



UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Teachers' views and methods for motivating students to write in English.

Knut Markus Olsen Skårnes



Acknowledgements

This process has certainly been a journey of discovery, both of myself, and of the challenges inherent in writing a master's thesis. It has been full of ups and downs, and now that it is coming to an end, I am glad I saw it through.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor, Hilde Brox, who helped me every step of the way here, and without whom this thesis would not be any good at all. I may not always have heeded your advice as well as I should, but I'm thankful that you had the patience to stick with me until the end.

I also want to thank the teachers who allowed me to interview them. This project would not have been possible without you, and I appreciated the insight into your knowledge and experiences.

Finally, thank you to my friends and family for believing in me when I didn't believe in myself, and supporting me through this journey.

Abstract

Both learning to write and motivation are central themes in Norwegian education and motivation is an important factor in learning to write in English. Yet, little research has been done on what knowledge teachers have of motivation for writing and how they practice it. The purpose of this study is to examine individual teachers' views on motivation and how they experience motivating students for writing. Interviews were used to ask a small selection of teachers what they thought of motivation, and how they practiced motivation for writing. The data was categorized and analyzed in relation to the relevant theory. This study found that while teachers partly incorporate several of the principles that are described in theories on motivation for writing, they did not show a broad understanding of these theories. Additionally, the study found that the teachers felt their ability to focus on motivation for writing was constrained by various limiting factors such as exams, students' abilities, and time. As motivation is regarded as important for learning to write, further studies to achieve a more general overview of teachers' outlook on motivation for writing, as well as studies to test which motivational methods could be successfully integrated into the Norwegian education system are needed.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
List of abbreviations	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Research questions	4
1.3 Outline	4
Chapter 2: Background and Theory	5
2.1 Writing in Norwegian schools: traditions, goals and current practices.....	5
2.2 What is writing?	6
2.3 The writing process	7
2.4 Writing discourses; What does good writing mean?	9
2.5 What is motivation?.....	11
2.6 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.....	11
2.7 Self-efficacy	14
2.8 Writing for a purpose	15
2.9 The context of writing	17
2.10 Promoting long term motivation through vision	20
2.11 Conclusion of this chapter	20
Chapter 3: Method.....	23
3.1 The scientific nature of interviews	23
3.2 The procedure of this study	26
3.3 Research quality	28
3.3.1 Validity	28
3.3.2 Reliability – Transparency, measures taken	30
3.4 Ethical considerations.....	31

Chapter 4: Findings and discussion.....	33
4.1 What do teachers think of motivation?.....	33
4.2 Do they find time to focus on motivational aspects of learning to write?.....	36
4.3 How do they promote motivation for writing?.....	38
4.4 Limitations & when motivation fails.....	43
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	49
References	51

List of abbreviations

L2: L2 stands for second language, in here adopting the meaning as simply the second language one learns, ignoring the distinction often made between foreign language and second language.

LK06: The curriculum that was implemented in Norway in 2006, which was called Kunnskapsløftet. In this thesis, I have used the English curriculum of LK06.

LK20: The new curriculum that is implemented in Norway from 2020, of which I have used both the English curriculum as well as the part about overarching values and principles.

NOU: Norwegian official report (Norges offentlige utredninger). A report published by a panel or committee appointed by the Norwegian Government.

EFL: English as a foreign language, in this context referring to classrooms where English is learned not as a native language.

PPU: Practical pedagogical education, a one-year postgraduate degree which qualifies you to work as a teacher.

NSD: The Norwegian Center for Research Data (Norsk senter for forskningsdata), a Norwegian government-owned company which manages research data for the research community of Norway.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

Writing is a key competence in the English subject in Norwegian education. Writing can both be a way for students to practice language skills, or a way to express themselves. Learning to write in English also prepares students for participation in a global society where much is based on writing. However, in teaching and learning contexts, writing can mean different things. A central distinction often made is between *writing to learn* and *learning to write* (Lund & Villanueva, 2018). While the former can involve both *writing to learn language* and *writing to learn content* (Manchón, 2011), the latter emphasizes *learning writing as a skill in itself*.

In the upcoming revised curriculum (LK20) that will take effect from August 2020, a main emphasis is put on *communication*. It is designated as one of the core elements of English, meant to be learned both in written and oral form, using different media, and exploring the language. The new curriculum emphasizes that communication entails conveying meaning in a way that is appropriate to the situation, and that students should learn in authentic situations (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019). Consequently, students must learn how to communicate clearly and appropriately in writing. Writing in the new curriculum is about planning, constructing, and revising texts that communicate, and to adapt the language according to purpose, audience, and situation and choosing suitable writing strategies (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019, p.4). After grade 10, students are expected to know how to write well-structured, coherent texts of different lengths for both formal and informal purposes (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019). With LK20, there is clearly an emphasis given to developing writing as a skill – or learning to write.

To some extent, the distinction between *writing to learn* and *learning to write* is an artificial one. In actual writing situations, the different dimensions could well be worked with simultaneously, since L2 writing entails an “*interaction of purposes*” (Manchon, 2011, p.4). Nevertheless, there appears to be a tendency among teachers to focus on one purpose at the time. Blikstad-Balas, Roe, and Klette (2018) found that either students were writing with an explicit purpose of demonstrating content knowledge, or they were writing

specifically to improve their writing skill. The distinction is therefore important from an analytical viewpoint, since it makes the different purposes of writing visible and allows an explicit focus on what it means to learn to write in a second language.

With the exception of teacher education, where Lund (2014) found that very little emphasis is given to learning to write for different EFL purposes, *learning to write* seems to be generally attended to in all levels of education. Horverak (2016) found that teachers in upper secondary school focus on teaching students how to write argumentative texts, or 5-paragraph essays. The practices of the teachers she studied were in line with a genre pedagogy approach, as most of them reported outlining the stages of essays and focused on using appropriate formality of language. Blikstad-Balas, Roe and Klette (2018), visited 48 classrooms in Norwegian lower secondary schools for four consecutive lessons, and found that in more than half of the classrooms, students were given sustained writing opportunities during this period. Similar to what Horverak found, these were often process oriented and genre specific, and teachers focusing on how to adapt writing to different audiences or genres.

Exams seem to play an important role in how writing in English is taught.

In Horverak's study, the explicit focus on practicing writing argumentative texts was stated as due to preparation for exams (Horverak, 2016). As confirmed by Ørevik (2018), expository and argumentative genres are the most prevalent production tasks in current English subject exams. After the introduction of LK06, narrative genres almost vanished from exams, constituting less than 10% of exam tasks, while expository genres constitute over 45 percent (Ørevik, 2018).

English textbooks are one of the main influences for how English classes in Norway are structured and seem to focus on technical aspects of learning to write. Textbooks are very important for teachers, especially in primary school, whether they use them directly or expand upon the tasks that are outlined there (Gilje, 2016, p.48-51). English textbooks reflect the publishers' views of the curriculum. In Gyldendal's *Explore 7*, for example, there are regular diagrams to help with structuring a text. Beside every text are new words for the students to expand their vocabulary and the tasks range from listing words you know, and writing sentences using a specific grammatical structure as practice, to writing full texts such as biographies or stories (Edwards, 2017, p. 1-90). In Gyldendal's *Enter 9*, the same lists of words appear beside the texts, but no diagrams for text structure. Writing tasks are related to

the text the students have just read and can be either to write a very similar text, or to write a text based on the topic they just read about. In addition, there are several tasks where the students get to practice writing skills, like grammar, vocabulary, and spelling (Diskin & Winsvild, 2016). These might also be contributing to how teachers focus on text structure and writing skills.

While some research attention has been directed toward how writing is practiced, less focus has been on the motivational side of this question. It seems that when teachers focus on students learning to write, they focus on genre specific skills, as well as adapting writing to different audiences and contexts. They also seem to direct their teaching toward preparing students for exams by teaching them genres which are most prevalent in exam tasks (Horverak, 2016). We know less about whether teachers have room for efforts toward promoting motivation and passion for writing as an activity. As this being a specified goal for all aspects of the Norwegian educational system, it is something which should be investigated.

Motivation is elevated as a goal in and of itself in government documents about education. Motivation is mentioned as a factor in personal development, completing education, and better learning (NOU 2015: 8, p. 21-22, 74, 98). LK20 also mentions that education should further students' motivation, attitudes and learning strategies, and lay a foundation for learning throughout their lives (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2017, p.11).

There has been little research on how motivation is used for learning to write in Norwegian schools, especially on a micro level. Teachers are the connection points between theoretical perspectives and classroom practices, and it is therefore important to investigate their views. Focus on the individual that operates within a larger context is valuable as it shows how individuals are affected by larger-scale factors, which again has an impact on how these individuals work together at a macro level.

