivational practices under study.

Table 6 displays the SD of responses for the five-item sets regarding each of competence, autonomy and relatedness. Responses more than one SD above or below the mean attract attention as expressions of markedly stronger or weaker than average support for the basic psychological need in question.

Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations on Support for Competence, Autonomy, and Relatedness

Basic Need	n	M	SD	Central Range
Competence	9	5.17	0.83	4.35-6
Autonomy	9	5.84	0.52	5.33-6.36
Relatedness	9	4.96	0.79	4.17-5.75

Scanning Tables 1, 2, and 3 with that criterion in mind, it is apparent that, regarding competence, only two participants stand out: Participant 4 (M = 6.47) is high, and Participant 5 (M = 3.33) is low. With respect to autonomy, Participant 4 (M = 6.67) is again high, and both Participants 5 (M = 5.2) and 8 (M = 5.27) are low. Finally, for relatedness, only two participants invite notice. Participant 6 (M = 6.4) is high, and once more Participant 5 (M = 3.67) is low. In view of those patterns, Participants 4, 5 and 6 were selected for follow-up interviews. Participant 5 is low (L) on all three measures and therefore was chosen; then, in each instance a high (H)[3] counterpart was sought. Participant 4 is the only available candidate for that role with respect to competence and autonomy; for relatedness, the single candidate is Participant 6.

4.2. Interview Results

The questionnaire results of each identified pair of high (H) and low (L) participants of course differ very clearly on average because overall, within each comparison, one participant is unusually high and the other is unusually low. Nonetheless, that pattern does not hold consistently with respect to every questionnaire item or every sub-query. Consequently, it was judged appropriate that each paired interview should highlight items apt to cast light on the finer-grained tensions between relative agreement and disagreement. Focal items for each stage of interview discussion are gathered in Tables 7, 8 and 9.

4.2.1. *Competence*

The patterns of responses (Table 7) by Participants 4 (H) and 5 (L) for questionnaire items 4 and 12 – where they contrast especially sharply – were elucidated by interview comments regarding the belief and feasibility sub-queries. Although rather different in each case, those remarks seemed to set the stage for vastly diverging levels of enactment (7 or 6 vs 1 and 1 respectively). However, the difference between the two participants is less marked on questionnaire items 2 and 8, with interestingly nuanced variations in their comments on particular sub-queries.

Regarding the belief sub-query for questionnaire item 4, Participant 4 (H) offered somewhat mitigated support for the concept of helping students manage time: "I do not know how well they can read … because everybody is different," while nevertheless strongly supporting its general feasibility: "it is very easy to give … information [about time management]; for example, I let them know … when the book review is due" and how much to read daily "so that you get through your book." Thus, Participant 4's high score on enactment (7) may have stemmed more from a perception of high feasibility than from certainty about the core principle. By contrast, Participant 5 (L) gave interview uniformly negative comments on each subquery leading to an equally low level of enactment (1). Firm disbelief in the basic principle of "helping students with time-management for ER" was justified by the view that "I don't feel that I should tell students

[3] Henceforth, the notations H and L will be used at the outset of each paragraph in the Interview Results section for clear indication of the high/low members of each pair of interviewees.

how to go about reading for enjoyment"; moreover, low confidence in feasibility stemmed from the logic that "ER is an individual activity … and students will do this at their own pace [since] some students may like to read for a few hours on one day while other students may prefer to read for shorter lengths of time over several days."

Table 7
Items for Competence Interviews, with Responses from each Participant

Item	Wording	Part 4 (H)	Part 5 (L)
2a)	Extensive reading teachers should teach students how to approach unfamiliar content in ER texts.	7	5
2b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	3
2c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.	7	3
4a)	Extensive reading teachers should instruct students in time-management for extensive reading, which typically unfolds over several days.	5	1
4b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	1
4c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.	7	1
8a)	Extensive reading teachers should facilitate students' comprehension of unexpected cultural elements in ER texts.	7	6
8b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	5	5
8c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy	5	1
12a)	Extensive reading teachers should support the task of reading texts that are much longer than intensive reading texts.	6	1
12b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	1
12c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy	6	1