1.2 Research questions

The research questions for this thesis are:

- 1: How do Norwegian teachers of English view motivation as a factor for *learning to write* in English?
- 2: How do these views affect their practice?

In order to examine these research questions, I interviewed three teachers situated in different levels of Norwegian education. When referring to teachers' *views* I was interested in what the teachers believe motivation is, how they believe it affects students in writing, how much they value it, and how they perceive their own efforts in promoting it.

1.3 Outline

After this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 provides the thematic and theoretical background for this study. Chapter 3 accounts for the methodological considerations, describes the procedures for collecting and analyzing the interview data, and discusses research quality and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 presents and discusses findings in the form of excerpts and statements from the teacher interviews and discusses these in light of relevant theory on writing and on motivation. A conclusion and suggestions for further research is presented in the final Chapter 5.

Chapter 2: Background and Theory

This chapter starts by accounting for how writing in English has developed in Norwegian schools, as well as some theory on what writing is and how it is done cognitively. Following this, a general definition of motivation is proposed, before the chapter delves into more nuanced theories on what motivation is and how motivation for writing can be promoted.

2.1 Writing in Norwegian schools: traditions, goals and current practices

English writing has come a long way from where it started in the Norwegian education system. English was introduced to the Norwegian curriculum in 1939, where the focus was on English as a written language. In fact, the term “English speech” was not introduced until the curriculum was reworked in 1957. In the period of 1939 to 1974, English in Norwegian schools developed from a focus on primarily grammar and vocabulary to more communicative and audiolingual approaches. Communicative tasks and activities are generally focused more on meaning than on form (Nunan, 1989). The approach builds on Hymes’ idea of communicative competence, in which knowledge of language structure is complemented by linguistic performance, meaning a process of encoding and decoding in specific sociocultural contexts (Horverak, 2016). In recent years, the focus has been on developing clear competence aims in different areas of the subject (Simensen, 2014). The focus on communication is carried into more recent ideas of producing text that is suitable for various contexts. In LK20, *global* communication is also emphasized as a major goal.

While LK06 and LK20 take many similar positions regarding writing in English, there are some differences between these two as well. In both LK06 (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2013) and LK20 (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019) the purpose of English is stated to be participation in a more and more global community, as well as gaining awareness of different cultures. Yet while in LK06, this point was focused more on English-speaking countries, LK20 widens its scope to encompass any culture. The concept of what a text is also seems to have been extended or become more clearly defined in LK20. In LK06 the concept of text encompassed written and oral texts in different combinations as well as digital texts. In LK20, text is specified as oral,

written, printed, graphic, or artistic, formal or informal, both fiction and nonfiction. LK20 values both critical thinking and creativity (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2017).

This wider definition of text carries over to writing. In LK20, the term writing is used less, instead replaced by the term *text production*, indicating a similarity in issues students face when producing oral and written texts as well as catering for a wider range of modes and modalities. In addition to focusing on communication adapted to different authentic situations, the new curriculum focuses more on the process of writing, emphasizing planning, writing and revising, as well as on using writing strategies. Specific competence aims are aimed at revising one's own texts, as well as writing both formal and informal texts (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019).

This study investigates a teacher reality which has been formed by LK06, as this is the curriculum teachers have been working under for well over a decade. In LK06, writing in English means being able to express ideas and meanings in an understandable and appropriate way, using written language. It also means to construct texts that communicate well through good structure and coherence. Additionally, writing is viewed as a tool for learning English. Competence aims for writing include using goal-appropriate writing strategies, vocabulary, writing different kinds of structured texts, and using correct grammar and syntax (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2013).

2.2 What is writing?

It can be easy to take writing for granted as simply a practical way to communicate: when we need it, we use it, without more consideration. However, writing contains complexities that are worth considering more analytically. Writing is essentially a set of symbols which correspond to sounds. Or, to use Encyclopedia Britannica's definition, a “form of human communication by means of a set of visible marks that are related, by convention, to some particular structural level of language.” (Olson, 2020). Moreover, writing is an important part of modern communication and society, and has evolved over thousands of years (Olson, 2020).

Writing can be approached from three angles: The text itself, the writer, and the reader. This is the distinction Hyland (2009) makes when he describes writing from the standpoint of teaching and research. The text itself can be seen both to exist independently or dependently of context. Hyland (2009) distinguishes between *text as objects* and *texts as discourse*. When viewing texts as objects, it has been common to view the words on the page as something that stands alone and conveys thoughts from the writer to the reader. The text is viewed separately from the context in which it was written. Text as discourse, in contrast, considers the fact that written texts draw on the reader's assumed understandings, and focuses more on the way the writer uses language to communicate or achieve some purpose. Writing is a social action, where context influences how language and structure is used. Prose needs to be fitted to the purpose of the text (Hyland, 2009).

Focusing on *the writer* also provides an interesting perspective, typically more focused on the process of writing. There are three positions which have largely contributed to this perspective. The first is the expressionist view of writing, in which good writing is seen as the writer being able to discover and creatively express their own style of writing. Second is writing as a cognitive problem-solving process, where the writer plans, drafts, and revises continuously until a text is produced. Finally, writing can be viewed as a situated act, in the sense that it happens within a specific social setting, and the writer's personal attitudes and previous experiences all come into play in this process (Hyland, 2009).

Lastly, *the reader's* perspective of writing extends beyond the composing situation into the purposes and goals that the text eventually will fulfill. Writers choose their words based on what would make sense to the reader (Hyland, 2009).

2.3 The writing process

To understand why writing a text it can be a difficult task for students, one needs only look at the mental processes involved in the activity. Flower & Hayes (2004) propose a cognitive process model to describe what happens in the writer's mind during writing. In their model, there are three units: the task environment, the writer's long-term memory, and the writing process.

The task environment includes the rhetorical task, as well as the growing text appearing as writing happens. The writer must first define what it is that they want to accomplish. At the start of the process is the rhetorical task, where the writer must balance the rhetorical situation and the needs of the audience with their own goals as a writer. The process in which this happens varies greatly from writer to writer, and some simplify it greatly. However, by simplifying it, they can then run the risk of having an inaccurate or underdeveloped representation of the rhetorical problem, which can result in being unable to solve the missing aspects of the problem.

The text which has been written so far places constraints upon what the writer can do as it grows. Its influence varies, but too little consideration of what has already been written can result in an incoherent text, while too much focus on it can lead to the writer being unable to step back from local text-bound problems to address larger themes and structural issues. As it grows, the text takes up much of the attention of the writer, competing with two other forces which direct the writer: Plans for dealing with the rhetorical problem, and knowledge stored in the writer's long-term memory.

The writer also needs knowledge of what they are writing about. The long-term memory in Flower and Hayes' model represents a vault of stored knowledge about the topic and audience, as well as writing plans and previous problems the writer has faced. The key here lies in finding the cues which activate this knowledge and lets the writer retrieve it. The writing process unit of their model involves planning, translating, reviewing, and monitoring. Planning is the way ideas are formed. Planning involves generating ideas by retrieving relevant knowledge from the long-term memory, organizing this knowledge by grouping ideas into a structure that is meaningful in relation to the rhetorical problem, and setting goals which are both substantive and procedural to guide the process. Ideas are then made to fit the form of written language. The term translating is used as opposed to transcribing or writing because it requires the writer to transform the abstract ideas from the planning process into the concrete rule-based form of language.

All through the process, the writer reviews their current work. Reviewing involves the two sub-processes of evaluating and revising. This can happen as a planned systematic process of reviewing written text, but also as an unplanned action triggered by evaluation of the text or planning, meaning unwritten text is also revised. The writer must also know when to move

from one process to the next. Writers monitor their progress and process as they write, and this monitor functions as a writing strategist, determining when the writer moves between processes. This choice is determined both by the writer's goals and individual writing habits.

This cognitive process model is not a linear process where the writer moves from the first stage to the second, and so on. Stages may interrupt each other, and the entire process may for example be embedded within itself as a way to solve a problem with translation. In fact, they state that one might view this process more as the writer's tool kit (Flower & Hayes, 2004).

2.4 Writing discourses; What does good writing mean?

When discussing learning to write, we must also consider how people view writing, and what can be considered good writing. To that end, Ivanič (2004) has defined six *discourses of writing*. Discourses of writing, as Ivanič defines them, are “constellations of beliefs about writing, beliefs about learning to write, ways of talking about writing, and the sorts of approaches to teaching and assessment which are likely to be associated with these beliefs” (Ivanič, 2004, p. 224). The six discourses of writing she outlines are a *skills discourse*, a *creativity discourse*, a *process discourse*, a *genre discourse*, a *social practices discourse*, and a *sociopolitical discourse*.

The skills discourse of writing focuses on writing as a skill, where good writing uses the correct forms of words, sentences and text formation. Associated with these beliefs is the belief that learning to write mainly involves learning correct grammar, syntax, and usage of paragraphs and text structure devices. This view of writing leans itself to explicit teaching (Ivanič, 2004).

The creativity discourse also focuses on the text itself, but more on content and style rather than linguistic form. Writing is seen as a valuable activity in and of itself, if it generates meaning and enjoyment for the readers. This discourse is connected to the belief that engaging more in the activity of writing will result in becoming better at it, and that reading good writing by others can also promote good writing in the reader (Ivanič, 2004).

The process discourse is focused not on the produced text, but at the process of production. Learning to write includes learning both the mental processes and the practical processes of writing. According to Ivanič, this is a tempting view to take, as the practical processes can be taught explicitly, but she questions whether it is possible to assess this aspect of writing, as assessing the product when so much focus is on the process seems wrong. Keywords such as ‘plan’, ‘draft’, ‘revision’, and ‘editing’ are manifestations of this discourse (Ivanič, 2004).

The genre discourse focuses on the product, but in this discourse, texts are shaped by social context and purpose. Good writing is correct not only in form, but also “linguistically appropriate to the purpose it is serving” (Ivanič, 2004, p. 233). Within this discourse, learning to write means learning the linguistic characteristics of different text types. While this can be learned implicitly, it is best learned from explicit instruction.

The social practices discourse views writing even more as part of a social context. Writing itself is part of social practices such as networks of support and collaboration, gender preferences, the use of tools, technology and resources, as well as the broader goals literacy serves in society. Associated with this discourse is the view that people learn to write implicitly by participating in writing which fulfills social goals that are meaningful to them. Identification is key here, as people are likely to participate in practices if they identify with the values and beliefs of others who engage in those practices. Good writing within this discourse is effective at achieving social goals, which can be measured by consequences such as effect on other people (Ivanič, 2004).

Finally, *the sociopolitical discourse* is focused on broader political aspects of context and is based on the belief that writing is shaped by social forces and relations of power. Within this framework, writers are not entirely free to choose how to represent the world, themselves, or how to address the readers as this is partly determined by the sociopolitical context. Within this discourse, learning to write means to develop a critical awareness of the historical and political factors which have shaped particular genres and discourses (Ivanič, 2004).

2.5 What is motivation?

The focus of this thesis is motivation for writing in L2 English. An account of what the term motivation involves is therefore required. There are several views on the precise nature of motivation, yet Schunk et. al. (2014) provide a definition of motivation consistent with what most researchers believe, as “the process whereby goal-directed activities are instigated and sustained” (Schunk, Meece, & Pintrich, 2014, p. 5). Within this definition are several important distinctions. Motivation is a process rather than a product, and can thus not be observed directly, but must rather be inferred from actions and verbalizations. It requires activities which are directed at achieving a goal, whether this goal is well-formulated or not. Lastly it not only initiates activity but sustains it as well. Many goals require long-term activity and perseverance through obstacles to achieve (Schunk et. al. 2014). Motivation is beneficial in the context of school and learning. It has been shown to enhance learning and promote activity which students believe will help them to learn, such as pay attention, take notes, and ask for help if they need it. While motivation affects learning and performance, these in turn also affect and sustain motivation for further learning (Schunk et al., 2014).

2.6 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation

While a general definition is useful, motivation can have different qualities. A common way to distinguish different qualities of motivation is to categorize it as intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is motivation to engage in an activity for the sake of doing it, independent of rewards or external constraints. Extrinsic motivation is motivation to engage in an activity to achieve something which is external to that activity, such as a reward, praise, or avoiding punishment. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are not separate ends of a continuum but could rather be thought of as two separate continuums, where each of them can range from high to low. Both kinds of motivation are dependent on the context and time, rather than something constant (Schunk et al., 2014).

Intrinsic motivation is generally viewed as desirable and can be influenced in several ways. Schunk et al. (2014) emphasize four factors as contributors to intrinsic motivation: Challenge, curiosity, control, and fantasy. Challenging students has been found to enhance intrinsic

motivation. Challenges should be of intermediate difficulty, so that attaining the goals of these challenges raises self-efficacy and perceived control over outcomes in students. The level of the goals needs to be adjusted as students improve, to stay on a similar level (Schunk et al., 2014).

If students are curious about something, they will be motivated to understand it. Curiosity can be engaged by presenting students with ideas or information that create a discrepancy between what they believe and what they are presented with. They will then seek to understand and resolve this discrepancy, provided it is not too large or small, in which case it might be ignored (Schunk et al., 2014). Intrinsic motivation is also affected by students having a sense of control over their academic outcomes. This sense of control can be enhanced by for example giving students choices in activities and a role in establishing rules. Lastly, involving the students in fantasy can promote intrinsic motivation. Schunk et al. (2014) use the term fantasy rather than imagination, as the concept they suggest is more specific than imagination. By identifying with and imagining characters and situations which are removed from their ordinary lives, students can derive vicarious pleasure. Fantasy may also be used to enhance the sense that what they are learning might be useful to them by portraying out-of-school situations where what they are learning is used (Schunk et al., 2014).

It is important to use these factors correctly. While they can positively influence intrinsic motivation, Schunk et al. (2014) point out that they must be used in a way that is relevant to the task. Non-relevant or distracting features may divert mental attention or decrease students' sense of control, which would be detrimental to intrinsic motivation.

What also can be detrimental to intrinsic motivation are unnecessary rewards. According to self-determination theory, intrinsic motivation will be diminished when individuals believe their actions are extrinsically determined, meaning they believe they are engaging in the activity as a means to an end. Presenting people with a reward when they are already intrinsically motivated might decrease intrinsic motivation. When the reward is no longer there, they might then lose motivation for the activity, whereas if they were allowed to engage in it based on intrinsic motivation, they would be more likely to sustain this activity in the future (Schunk et al., 2014).

This does not mean extrinsic rewards do not have their place, especially in schools. According to Schunk et al. (2014), "...teachers should not be afraid to use extrinsic rewards, but should use them in a way that makes them contingent on actual academic performance, not as ways to control general behavior or as bribes to comply with the teacher" (Schunk et al., 2014, p. 162). Not all desirable behaviors are intrinsically motivated. Within schools there are extrinsic structures which promote good behavior and social functioning. The extrinsic motivators which are inherent in schools might eventually become internalized as part of the self-regulation process. This process is closely linked to motivation, as it is the process which activates and sustains thoughts and behaviors which are oriented toward attaining their goals. To account for this, Ryan and Deci (referenced in Schunk et al., 2014) expanded upon theories of extrinsic motivation, by dividing it into four levels: external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation.

Within the level of external regulation, there is no intrinsic motivation, and students engage in activity based on external rewards or punishments. They behave well and do what they are supposed to, but there is no self-determination by the students themselves. At the next level, introjected regulation, the motivation is internal, but still not self-determined. Factors such as guilt fit within this level. While the feelings that drive this kind of motivation are internal, the source of these feelings can be external.

Identified regulation is where students engage in an activity because it is personally important to them. A student might decide that they want to get into college, and study hard based on this goal. The key factor here is that the end goal is chosen by the student themselves. The last level of extrinsic motivation is integrated regulation, in which students engage in behavior because it is important to their sense of self. This is based on the integration of both internal and external information into their own self-schema.

The account above provides a useful lens through which we can view extrinsic motivation. Schunk et al. (2014) point out that integrated regulation needs to be more clearly defined as something different than intrinsic motivation. Nevertheless, by looking at this theory, we can tell that using extrinsic motivation can be useful, and that it might be best to use it in ways that promote self-determination as much as possible to push students in the direction of internalizing these factors.

2.7 Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is a key term when discussing motivation and provides an important backdrop when considering how to motivate students for writing. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy refers to the concept of *one's belief in one's ability to succeed in specific situation*. This is not the same as the skills one possesses, as actual skills do not necessarily translate into beliefs. Efficacy beliefs are a key factor in performance, and thus two people with the same skills may perform differently based on differing beliefs of personal efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

One of the key beliefs in Bandura's theory is that people can exercise influence over how they behave. Behavior is also influenced by many other factors, so people are not the sole determiners of what happens to them. Here, it is important to distinguish between the intended outcome of an action and the actual outcome, as the effect of that action might be different than what one intended. Human agency, which in this context refers to acts done intentionally, is dependent on beliefs of personal efficacy. For humans to try influencing results, they must believe it possible (Bandura, 1997).