With questionnaire item 12 we again see unswervingly low responses from Participant 5 (L) on all sub-queries including enactment although, in the interview this time, their[4] forthright declaration of doubt about the feasibility of using lengthy ER texts is so stark as to render consideration of belief or enactment almost irrelevant: "I always encouraged [students] to select reading texts that were shorter" for a number of reasons, including long days of classroom time, heavy homework, five different classes, living outside the family home, and adjustment to a new culture, in which daunting context "students had [only] approximately one week to finish reading the text for their weekly book review." Therefore, this instructor reported, "I do not feel that it is feasible to encourage students to choose [ER] texts that are much longer than the intensive reading texts." This discouraging – but perhaps realistic – perspective resonates in an interesting way with Participant 4's (H) somewhat skeptical-seeming take on feasibility: although "anything is feasible... it depends on your curriculum"; ultimately "it's [the students'] job to do it" so that, in the long run, "you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink." In that case, the meaning of Participant 4's high (6) score for enactment may be coloured by a perception that feasibility relates only to the creation of opportunities, regardless of outcomes. Consequently, the

[4] For purposes of anonymity, epicene use of the singular pronoun *they* is adopted.

overall difference between participants on this item could to quite an extent reflect inconsistent conceptualizations of responsibility for enactment.

Although with questionnaire item 2 the difference between Participants 4 (H) and 5 (L) is less pronounced, interview follow-ups once more appear to highlight the importance of the feasibility sub-query. Participant 4 voiced a high level of belief: "different styles of writing" call for "different techniques and skills to understand a piece of writing," and also high confidence in feasibility: "I can teach context clues, skimming and scanning" to assist students in reading any text "without knowing what the [specific] content is." Together, these optimistic assessments of belief and feasibility seem to predict the high level of enactment that is in fact reported. On the other hand, whereas Participant 5 confirmed support for the principle itself – "I do feel that a reading teacher should help students to approach unfamiliar content in ER texts." – they gave multiple justifications for lesser confidence in the feasibility of actually doing so: "sometimes I was not sure how to go about … [ER because] my education did not really prepare me well to teach reading as a subject," and "I did not have much experience"; moreover, "it is more important to allocate more time to intensive reading texts and activities since [students] will be tested and assessed more on these as opposed to the ER texts." Additionally, perhaps the greatest obstacle was the challenge of attempting to "address unfamiliar content for over 20 plus students in one class while, at the same time, trying to cover required intensive reading text and related activities." In that context, it is not surprising that Participant 5's quantitative response to the enactment sub-query resembles their feasibility rather than their belief score.

Participants 4 (H) and 5 (L) respond quite similarly on the belief and feasibility sub-queries, but then dramatically differently on enactment. In the interviews, both participants expressed belief in the practice of clarifying culturally unfamiliar content, and both were reasonably confident about feasibility. Although Participant 4 cautiously advised that "it depends on the classroom", they had a ready solution: "if anything comes up culturally that the students do not understand, I will expect them to come and ask me because I do not know what each student is reading." This buoyancy seems to pave the way for practical enactment of their belief in the practice. By contrast, while likewise affirming that feasibility is not problematic – "I don't think [unexpected cultural elements] are difficult to address in class," – Participant 5 candidly explained that "I lacked experience teaching reading as a subject, so I relied more on the material provided by the institution. After having gone over the suggested weekly questions for the book review, I noticed that the types of suggested questions did not touch on cultural awareness and then thought that maybe I should not address cultural awareness." Plainly, then, low enactment can result from limited experience or an unclear sense of objectives, rather than low confidence in the principle or its feasibility. In fact, Participant 5 said their enactment of this principle could increase if the institution "provide[d] more examples on how to incorporate cultural awareness into the book review… I think this would help out novice teachers quite a bit."

4.2.2. Autonomy

As with Competence, in Table 8 we can see a pattern of sometimes similar but sometimes strongly different reported levels especially of enactment. The numerical contrast is most remarkable for questionnaire item 15 but, while the responses for questionnaire items 1 and 5 seem in each case quite similar, informatively dissimilar explanations emerged in the interviews with respect to both item 1 and item 15.

Item 5 illustrates a high degree of consistency between Participants 4 (H) and 5 (L), which deserves attention in view of the way in which it contrasts with items 1 and 15. The interviews illuminated why each Participant responded so positively on all sub-queries for questionnaire item 5. Participant 4 supported their belief in the basic principle of freely choosing ER materials by mentioning students' "right and… responsibility to choose an appropriate book … that would interest them." Additionally, they explained a very practically feasible way to provide students with helpfully guided but still free choice: "I give them rules so that they know what they can read. For example, it has to be a fictional novel; it has to be written after 1980, it has to be a Canadian or American author... So, they have the criteria, [but] their choice [of] … the novel is totally up to them." Likewise, Participant 5 reacted very positively in the interview, saying, "I encourage students to choose books … that interest them", adding a practical comment about how to make the principle feasible: if students cannot find a suitable book, "I encourage them to talk with each other … and even trade books." Again, we see this participant's clear reasons for approving this principle and for viewing it as feasible. Consequently, neither participant's very high report on enactment comes as a surprise.

Table 8
Items for Autonomy Interviews, with Responses from each Participant

Item	Wording	Part 4 (H)	Part 5 (L)
1a)	Extensive reading teachers should emphasize that it is fine for students to carry out extensive reading at their own pace.	7	7
1b)	In particular terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	7
1c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.	5	7
5a)	Extensive reading teachers should encourage students to feel free to choose what they want to read extensively.	7	7
5b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	7
5c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.	7	7
15a)	Extensive reading teachers should advise students to explore how individual and silent reading in a foreign language fits into their lives.	6	1
15b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	1
15c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.	7	1

Item 15 presents an obvious contrast with item 5; in the interviews, almost as consistently as for item 5, Participants 4 (H) and 5 (L) gave entirely reasonable justifications for broadly opposite perspectives. Participant 4 expressed strong belief in the general principle of suggesting that students integrate ER into their individual lives: "I always provide reasons why we do everything in class because, if I was a student, I would not want someone to tell me that I have to do something without knowing why." Moreover, this participant explained that it was entirely feasible to convey that advice: "ER is good for language skills and all the skills, but they need to figure out how it is going to fit in their lives." Such positive views lay a firm foundation for a claim of very high enactment. Contrariwise, Participant 5 advanced an integrated argument against both feasibility and belief: "the factor of classroom time is constraining when I consider everything I need to cover for intensive reading and ER. So for me, I think that understanding

how individual and silent reading fits into their lives should be something they explore on their own". Therefore, Participant 5's low report of enactment is perhaps as predictable as Participant 4's high one. Yet, Participant 5 did suggest a measure to improve feasibility and enactment: "the institution can encourage teachers to explain ER in more detail, [and] provide explicit instructions to go about ER … and the reasoning behind ER to help motivate students." Perhaps most interesting of all is questionnaire item 1 where – despite otherwise similar responses, so that feasibility is not immediately identified as the weak link – Participant 4 (H) reports a slightly lower level of enactment than Participant 5 (L): 5 as opposed to 7. When interviewed, Participant 5 drew a quite simple connection between belief in the principle and its feasibility: "students should read at their own pace because we all have our own reading habits," and self-pacing was easy to promote because "the main goal is enjoyment for the reader." However, Participant 4 problematized that sequence by envisaging a multidimensional concept of feasibility. On the one hand, ER was indeed "for students' pleasure", so that learners might well readily accept advice to work at their own pace but, on the other hand, "they do that in this program in their own time," which complicated the meaning of this participant's 7 rating for feasibility, ultimately explaining their more modest (5) report of enactment. Accordingly, Participant 4 suggested a way to provide a more exact sense of feasibility: "if we start to implement some reading times in the classroom … then I would be more aware of exactly how they are reading it. How long is it taking them?"