Human agency is influenced by several factors. In social cognitive theory, human agency operates within a structure where three major classes of determinants influence each other; behavior, the external environment, and internal personal factors in the form of cognitive, affective, and biological events. These influence each other in various degrees of strength and at various times depending on the situation. They must also be seen in the context of the social system humans operate within. Social cognitive theory extends the concept of human agency beyond the individual to encompass collective agency as well (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy must be differentiated from self-esteem. "Perceived self-efficacy is concerned with judgements of personal capability, whereas self-esteem is concerned with judgements of self-worth." (Bandura, 1997, p. 11). In ongoing pursuits, self-efficacy predicts the goals people will set for themselves, as well as the effort they put in towards reaching those goals. Self-esteem will affect neither of these factors.

Knowing how to promote self-efficacy can be useful for teachers. Bandura lists several sources of self-efficacy. Chief among these are enactive mastery experiences, which in short

means succeeding at tasks. This provides the most authentic evidence of one's ability to succeed, which can fuel one's beliefs. However, there are several factors besides past performances that affect what people get out of their mastery experiences, such as how people view themselves, task difficulty, context, and the effort expended (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy can also be promoted by providing examples of mastery. While enactive experiences are most influential, vicarious experiences are also a source of efficacy beliefs. Through modeling we gain an understanding of what can be done, and how well we are doing compared to that. People compare themselves to associates, such as classmates. Surpassing them raises efficacy beliefs, while being outperformed lowers them. To get the most out of modeling, it should be structured to maximize its instructive function while minimizing its comparative evaluative function. Modeling can also happen through television or other visual media, or by self-modeling, where people are aided to perform above their usual attainments (Bandura, 1997).

Lastly, another way to strengthen people's beliefs is verbal persuasion. While verbal persuasion alone might have a limited effect on efficacy beliefs, people who are persuaded verbally that they are capable of something are more likely to expend greater effort in trying it, as long as the positive appraisal is within bounds. Factors such as the knowledge and credibility of the person who is attempting to persuade someone can affect how effective persuasion is in changing efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

The next section turns to motivation for writing specifically, which is addressed from several angles: The importance of a purpose in writing, the impact of writing context on motivation, and using vision to promote long-term motivation for L2 writing.

2.8 Writing for a purpose

Many have noted that motivation can be promoted by giving writing a real purpose. Bruning & Horn (2000), among others, argue that one of the factors upon which motivation for writing depends is the use of authentic writing tasks, where writing is used for an immediate goal of enjoyment or communication, instead of some unspecified future use. Having genuine reasons for writing instead of doing it because one is simply told to almost certainly has

motivational consequences. Another powerful motivator and possible purpose is interest. Students' interest in a topic can determine the level of attention they are willing to commit to writing about it, and how long they will persist at that task (Bruning & Horn, 2000).

Having a purpose for writing is a central part of the *writing for pleasure* pedagogy. This pedagogy was formulated and defined by Young (2019) and is characterized by promoting a feeling of enjoyment for writing. In his study about the writing for pleasure pedagogy, Young (2019) compiled a list of 14 principles for teaching within this framework. Among these were two principles dedicated to giving students a feeling of purpose in their writing. The first principle is what he refers to as a *Purposeful and Authentic Writing Project*. If children can generate their own subject and purpose, work in their own way, and have a clear sense of a real reader, they are more likely to care enough about their writing. The second principle concerns having *Personal Writing Projects*. According to Young, "...it is essential that children are given time to write for a sustained period every day and to work on both class and personal writing projects" (Young, 2019, p.20). It is through personal projects that students experience agency and can come to see writing as an empowering and pleasurable activity.

Students themselves also state that they want to write about things that are relevant to them. Stewart, Walker, and Revelle (2018) surveyed high school students in Texas before and after instructional intervention and asked how they preferred to work with literacy. The intervention was focused on reading and writing content that was culturally and personally relevant for the students. When asked what they wanted to write about, students primarily wanted to write about themselves and their own cultural knowledge. One student stated, "I would like to write about my country how it is and how they are", another "I would love to write about my weekend." (Stewart et al., 2018, p. 31).

Students write both because they want to learn and because they want to share things about themselves. The students in the study by Stewart et al. said that they wanted to learn, make sense of their learning, improve their English, and share and demonstrate what they had learned. Sometimes this learning was of a personal nature, such as understanding their own feelings. Most importantly, students wrote because they wanted to be known, and they enjoyed writing to tell others about themselves. There was less consensus on how they wanted to write. While some students preferred sharing their writing, others preferred to keep it

private. A major reason for wanting to share their writing was a desire to improve it. The ones who wanted to keep it private reasoned that their writing was too personal to share with others, at least in the context of school. They also appreciated if the teacher let them know in advance if the writing was to be read by others.

The study also concluded that there are four areas that contribute to English learners' engagement in reading and writing. Teachers need to expect students to engage in reading and writing English every day for them to do so and make it a habit. Schools and teachers need to provide access to culturally relevant and self-selected literature. The books need to fit students' levels, and teachers themselves should model active reading habits so that they are prepared to make appropriate recommendations. Expectations also need to be present for students to read the books that are made available. Students wanted authentic ways to respond to reading with writing, and preferred scaffolded writing opportunities. They also need a genuine reason for writing, other than just sharing with the teacher. Sharing their writing with someone else, like their parents or the class gives them purpose. Lastly, it is important to give students opportunities to share their voices. Not only does this help with engaging the students in reading and writing, but we are telling them that their voices matter (Stewart et al., 2018).

2.9 The context of writing

The context in which writing happens influences students' motivation for writing. It has been hypothesized that when a student feels uncomfortable due to believing that other people are thinking about them and how they are using language, this can heighten an *affective filter*, which can greatly diminish language acquisition by for example lowering self-image (Krashen, 1981). It is easy to see that this could tie into motivation as well, for example by self-efficacy. Thus, it is important, as Bruning and Horn (2000) propose, to provide a supportive context for writing. The context of writing defines the initial nature of the writing task and affects the writer's goals and decisions. The writing task itself provides much of the context and has motivational resources embedded in it, such as its perceived utility. Bruning and Horn (2000), similarly to Schunk et al. (2014) recommend making writing tasks as complex as possible without taking the students beyond their ability. If writing tasks take students beyond their ability, this can result in anxiety which would disrupt the writing

process, or if expectations are too low, there would be lack of motivation from boredom or apathy

The theory of the zone of proximal development is central to both motivation and learning. Vygotsky's theory on the zone of proximal development is especially relevant to the issue of context, as it can only be utilized fully in the context of competent peers or adults. The zone of proximal development is "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1979, p. 86). The zone of proximal development defines functions in a child which have not matured fully but are in the process of maturation. It is individual to each child, and thus cannot be surmised by for example simply considering how old the child is (Vygotsky, 1986).

Vygotsky saw motivation not as a prerequisite of learning, but as a product of it. The traditional view had been that in order to learn, children needed to be motivated for it, while Vygotsky claimed that in order to be motivated, children needed to learn. Thus, through learning in the zone of proximal development, the child will be motivated to engage in a developmental activity (Newman & Holzman, 2005). Social interaction is important for learning. One way to foster cognitive development, and thus the development of motivation, self-regulation and self-control, is through peer interaction. By having the students work in groups on tasks that are beyond the developmental level of some or all of them, the children could create a zone of proximal development for each other and expand their potential. This would lead to development of both cognitive and motivational functions (Newman & Holzman, 2005).

Psychological and affective states are also a major factor for influencing efficacy beliefs. Enhancing physical status, reducing stress and other negative emotions, as well as correctly interpreting bodily states are all things that can alter efficacy beliefs. However, preexisting negative efficacy beliefs can affect people's sensitivity to these states. Mood can also affect how events are interpreted, and through that, efficacy beliefs. It can also affect people's judgements of personal efficacy through memories, as a negative mood is more likely to bring forth thoughts of past failings, while a positive mood is likely to bring forth thoughts of success (Bandura, 1997).

Bruning and Horn (2000) outline some reasons for why negative feelings about writing can arise, and how to avoid these issues. The reasons can be as varied as there are writers, but for novices, writing may typically feel slow and full of errors. It can be an unexpectedly difficult process, unlike anything else, which little in their life has prepared them for. More experienced writers might get hypercritical about their work, resulting in anxiety and procrastination. To prevent negative emotions, one must eliminate unnecessary stress related to writing and create enjoyment. Positive reinforcement is a good way to achieve this. Breaking writing down into manageable pieces will also help, ensuring that students feel they are able to carry out the task of writing. Another way to counter negative attitudes is giving students a feeling of control, for example by giving them manageable writing tasks where they get to write about a subject that they are knowledgeable about. Lastly, working on eliminating negative self-talk and monitoring negative thought patterns can help students stay more positive toward writing, Bruning and Horn conclude (2000).

A supportive context for writing is also a focus in the *writing for pleasure* pedagogy, as outlined by Young (2019) in these principles:

Creating a community of writers: The classroom should feel like a writing workshop where children are seen as participants and have the ability to influence how they are taught and how they undertake writing.

Every child a writer: The teacher views all children as writers, holds high achievement expectations for them, and ensures that they understand the need to establish purposes and *audiences for all their writing*.

Reading, sharing and talking about writing: In the writing workshop, children have many opportunities for sharing and talking about their writing, and giving and receiving constructive criticism. They start to talk and think as writers. A positive and settled writing environment is best for this.

Reassuringly Consistent: Good classroom organization, such as readily available resources that clearly communicate strategies, and a set routine with for example a mini lesson, writing time, and class sharing being the most effective routine. A well-organized classroom ensures that children can work independently (Young, 2019).

2.10 Promoting long term motivation through vision

Another interesting view on motivation, which is rarely mentioned in a Norwegian educational context, is the method of vision. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009) state that envisioning the situation when you have succeeded at what you want and keeping that vision alive is one of the most powerful long-term motivators. This method utilizes the fact that brain activity is similar when a person is seeing something and when they are imagining something. This specificity separates the term vision from the term goal; a goal is simply an abstract idea of what one wants to achieve, while vision adds specific sensory elements to this idea. This method has been used by many successful people, for example Olympic athletes. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009) apply this idea of vision to the context of L2 learning and proposes that it can be especially useful in this context.

The first step is to create a vision, if there is not already one in place. This can be done by for example providing exposure to role models and regular tastes of desired future states. For writing, this could be as simple as reading something that they themselves would like to have written, or workshops with accomplished writers. One can also work more psychologically, by for example helping the students to create mental images through guidance. Once created, the next step is to work on strengthening the vision and keeping it strong, as well as transforming it into action. The vision can be strengthened by training the skill of visualization. Once the vision is vivid, one needs to make it realistic by looking at talent, obstacles and what the goal entails. It is not supposed to be fantasy, but a vision of a possible future self. Once the vision is substantial, it is time to transform the vision into action. A teacher can assist by individually guiding students toward their vision and providing models for relevant road maps to success. Teachers can also help them envision not only the goal, but the process as well. After this, it is a matter of keeping the vision alive through regular reminders, and other methods (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2009).

2.11 Conclusion of this chapter

This chapter has outlined some of the main theoretical points of writing and motivation for writing. The focus has been on defining writing and motivation and providing some insight into central theory on motivation for writing. The chapter has put a spotlight on the

importance placed on both learning to write and motivation in the Norwegian education system, as well as provided different views for what learning to write could mean, and concrete measures teachers can take to promote motivation for writing in students. As the following chapters show, teachers use these motivational methods to various degrees, but awareness and knowledge of motivational theory could be improved.

Chapter 3: Method

In this study I have been interested in finding out teachers' views on motivation, writing, and how they promote motivation for writing in English. Interviews appeared to be a suitable approach for investigating what teachers thought on a micro individual level. Through using qualitative interviews, I hope to shed light on the topic through knowledge that is representative not of a generalized population, but of an individual perspective.

This chapter introduces the methodological considerations and procedures that surrounded the process of collecting and analyzing qualitative interview data from three individual teachers. It also addresses questions regarding research quality and research ethics.

3.1 The scientific nature of interviews

Interviews are generally qualitative in nature and are influenced by several scientific disciplines. A characteristic of qualitative research is that it takes place in real-world settings, and the researcher attempts to observe the phenomenon of interest without manipulating it. Qualitative data describe, capture and communicate someone's experience of the world in their own words (Patton, 2002). Roulston (2014) states: "*Approaches to research that have substantially influenced how interview data are commonly analysed and interpreted include hermeneutics and phenomenology, and grounded theory, ethnographic, and narrative methods.*" (Roulston, 2014, p, 301). This study was be influenced in some way by all of these, though particularly phenomenology, and interviews were the method of choice. Here, some of the influences that were more prevalent in this study will be discussed.

Phenomenology was a large influence in how I approached this study, as I am interested in how certain people experience the phenomenon of motivation and encouraging motivation in relation to writing. Kvale and Brinkmann (2010) describe phenomenology as an approach that seeks to understand social phenomena from the perspective of the people acting within them, and to describe the world as those people see it. This is based on the understanding that true reality is what people sense to be true. The two goals I had in relation to exploring the phenomenon of motivation for writing was to discover the experiences of teachers and the

contexts of those experiences. From this I want to extrapolate commonalities and differences, and then to compare this narrative with existing theory.

The study is also influenced by hermeneutical approaches as I accept that there is not only one adequate interpretation of the data, and that interpretations are based on biases and subjectivity (Wernet, 2014). An interview, as I have done it, filters through several channels before the data is presented. The informant's experiences are filtered through their mind into words. These words are then recorded and filtered through the researchers' minds as they interpret them. That all of these steps in the process are unavoidably affected by individual biases should be taken into consideration when reading about the findings of this study.

The project was also influenced by narrative research. To some extent, storytelling is involved in all qualitative interview approaches. As Roulston (2014, p. 303) comments, "*...all research interviews involve both participants telling stories and researchers representing the stories of participants*". In this study, having informants tell stories about motivation and about writing was an explicit goal. Stories are a natural part of how humans think (Bruner, 1991), and was used as a means to get to specific examples and events from the teachers' lives.

Kvale and Brinkmann (2010) present two different views on how knowledge is generated during a research interview. One view is to regard the interviewer as a miner, digging at the informant's mind with questions to get to the knowledge within. This knowledge is then refined through analysis. In this view, the interview process is separate from the process of analysis. Another view is that of the interviewer as a traveler, collecting narratives which are interpreted as s/he wanders on. Here, interview and analysis are seen as interconnected phases in the generation of knowledge. In this study I tend towards the latter view. I was constantly thinking about the potential analysis of the data throughout the process and adjusted my conceptions continuously.

According to Kvale and Brinkmann, knowledge that is generated through interviews has seven distinct features. It is produced through social interaction, rather than just discovered, and based on relationships. It is conversation based, and reality can be seen as a negotiation between subjective experiences rather than an objective truth. The knowledge that is produced is contextual, and based on language, both oral and written in the case of transcription. Lastly,

interview knowledge is narrative and pragmatic. It is produced through the stories people tell, and focus is on whether this knowledge can be useful, rather than objectively true (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2010).

A qualitative interview's main benefits lie in the ability to discover how people experience the world, as well as the possible flexibility an interviewer has. One of the biggest advantages of a qualitative interview, if done properly, is the generation of nuanced and in-depth knowledge about the informant's perspective. The interviewer can hear what the informant is saying, grab on to certain details, and then dig deeper into the aspect of the knowledge they are after. It is also a flexible method which allows the interviewer to adapt to the situation depending on what the informant says.

One of the main drawbacks of a qualitative interview is that it is difficult to do right and requires certain skills. These skills include reading body language, keeping an open mind, asking the right kinds of questions, and framing questions in such a way that the interview strikes the right balance between formality and informality. The interviewer must be able to grasp the nuances at play, interpret the situation correctly, and act accordingly. All these skills are essential in order to make the informant feel comfortable and willing to share his or her views. Moreover, the interviewer must consider the fact that the two parties are not equals in the interview situation. The interviewer is the one deciding what they talk about, where the conversation goes, and when the conversation is over (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2010). According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2010), therefore, the research interview is a craft that takes a mixture of practice and study in order to master.

I am not an experienced interviewer. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2010), the research interview is a craft that takes a mixture of practice and study in order to grasp the nuances at play and interpret the situation correctly to act according to what the situation needs. The qualitative research interview can't be seen strictly as a method, if one defines method as a set of rules you follow to get the expected outcome. Each interview is different, and one set of rules could not apply to all interviews. However, all interviewers must start somewhere, and I studied the method beforehand to be as prepared as I can.

3.2 The procedure of this study

The informants were selected randomly with a base criterion in mind. I chose to interview Norwegian teachers of English, that either mainly or always teach English as a second or third language. Besides this criterion, the selections were made randomly, based on an existing network and availability.

I chose to use semi-structured interviews with an interview guide, since this approach seems to strike an appropriate balance between flexibility and preparation. I was then able to prepare certain questions and topics beforehand, but also to explore topics and narratives that would arise during the interview. I followed Kvale and Brinkmann's (2010) suggestions of specificity and using open questions. It is important in a qualitative interview with a phenomenological approach to focus on specificity. Questioning around specific events will allow for discovering concrete meanings, rather than more generalized beliefs. The use of open questions that are focused on the subject are also recommended, as well as being aware that answers can mean different things, and that this is not necessarily bad (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2010).