4.2.3. Relatedness

As has been observed with Competence and Autonomy, interesting distributions of reports for Relatedness appear in Table 9. For item 13, it is noteworthy that Participants 5 (L) and 6 (H) respond identically on the first two sub-queries but very differently on the third. By contrast, across all three sub-queries for both of items 14 and 9, Participant 5 gives lower and then much lower responses respectively.

Table 9

Items for Relatedness Interviews, with Responses from each Participant

Item	Wording	Part 5 (L)	Part 6 (H)
9a)	Extensive reading teachers should guide students to view extensive reading as a participation in a global culture of reading in English.	1	6
9b)	In particular terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	1	6
9c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy	1	4
13a)	Extensive reading teachers should allow each learner to see that they, too, engage in extensive reading just as their students do.	7	7
13b)	In practical terms the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	7	7
13c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy	1	7
14a)	Extensive reading teachers should provide opportunities for students to discuss extensive reading materials that they have read with classmates.	4	7
14b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.	1	7
14c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.	1	7

Possibly the most clear-cut contrast can be found with respect to questionnaire item 13, on teachers' practice of showing students that they, too, are readers. Interview information helps explain the opposite reports given by Participant 5 (L) and 6 (H) for enactment of this strategy: 7 vs 1. For Participant 6, the issues were obvious. For example, they noted that belief could be taken for granted: "I enjoy extensive reading. Many times I will be reading things and I will share what I have been reading in the classroom." Similarly, there was no obstacle to feasibility because it was easy to "join the discussion … in order to share what I will be reading" whenever "we are doing discussions in the classroom with ER." As has appeared in other such cases, these consistently positive views are followed by a very strong report of enactment. However, Participant 5 experienced the situation in different way. They reinforced their high report of belief in the principle with a clear affirmation that "I think teachers sharing their experiences about reading … is very important," but they justified their trust in its feasibility by reference to what they had learned in their TESL "education". Yet, with regard to enactment, Participant 5 explained that they still felt that they were developing their craft and, "when you start teaching, you are so focused on teaching the materials and lessons that you do not consider other aspects of teaching such as … how the teacher's experiences are beneficial for students." In those circumstances, it seems that equal support for both belief and feasibility could be accompanied by very different levels of enactment.

Questionnaire item 14, advocating discussion of ER materials among classmates, presents yet another through-provoking pattern, which contrasts Participant 6's (H) regularly very high responses across all three sub-queries with neutral or very low responses by Participant 5 (L). The trend for Participant 6 at first seems to be blandly smooth. In interview comments, they powerfully validated both belief in the value of the practice as well as its feasibility: "I strongly agree with the statement. I think getting excited about what you read and sharing that with classmates can increase motivation in students who want to continue reading." Nonetheless, it is interesting that for this participant the move towards high enactment relied as well on an additional factor, "the way that ER assessment is done in the classroom," noting that:

> Some teachers may have put 'strongly disagree' … because of the requirements [set] by [the institution] about how ER should be assessed. I do follow that assessment method, but often times I go beyond that as well. I will do the regular assessment where they are answering the question, but then again, giving students the opportunity to get into groups and discuss beyond just the writing of an answer to the question.

Even more curious are the quantitative responses of Participant 5, and not just because of their thought-provoking 4, 1 and 1 distribution. Participant 5 offered a perhaps case-specific justification for their neutral level of support for belief in the practice: "we had a lot of material to cover for intensive reading [this term], so I didn't think it was important to provide students with opportunities in class to discuss the books that they read." Rather than disbelief in the principle itself, this explanation appears to reflect contextual constraints at one particular moment, because they said that they "did encourage [students] to do so on their own time." Additionally, Participant 5 cited program design limitations as another factor: "I was neutral about the principle since I thought it was important to do, but not important enough to take time to provide opportunities in class since they would be assessed more on readings and activities related to intensive reading." Such is the complex background to this participant's subsequent very low responses to the feasibility and enactment sub-queries.

Finally, questionnaire item 9 – on participation in a global culture – receives responses that are worthy of attention for more than just the contrast between the lowest possible level of support from Participant 5 (L) across all sub-queries, as compared to a distinctly higher level in all cases from Participant 6 (H). Interview comments from each participant cast light on these quantitative responses. Participant 5 directly opposed belief in the principle by arguing that "I see ER as an individual activity… because the student is doing it for his or her enjoyment." In terms of feasibility, generally the same local-not-global emphasis was proposed: "the student will choose a book that interests himself or herself and will read at his or her own pace." Such reflections, which seem inevitably to predict the very low level of enactment that is in fact observed, attract attention by inventively but not unreasonably contradicting the apparent presupposition of the principle. Indeed, Participant 5 explicitly noted that "questionnaire item 9 … seems to indicate that ER can be done as participation in a larger group activity, [but] I have never thought about ER that way," which may indicate a gap in teacher education. This participant also stated that further on-site "training" could have helped. By contrast, Participant 6's remarks drew attention to a different factor that might influence enactment. This participant did rather conventionally underline belief in the basic principle and support for its feasibility: "we should encourage students to view ER as kind of going beyond just the classroom", and "I think it could work … in my English classroom." However, they pragmatically added that enactment – reported with just a neutral 4 – depended as well on institutional expectations: "it is a matter of having to follow the guidelines for what we can or cannot do in our classroom … For example … in the classroom, ER is only done for probably 20 minutes out of the week." The implication is that it may be difficult for ER teachers to enact this practice, no matter their beliefs or their sense of its potential feasibility, without institutional support. This was reinforced by Participant 6's suggestion of measures to facilitate enacting membership in a wider ER culture; they proposed "[having] … some sort of a book club or something like that, where [students] can discuss materials that they are reading extensively … [or] doing blogs in the class, with regards to ER, where students could even socially connect and share through the blog."

5. Conclusions

Overall, in keeping with the purpose expressed by Day and Bamford (2002), the ten principles served well as a foundation for examining "extensive reading and the conditions and methodology necessary for its success" (p. 136). Moreover, by mapping relevant SDT elements onto the ER principles, and observing a sample group of ESL teachers' report of professed adherence to them, it was possible to clarify how the level of application of Day and Bamford's principles could correspond to the quality of promotion for learners' experience of competence, autonomy and relatedness.

In answer specifically to research question 1 – *Framed as implementation of principles from Day and Bamford, what is the level of ESL teachers' engagement in promoting ER by supporting students' experience of each of the three basic psychological needs (competence, autonomy, and relatedness)?* – it was seen that, on a 1-7 Likert scale, the mean response for each of competence (M = 5.17) and autonomy (M = 5.84) was not far above the lowest point of the positive range, and that the mean response for relatedness (M = 4.96) was just inside the neutral range. Also, cautious statistical evaluation suggested that there was no significant evidence even for modestly greater or lesser fidelity to any one of the three basic psychological needs. This indicates that, although Ryan and Deci (2000a) view relatedness as a somewhat "distal" component of motivation (p. 71), which one might surmise could lead to its receiving the weakest endorsement,

in this sample that did not occur: in fact, support for all three basic psychological needs was low. Additionally, consideration only of enactment (sub-query c) revealed mean responses for competence, autonomy, and relatedness of just 4.7, 4.2 and 3.39 respectively. In sum, it appears that Mori (2015) was correct to suggest that selective adoption of the principles could lead to weak support for intrinsic motivation to participate in ER, although in fact not simply through poor commitment to Day and Bamford's fifth and sixth principles. Given that optimal intrinsic motivation can only be expected when all three basic psychological needs are fulfilled (Ryan & Deci, 2000a), this finding strongly implies that erratic adoption of Day and Bamford's familiar principles can go hand in hand with ineffective attention to the three SDT factors. Viewed either way, maximal achievement of the numerous L2 learning benefits associated with vigorous engagement in ER is unlikely to ensue.

Research question 2 – *What reasoning underlies those levels of engagement?* – was addressed on the basis of qualitative data from follow-up interviews with selected participants. Interestingly, interview comments suggested that, although either belief or feasibility could affect engagement, low enactment was very often predicted by uncertainty about feasibility rather than by simple disbelief in a given principle. Four themes regarding the origins of suboptimal engagement emerged: observations around (a) pre-service professional education, (b) teaching experience and in-service training, (c) classroom constraints, and (d) institutional constraints.