The interviews were conducted at the schools where the teachers worked, as that was the most practical option for them. They were recorded by means of an Olympus WS-853 digital voice recorder, which was recording continuously from the beginning to the end of each interview. The recording of the interviews started before we got into the topic, so that no data would be lost.

During the interviews, most of my focus was directed simply listening to the informants. I focused on letting the informants speak and followed up on any topics or threads I deemed interesting in regard to my research question. I attempted to keep my prior conceptualizations and assumptions about the topic bracketed, as is common to do in phenomenological research (Roulston, 2014).

Unfortunately, I was only able to conduct two of the interviews as planned. Due to extraordinary circumstances, the last interview could not be conducted in person. In consideration with the informant's preferences, the last interview was conducted in writing based on questions similar to the ones given to the other two informants. For

simplicity's sake, it will be referred to as an interview in the text, but it consisted of a set of written questions which were answered and returned in writing.

The data collection yielded approximately 90 minutes of sound recordings combined. The written interview consisted of six pages. After transcription, I was left with around 17,000 words of interview data.

Personal data protection was a priority during the entire process. Hence, the interviews were transferred directly from the recording device to One Drive, and then deleted from the device to minimize the chance of accidentally exposing them to someone. They were also transcribed directly from One Drive, rather than downloaded for the same reason, as securing personal data was deemed more important than convenience.

During transcription, the focus was on retaining meaning. As Roulston writes, there are no right or wrong ways to transcribe and translate interviews, but different methods open up for different kinds of analysis (Roulston, 2014). The interviews were transcribed in Norwegian at first, as close to the dialect and way they were spoken as possible, though some instances of repeated words were left out as well as repairs and false starts. Some notations were made of intonation, pauses and laughter, although not in every case they occurred. This choice was made because this study focuses on meaning rather than language and speaking patterns, and I did not judge meaning to be compromised by leaving out those features. Instances of small talk was also left out, as I did not consider it relevant.

The approaches to analyzing qualitative interview data varies among researchers, but generally involves an iterative process of reading, coding, reflection, writing, and rereading. Researchers will generally discern the key concepts concerning the topic of study, then read through the data again and again while reconsidering previous ideas about the topic (Roulston, 2014). A similar process took place in the present study, where the data was handled through various attempts to reorganize, classify, and categorize the informants' responses. Eventually, different key categories were formulated, and relevant quotes were then placed within these categories. Quotes were then connected based on themes and ideas, where some similar ideas were compared and differing views on a topic were contrasted. Once the quotes had been categorized, they were translated for use in the actual text. During translation, the quotes were shortened to fit better into the text, and instances of hesitation or

misspoken words were corrected. The quotes were also translated in a way that fits English grammar and syntax in order to ensure readability.

3.3 Research quality

3.3.1 Validity

Validity is concerned with whether a study investigates what it is claiming to investigate. In terms of interviews, the question becomes: Is the knowledge which is produced reflective of the phenomena the researcher wants to study? While validity often has been something to consider toward the end of a study, Kvale and Brinkmann (2010) suggest a more process-oriented control of validity to ensure validity throughout the entire process. They propose seven stages for checking the validity of an interview study, which I will use as a framework for discussing the internal validity of the present study.

Firstly, validity depends on the theoretical presumptions and how these logically lead into the research question. These were presented in the introduction of this thesis, and while some adaptations have been made during the process of writing this thesis, the core reasoning was present from the beginning. Secondly, planning to ensure good quality in the methods of the study is a way to ensure the validity of my interviews. I prepared myself for the interviews by researching the topic properly beforehand, and by constructing a well-thought-out interview guide. The interview guide was an important measure in order to ensure that I asked the right questions and focused on the important parts of the informant's narrative, all the while I kept the research question present in the back of my mind.

Validity also depends on the informant's believability and the quality of the interview itself. The choice of using three informants was made based on wanting an individual perspective. By delving deeper into a few perspectives, I hoped some interesting contrasts or similarities would arise, which could spur important discussions around the topic of this study. As for believability, all the informants were teachers with years of practical experience, but my own lack of competence as an interviewer probably affected the validity of this study more.

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2010), validity also ties in with issues of transcription and with counts as a valid transference of oral language to written language. As noted above, I stayed as close to the original phrasing and dialect as possible while transcribing, and my transcriptions could hence be considered valid.

In the process of analysis, validity depends on both whether the questions asked of the data are valid, and if the interpretations are logical. The analysis process was largely based on finding and interpreting statements which corresponded to the research question, and thus assumed to be logical. Kvale and Brinkmann's (2010) approach also includes a separate process of validation. Here, there must be a reflected assessment of which forms of validation are relevant for a particular study, and how they should be executed. For this study, what is deemed most relevant in terms of internal validity is the correspondence between the research question and the topics that were discussed in the interviews. While the interview questions were largely on topic, more attention could have been given to certain areas, and there could have been more coherence of talking points across interviews. Lastly, there is the question of reporting the findings, and if that report gives a valid description of the findings. The reports made here are of a selection of quotes from the interviews which seemed most relevant with regard to answering the research question and relating to the theory presented in chapter 2.

As for the validity of using an interview at all, this method was judged as the most valid one. Interviews are well suited for getting stories about what people experience, and why they think and act as they do when they are experiencing things. The interviewer can notice bits of information pertaining to the research question, and have the informant elaborate on those points, thus getting as deep an understanding as possible on these experiences as they relate to the research question. These opportunities would not be there in for example a survey, as there would be limited opportunities for follow-up questions and individual adaptation. One clear issue with the validity of the approach used in this study, it is that it could have been more thorough and extensive. Due to the scale and time frame of this study, the interviews were done in one session, with no other supplementary methods. Had the timeframe allowed, the study would have benefitted from having a period of observation, and perhaps follow-up interviews with both teachers and students. This would have allowed a deeper and more nuanced perspective.

External validity, or *generalizability*, refers to the extent to which the results of the study can be generalized to apply to other individuals or phenomena. The study counted only three randomly chosen informants that cannot be considered representative of teachers in general. However, this was not the intention of the study, which simply sought to examine the insider perspectives of some teachers on writing and motivation.

3.3.2 Reliability – Transparency, measures taken

Reliability in scientific research involves the question of whether a study can be reproduced with similar results. For interviews, one can think of this in the terms of if the informants would give the same answer to another interviewer. In qualitative interviews, reliability is concerned with believability and consistency, and can be affected by factors such as leading questions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2010).

There are several challenges involved in terms of ensuring reliability of qualitative interview data. The knowledge produced in these interviews is somewhat context specific, meaning it is influenced by the people who are interacting to create it, and the situation in which they are doing so. The interviewer can take certain measures to ensure that the knowledge they produce is as reliable as it can be given these limitations. These measures include avoiding leading questions; checking with informants after analyzing to see that nothing was misinterpreted; asking clarifying and critical questions during the interview; and being critical to one's own hypotheses and beliefs during the interview. Additionally, the use of sound recording to ensure that spoken word is stored and can be transcribed exactly how it was spoken later helps to ensure some reliability (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2010).

Transparency can also help ensure reliability and is important part of scientific accountability. One way this study enhances transparency is by providing quotes as close to the original as possible, without compromising readability. Additionally, assuming that interpretation is a function of one's perspective, accounting for predispositions of for example theory and methodology can be considered to raise transparency (Cornish, Gillespie, & Zittoun, 2014). Theoretical predispositions should be apparent from chapter 2 and as for methodological predispositions, the fact that I am new to interviewing has been accounted for.

3.4 Ethical considerations

When conducting a qualitative interview, there are ethical concerns to take into consideration at every stage. These concerns come into play when choosing a subject to research, when planning, during the interview, while transcribing and analyzing, and when presenting the findings. While ethical concerns are important to consider, Kvale and Brinkmann (2010) state that a researcher needs to be practical when dealing with ethics.

In a research project such as this, ethical problems exist not as some abstract thought problem, but as actual situations within a context. This project did not deal with any particularly sensitive data or information, but rather what teachers feel about a part of their job. Although this means there were fewer ethical challenges involved than in other types of research, this did not mean I could not take questions of research ethics into consideration.

In the process of choosing a subject and planning, ethical efforts were focused on formulating a relevant research question and getting permission to collect data through the proper channels. I did my best to make sure I provided a new and potentially valuable angle, though, it might be for others to decide how well I succeeded. I also cleared my project with NSD and made sure I covered the bases I needed to in order to achieve informed consent from the informants.

During the interviews, I made sure to focus on listening and keeping the informant's viewpoints in focus, without interjecting my own. I attempted to remain impartial and not show personal judgements of what they were saying, in order to not influence the data, while still showing enthusiasm and encouragement.

Various additional ethical concerns were also addressed. The transcribed and translated quotes were sent to the informants for verification, as it is important to make sure the intentions behind their statements were not misinterpreted, and that they were given the chance to correct potential misspoken words or phrases.