Pre-service professional education

This factor was mentioned on a number of occasions. Although weaknesses in pre-service education did not emerge as an acute concern, the pattern does warrant attention. For example, some misconceptions about ER instruction might be traced to teacher education, as when Participant 4 rather surprisingly suggested that in-class encouragement of self-paced ER might be a useful innovation (re. questionnaire item 1: autonomy), which may connect with that same participant's remark that "my education did not really prepare me well to teach reading as a subject" (item 2: competence). Also, Participant 5 appeared not to have been alerted to the possibility of guiding students with respect to time management for ER (item 4: competence). Another example was Participant 4's sense that, as a mentor for the comprehension of culturally unfamiliar content in ER passages, they should passively wait for students to raise questions rather than actively eliciting queries (item 8: competence). Finally, there was Participant 5's admission (item 9: relatedness) that they had "never thought about ER" as having implications for membership in a wider community of readers.

Teaching experience and in-service training

Occasionally, the influence of experience, including in-service training, was raised in the interviews. Actually, however, although the matter was typically addressed in a substantive manner indicative of a constructive concern whenever it arose, this dimension was stressed only by Participant 5. With respect to encouraging students to find a place for ER in their lives as a whole (item 15: autonomy), helping learners understand unfamiliar cultural elements (8: competence), or representing ER as an entry-point to a more global community (9: relatedness), they suggested that the program might be able to provide training in how teachers could achieve these goals. Those were all very practical proposals; possibly, the other interviewees did not raise them mainly because of being more confident in their own level of experience as teachers of ER. By contrast, Participant 5 twice drew attention to their self-perceived lack of experience: in connection with items 2 and 8 (both competence).

Classroom constraints

Since classroom conditions are to some extent a reflection of institutional policy (or financial constraints), it is impossible to separate this item entirely from the following one (D: Institutional constraints), but it does seem informative to concentrate here more on *classroom conditions*, and on *program-design factors* in the next section. With that in mind, we note that Participant 5 twice commented on problems relating to class size and available classroom time for learning activities (items 2: competence, and 15: autonomy). However, Participant 4 conceptualized classroom constraints or opportunities in a rather different way, referring more to what might or might not be possible with a particular classroom group of learners (item: competence 8). In addition, Participant 6 mused about the possibility of enriching the classroom setting with access to social media (item 9: relatedness). Interestingly, other potential constraints – regarding for instance seating arrangements, room size, noise level or, especially relevant to ER, access to appropriate reading materials – were never presented as factors.

Institutional constraints

Perhaps rather realistically, program-related issues were raised several times. For example, Participant 4 explained that their ability to advise students on doing ER at their own pace, and to responsibly monitor their students' self-paced progress, would be much increased if there were a policy change to allocate more in-class attention to ER (item 1: autonomy), and much the same remark was made by Participant 5 regarding provision of help with unfamiliar content (item 2: competence) and facilitation of discussions of ER books among students (item 14: relatedness). By contrast, Participant 6 was more concerned with very specific rules, such as precise guidelines on the time per week allowed for ER (item 9: relatedness), or on the type of testing and test content that was permitted (item 14: relatedness). More generally, when explaining the difficulty of encouraging students to challenge themselves to read relatively lengthy texts, Participant 5 gave a vivid account of all the conflicting daily activities and responsibilities that distract international students enrolled in a busy program (item 12: competence).

The above themes could well provide a basis for re-thinking various aspects of pre-service teacher education, in-service professional development, classroom conditions, or institutional planning. Plainly, the study does have some limitations. Above all, it examines just a convenience sample of participants from a single ESL program. No doubt a larger and randomized pool of participants could provide more generalizable results. Nonetheless, as a snap-shot of real-life ER practitioners it has the merit of suggesting a number of plausible conclusions that confirm the wisdom of attending consistently to Day and Bamford's (2002) very serviceable ten principles for ER, and that broaden understanding of the way in which selective adoption of them may inadvertently undermine intrinsic motivation. For teacher educators, in-service trainers, teachers and policy-makers, there seem to be strong reasons for grouping reflection on the ten principles alongside an introduction to SDT, so as to highlight the powerful motivational opportunities that are in play.