Chapter 4: Findings and discussion

This chapter presents the findings of the interviews seen in relation to existing theory on writing and motivation which was presented in chapter 2. Firstly, the teachers' thoughts on motivation are presented, before the chapter proceeds to explore the question of whether they find time to focus on motivation for writing. Then, the chapter discusses how the teachers promote motivation for writing. Lastly, the chapter wraps up by considering the limitations of motivational techniques and presenting experiences where they were not successful in motivating students.

4.1 What do teachers think of motivation?

The interviewed teachers all spoke of motivation in the context of school where they as teachers try to motivate students. However, they all view motivation from a different perspective: the perspective of mastery, the perspective of meaning, and the perhaps broader perspective of the will to complete something.

Emma: "Motivation is, for me anyway, to be able to do something. That you can almost do it, and then you see that you can do it if you just try a bit harder. That in itself is motivating."

Jakob: "Motivation is that a student sees a connection between what is done there and then, the work they have to put down, and what they can use this for."

Nora: "By 'motivation', I think of anything that can be said and done to ignite a spark of will to complete something."

There was not a uniform perspective on motivation, but rather it was shaped by personal knowledge and experiences. While Emma and Jakob thought of different specific aspects of motivational theory, Nora thought more about a definitional perspective. This might have been influenced by the fact that Nora's "interview" was in writing, while the other two were in person, thus she had more time to come up with an answer and had the option to self-edit.

When speaking of intrinsic motivation, all the teachers seemed to view it as something students might have, or might not, but almost like it was something independent from what happened at school and what they did as teachers.

Emma: “So the motivation the students have for writing is more about finishing the assignment, and solving it in a satisfactory way, not so much because they take any joy from it. Some do, but they tend to be governed by a sort of inner drive to do well.”

Nora: “...I think of extrinsic vs. Intrinsic motivation, and how fascinating it is that some seem to have an inner “drive” to do things without external stimuli... ...Of course, I would ideally want an intrinsic type of motivation, a strong desire to do the writing assignment/work on one’s own text so that it can become better. This must be the ideal type.”

Jakob: “So, I think intrinsic motivation is a little, sure, if a student is super psyched about football, they can easily write a text about football in English, but I think extrinsic motivation is important.”

At this point, I could have asked them follow-up questions to examine whether they thought intrinsic motivation could be cultivated. Established theory points to ways one can influence and improve intrinsic motivation in students, and the factors described by (Schunk et al., 2014) of challenge, control, curiosity and fantasy are relevant here, as is Young’s (2019) study of the writing for pleasure pedagogy, where collaboration and community were emphasized. Through creating a community for writing, and letting the students collaborate and discuss their writing with each other, a classroom culture where writing is viewed as important may be more likely. As outlined later, many of these factors were mentioned to some level by the teachers, so whether they are aware of it or not, they do contribute to students’ intrinsic motivation.

Their education as teachers were not very influential in how they thought of motivation. None of the teachers learned very much about motivation from their education, at least that they could remember, and Emma was the only one who could think of anything specific she learned about motivation from her education that influenced how she is as a teacher. The idea I got from all of them was that most of their knowledge of motivation and methods of motivating students came from experience as teachers. Thus, while they might not know a

broad spectrum of motivational theories, what they know is what works for them, and they are able to apply the knowledge that they have in real life situations.

Emma: “I took PPU (Practical Pedagogical Education) after 4 years, and the didactics part was thin, because it was the first year they did general professional PPU... ..there wasn’t much to get there... ..I did write a paper at the end of PPU... ..and the main theorists for that paper were Vygotsky and Bruner... ..Bruner is very oriented towards motivation, and Vygotsky has that proximal zone. And it’s possible that the reason I am still affected by this is because it suited me, but they are probably with me in what I am.”

Jakob: “I did that PPU version, where we take the subjects we enjoy first, and then build on that with practical pedagogical education... ..but I can’t remember learning about motivation through my teacher education, but I probably did, we can’t not have been through it. But I don’t remember now.”

Nora: “I have 4 years of teacher education, and it was of course a topic there, but sadly I don’t remember it that well. I was 18 when I started teacher education, so the theory, including that on motivation, felt very... theoretical. I didn’t have any experience as a teacher when I was studying, and I don’t think the theory felt very “useful” because I had nothing to relate it to.”

Jakob was perhaps the largest proponent of extrinsic kinds of motivation, mentioning several kinds of extrinsic rewards, such as praise or a positive message to their parents.

Jakob: “I think extrinsic motivation is important. I didn’t learn much about it from my education, but I can see that in practice extrinsic motivation works very well.”

However, extrinsic motivation was also prevalent in motivational methods mentioned by the other two teachers. For example, both Emma and Nora mentioned that good teacher-student relationships can be a factor in motivating students

4.2 Do they find time to focus on motivational aspects of learning to write?

Another question I was interested in was whether they ever had or took the time to do writing that was not meant to be assessed but was mainly for the sake of developing motivation for writing. While motivation can happen in assessment situations too, it could be hard to focus on motivational factors as well in those situations. With this I hoped to find out a little about how much they prioritize motivation for writing.

Emma: “The problem with the tasks we do in school is that they are mostly part of an assessment basis... ..you need maybe three assessment situations in oral and three in written every six months. And then there’s no room for very much motivationally oriented writing. And that influences everything.”

Jakob: “We are working toward national tests for the most part of the rest of the spring. How you read a text, how you find information in a text... ..so that is what we’ll use a lot of time for now. So, not much time for writing.”

The focus on tests and assessment in school meant that the teachers were having trouble finding room for motivationally focused writing. However, even as the focus lies in preparing students for exams or tests or making sure they have enough of an assessment basis, the teachers do find time for motivational measures. They also do mention some cases where they have students write for the sake of either enjoyment or self-development.

Nora: “They write a good deal of texts that are not assessed, but I think they did this more before. I experience that many of them view what is not handed in or assessed as something that they don’t have to do. However, I often do writing for the sake of writing in small groups, where the finished product doesn’t have any value except that it’s supposed to be fun to do... ..for example poems, I rarely assess the poems that the students write, but can get them to produce 8 poems each.”

Nora mentions here that when doing writing for the sake of writing, the finished product’s value is that it is fun to do. This seems to go against the theories on providing authentic writing tasks with an actual audience, however, it also might give the students freedom to

experiment with words and the writing process and enjoy it for what it is rather than worry about meeting certain expectations. This could be thought to promote a more positive emotional environment by eliminating unnecessary stresses around writing, as Bruning and Horn suggest.

Emma: “Yes, I have, but the goal may not have been joy of writing but might have been self-development. So, what I think is that I want you to get to know yourself better through this... ..I had them write a text that was personal, which I was not going to assess but that I would like to see, which was about a situation where they’d experienced the same... ..and it’s a sore subject, and I think it’s good if the students get to explore these without having to be assessed. Because I think it’s so personal, so it’s very hard to evaluate. Yes, that was nice and sentimental, four.”

The English curriculum in LK20 states that part of the purpose of learning English is for students to learn about themselves and their own identity. This can also contribute to a feeling that what they are writing is relevant to them. As the findings in Walker and Revelle’s (2018) study suggest, students enjoy writing texts about themselves and their own experiences.

Jakob: “Not all the things the students write are to be assessed. Then you’d work yourself to death... ..But when you do larger writing tasks, you have to choose some topics that you focus on within a year... ..Of course there is feedback then, where they give feedback to each other, or the teacher gives them two stars and a wish.”

Positive feedback could be viewed as a form of extrinsic motivation, where the students write because they want that feedback. In the case of students giving feedback to each other, the factor of having an audience and writing for someone other than the teacher might also influence motivation. Emma makes the following comment:

Emma: “So as a teacher, I work a lot with creating, or helping students create structure in their texts, because I believe that in itself can be a motivating factor. If you don’t have a good structure and a clear idea of where you’re going with the text you’re writing, then it’s hopeless.”

This is a way to create a sense of control for the students. If they feel that they know what they are doing, and are able to direct their text by themselves, they can feel more in control throughout the process of how the final result will look. This could promote intrinsic motivation.

Nora: “I try to make writing tasks which can (as mentioned before) ignite a spark which makes them want to go at the keyboard and get something down. I model everything, always, and often along with the students. If they for example are to write a fairy tale with genre features and depiction, I write something along with them first, on the SmartBoard. In such modelling sequences, I make sure to take all their input seriously, so that the model-text doesn’t become “perfect” and more a product of my own head than of theirs.”

Modeling is a way to promote vicarious experience and better self-efficacy, leading to more motivation. According to Bandura (1997), it is important to maximize the instructive function of modeling and take focus away from comparative evaluation, which for example could be achieved by including all of the students in the modeling sequence.