References

Al-Homoud, F., & Schmitt, N. (2009). Extensive reading in a challenging environment: A comparison of extensive and intensive approaches in Saudi Arabia. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(4), 383-401.

Asraf, M. R., & Ahmad, S. I. (2003). Promoting English language development and the reading habit among students in rural schools through the guided extensive reading program.

Reading in a Foreign Language 15(2), 83-102.

Bamford, J. & Day, J. (1997). Extensive reading: What is it? Why bother? *The Language Teacher, 21*(5). Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/old_tlt/files/97/may/extensive.html

Bell, T. (2001). Extensive reading: Speed and comprehension. *The Reading Matrix, 1*(1), n.p.

Brooks, F. C., & Young, L. S. (2011). Are choice-making opportunities needed in the classroom? Using self-determination theory to consider motivation and learner empowerment. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*(1), 48-59.

Camiciottoli, B. (2001). Extensive reading in English: habits and attitudes of a group of Italian university EFL students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 24*(2), 135-153.

Cho, K., & Krashen, S. (1994). Acquisition of vocabulary from the *Sweet Valley Kids* series: Adult ESL acquisition. *Journal of Reading, 37*, 662-667.

Coady, J., & Huckin, T. (1997). *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 225-299.

Day, R. (2015). Extending extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 27*(2), 294-301.

Day, R & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, R. & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(2), 136-141.

Deci, E. L, & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49* (3), 182-185.

de Morgado, N. F. (2009). Extensive reading: Students' performance and perception. *The Reading Matrix, 9*(1), 31-43.

Edy, S. (2015). The effectiveness of extensive reading on students' reading comprehension achievement as observed from students' motivation. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora, 2*(1), 54-58.

Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning, 41*(3), 375-411.

Fox, G. M. (1990). Increasing intrinsic motivation in second language readers. *The Language Teacher, 14*(3), 13-15.

Fuisting, B. (2014). Principles and practice of extensive reading. *Journal of Extensive Reading in Foreign Languages, 1*(1), 15-20.

Gee, R. W. (1999). Encouraging ESL students to read. *TESOL Journal, 8*(1), 3-7.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2013). *Teaching and researching reading* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Green, C. (2005). Integrating extensive reading in the task-based curriculum. *ELT Journal, 59*(4), 306-331.

Hafiz, F., & Tudor, I. (1989). Extensive reading and development of language skills. *ELT Journal, 43*, 4-13.

Hardy, J. E. (2016). The effects of a short-term extensive reading course in Spanish. *Journal of Extensive Reading, 4*(2), 47-68.

Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: A measurement study. *The*

Canadian Modern Language Review, 61(3), 355-382.
Huang, Y. C. (2015). Why don't they do it? A study on the implementation of extensive reading in Taiwan. *Cogent Education, 2*(1), 1-13.
Judge, P. B. (2011). Driven to read: Enthusiastic readers in a Japanese high school's extensive reading program. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 23*(2), 161-186.
Kirchhoff, C. (2013). L2 extensive reading and flow: Clarifying the relationship. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 25*(2), 192-212.
Komiyama, R. (2013). Factors underlying second language reading motivation of adult EAP students. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 25*(2), 149-169.
Macalister, J. (2008). Integrating extensive reading into an English for academic purposes program. *The Reading Matrix, 8*(1), 23-33.
Macalister, J. (2010). Investigating teacher attitudes to extensive reading practices in higher education: Why isn't everybody doing it? *RELC Journal, 41*(1), 59-75.
Mason, B. (2006). Free voluntary reading and autonomy in second language acquisition: Improving TOEFL scores from reading alone. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 2*(1), 1-8.
Mason, B., & Krashen, S. (1997). Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *System, 25*(1), 91-102.
Mori, S. (2002). Redefining Motivation to Read in a Foreign Language, *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(2), 91-110.
Mori, S. (2015). If you build it, they will come: From a "Field of Dreams" to a more realistic view of extensive reading in an EFL context. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 27*(1), 129-135.
Nation, I., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge
Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence and relatedness in the classroom: Applying Self- determination theory to educational practices. *Theory and Research in Education, 7* (2), 133-144.
Nishino, T. (2007). Beginning to read extensively: A case study with Mako and Fumi. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 19*(2).
Piagada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 18*(1), 1-28.
Pino-Sylva, J. (2006). Extensive reading through the Internet: Is it worth the while? *The Reading Matrix, 6*(1), 85-96.
Powell, S. (2005). Extensive reading and its role in Japanese high schools. *The Reading Matrix, 5*(2), 28-42.
Ro, E. (2013). A case study of extensive reading with an unmotivated L2 reader. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 25*(2), 213-233.
Robb, T. N. (2002). Extensive reading in an Asian context - An alternative view. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(2), 146-147.
Robb, T. N., & Susser, B. (1989). Extensive reading vs skills building in an EFL context. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 5*(2), 239-249.
Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.
Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classical definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Psychology, 25*, 54-67.
Shen, Y. (2008). EFL learners' responses to extensive reading: Survey and pedagogical applications. *The Reading Matrix, 8*(2), 111-123.

Takase, A. (2007). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 19*(1), 1-18.

Wong, C. K. (2001). What We Know after a Decade of Hong Kong Extensive Reading Scheme. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED458806. Retrieved from http://erfoundation.org/bib/bibdocs/wong1999.pdf

Yu, V. (1993). Extensive reading programs – How can they best benefit the teaching and learning of English? *TESL Reporter*, *26*(1), 1-9.

Appendix

All questionnaire items, with corresponding Principles (by Number) and SDT needs (**C**ompetence, **A**utonomy, **R**elatedness)

Item	Wording	Principle	SDT
1a)	Extensive reading teachers should emphasize that it is fine for students to carry out extensive reading at their own pace.	8	A
1b)	In particular terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
1c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
2a)	Extensive reading teachers should teach students how to approach unfamiliar content in ER texts.	9	C
2b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
2c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
3a)	Extensive reading teachers should entice students to satisfy their curiosity by reading a variety of reading materials on a wide range of topics.	2	A
3b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
3c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
4a)	Extensive reading teachers should instruct students in time-management for extensive reading, which typically unfolds over several days.	4	C
4b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
4c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
5a)	Extensive reading teachers should encourage students to feel free to choose what they want to read extensively.	1 & 5	A
5b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
5c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
6a)	Extensive reading teachers should encourage students to advise others about which extensive reading materials to select or to avoid.	6	R
6b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
6c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
7a)	Extensive reading teachers should empower students to stop reading any extensive material that they find unappealing, and replace it with different material.	3	A
7b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
7c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
8a)	Extensive reading teachers should facilitate students' comprehension of unexpected cultural elements in ER texts.	5	C
8b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
8c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy		
9a)	Extensive reading teachers should guide students to view extensive reading as a participation in a global culture of reading in English.	5	R
9b)	In particular terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
9c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy		
10a)	Extensive reading teachers should structure a cooperative learning environment in order to help students recognize that extensive reading is a social event.	10	R
10b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
10c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy		
11a)	Extensive reading teachers should help students learn strategies to handle challenging linguistic features in ER texts (in terms of vocabulary and grammar).	7 & 9	C
11b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
11c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
12a)	Extensive reading teachers should support the task of reading texts that are much longer than intensive reading texts.	4	C
12b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
12c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy		
13a)	Extensive reading teachers should allow each learner to see that they, too, engage in extensive reading just as their students do.	10	R
13b)	In practical terms the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
13c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy		
14a)	Extensive reading teachers should provide opportunities for students to discuss extensive reading materials that they have read with classmates.	10	R
14b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
14c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		
15a)	Extensive reading teachers should advise students to explore how individual and silent reading in a foreign language fits into their lives.	8	A
15b)	In practical terms, the above strategy would be feasible for a teacher to enact.		
15c)	I myself regularly enact this strategy.		