Regardless of the pressure of grading and testing, each of them did find time for writing which is not to be evaluated. The reasonings vary, as Emma did it more for the sake of self-exploration and self-development, while Nora did it to make writing fun and to play with language. Jakob works with younger students, where summative assessment is not such a big focus, and there is more feedback for the sake of progress.

4.3 How do they promote motivation for writing?

Here, I wanted to get specific examples of measures they take to motivate students, or factors that they have experienced working. I also wanted to have them elaborate on their views on what motivation is and what factors contribute to motivation beyond their previous definition.

What is interesting here is that there were some rather clear commonalities in their experiences. All the teachers have experienced that the choice of topic is one of the key motivators for students. If they are interested in the topic they are to write about, they will be

more motivated for writing. Jakob especially emphasized this point and connected it to the idea that what they are doing has to have meaning in relation to the students' own lives.

Nora: "What maybe motivates them a little is to write about something that can be of use to them directly (for example applications if they know they are about to apply for a summer job at the nursing home). In addition, they of course find it motivating to write about something within their field of interest, such as gaming, etc."

Jakob: "If you can't relate what we do to how it matters in relation to the students' own lives, then you might as well give up."

Emma: "Maybe these individual bigger projects and such, where you choose a subject, then you write about that subject, like a project with a topic question, and so on. And there they are mostly relatively motivated, because they've chosen it themselves."

Bruning and Horn (2000) stated that one of the factors upon which motivation for writing depends is the use of authentic writing tasks. This means having a genuine reason to write something, rather than just because you're told to. Such reasons could be communicating something that is relevant to their own lives or writing as a means to figure out their own thoughts on something they care about. This is further supported by Stewart, Walker and Revelle (2018), who found that students wanted to write about things that were immediately relevant to them, such as themselves, their own lives, or their own culture.

Emma also mentions having success with writing assignments that were very personal. She has examples where students wrote about a time when they chose the road less traveled (inspired by Robert Frost), or about their own dream, which seems to have been a success in terms of motivation. "Many of them wrote a lot on that one." This is also consistent with the results above.

Another common theme is having a good teacher-student relationship, which both Emma and Nora pointing that out as another key factor in motivation. While Jakob did not mention teacher-student relationships directly, he did state that the teacher's motivation and attitude towards writing will affect how motivated the students are, which suggests the importance of

having some sort of relationship there in order to have the students care what the teacher does or feels.

Emma: “So I think the most important tool one has as a teacher in the first place is that relationship. That they know that you want the best for them, that you like them, and that you want to do something for them to help them become better.”

Jakob: “They are very young, so I don’t think they have many thoughts about a lot of what we work with. A lot of it is completely new for them. So, then it’s my motivation for a topic that sets the mood.”

Nora: “And that motivation and learning is connected with relationships, good relationships can be motivation enough in itself (that’s why it’s important to build good teacher-student relationships).”

There are several lenses through which one can view the effect a good teacher-student relationship has on motivation. It could be a source of introjected regulation, in which this relationship gives students an external source for the feeling of ‘should’, or some form of guilt if they do not achieve what the teacher wishes for them. Additionally, mentoring relationships can have motivational impact on both parties (Schunk et al, 2014).

While many of the things the teachers said were commonalities, they also mentioned a few things that were unique to each of them. This does not mean that the other teachers do not use these methods, but at least that they were not the first things they thought of when talking about this topic. Emma pointed out that helping students achieve a good structure in their text could provide good motivation.

Emma: “So as a teacher, I work a lot with creating, or helping students create structure in their texts, because I believe that in itself can be a motivating factor. If you don’t have a good structure and a clear idea of where you’re going with the text you’re writing, then it’s hopeless.”

This could be linked to the feeling of mastery, as a good structure might make it easier to complete a text. It could also be contributing to a feeling of control, by helping the students

feel like they are in control of where the text is going, and that they know how they can affect their own results.

Jakob finds the use of a reward, for example in the form of a “kosetime”, helpful for motivation, and finds extrinsic motivation very helpful in general when it comes to school. As emphasized by Schunk et al (2014), extrinsic motivation has a definite place in schools, and is necessary for promoting desirable behavior.

Jakob: “In our class we have something we call “kosetime”. If they do a good job over a certain time period, they get a “kosetime”. Extrinsic motivation works very well. When it comes to writing, schoolwork in general, then I think extrinsic motivation is important. Extrinsic motivation is also like, praising the work that they do.”

Nora found the use of sentence starters, or story beginnings helpful for motivation. This seems to be connected with what Emma thought of with structure, as both could make it easier to start writing and complete a text, thus giving a sense of mastery.

Nora: “I’ve also experienced that they are motivated for writing if I have got good sentence starters, or the start of a story with a good “cliffhanger” that they are to complete.”

Another method that was emphasized by teachers was feedback. In the study on the writing for pleasure pedagogy, feedback was mentioned as important, and though teachers use both verbal and written feedback, research emphasizes the usefulness of live verbal feedback, which happens during the process instead of after the fact.

Emma stated that going around and helping students through live verbal feedback was one of her favorite parts of the job: “If the students are stuck, and you can help a little bit, and suddenly they can do it by themselves. And that motivates me a lot.”

Jakob: (It is motivating if...) “If they get feedback on their work... ..and recognition for what they’ve done. Either in the form of their parents reading it, or looking over it, or that it in some way is featured or praised by adults.”

The students in Walker and Revelle's study also stated that sharing their writing with someone else, for example their parents, gives them purpose. In addition, one of the key points in Young's writing for pleasure pedagogy is establishing an audience and a purpose for students' writing.

Another perspective to take on feedback in motivational contexts is to use it as a source of extrinsic motivation. In terms of the self-determination theory, this would be a form of external regulation. Students receive praise on something they did, so they are motivated to do it again so they can potentially receive more praise. There are of course other ways to use external regulation, as Jakob speaks about.

One could also use feedback in terms of motivation to work on self-efficacy.

Emma: "I write feedback for them. I use the criteria which are specified as high, low, and middle. Then I use a marker for each of the criteria, so that when they get their feedback, they can see, oh I'm all the way up on five and six on reflection, but my use of references is only a two. So, it becomes very clear for them, in a way, and I hope that will be motivating, because they see that it's not all bad. They are good at some things, less good at other things, and they can see clearly what they need to work on then. It's visual."

Self-efficacy is many ways centered around one's own awareness of one's abilities. Making it clear through the use of criteria divided into different areas of competence might help students get a realistic image of their own abilities and by making it clear how they could improve by listing specific skills, could aid them in building positive efficacy beliefs.

Nora's use of sentence starters and cliffhangers are other good methods to help bring the tasks down to a manageable level for students, by providing helpful writing tools that can help set the tone and spark the imagination to come up with ideas, which can be the tricky part for many students. Emma brings up another good way of making complex tasks feel like they are doable.

Emma: "...and then there are small deadlines all the way, where you have to turn in the task little by little and get feedback on it, so that the whole task isn't insurmountable."

Bruning and Horn (2000) suggested creating a positive emotional environment to counteract negative emotions and stresses towards writing as a way to promote motivation for writing. One of the ways to accomplish this that they mention is to break writing down to manageable pieces, like Emma describes. They also mention positive reinforcement as a way to prevent negative emotions, which can be given in the form of verbal feedback, for example.

There is a good deal of correlation between what the teachers think of motivation and what they say that they do to promote it, as well as what some of the motivational theory suggests. There might be several explanations for this. One explanation could be that their teaching practice is a result of what has worked for them, and that their perspectives on motivation come mainly from that experience. There could also be influence from motivational theories in their what they do as teachers, such as Emma with Vygotsky and Bruner, or even subconsciously if they learned theory, but do not remember it. Likely, it is a combination of factors or explanations.

4.4 Limitations & when motivation fails

Another question I asked two of the teachers was if they had any examples of instances where they tried a method to motivate students for writing, and it did not turn out as well as they had hoped or expected.

Jakob mentioned two examples of when he had thought the students would be motivated, but something got in the way of that motivation.

Jakob: “I thought getting to plan a trip to a strange country, experiencing new things, using the English language, and being independent and get to decide their own plans, I thought that would be enough to motivate them. But it wasn’t... ..They got stuck in small details that I hadn’t considered as important, but that they thought were hard. It was hard to use digital resources and read tables online. So, I felt that all the motivation I’d started the class with sort of ran away...”

When students meet challenges without having built up enough beliefs in their own ability to solve problems within a certain area, motivation can disappear quickly. Without positive

efficacy beliefs, they might not have the will to persevere through the difficult phase of figuring out how to for example use digital resources to plan travels, as Jakob mentioned. Bruning and Horn (2000) also briefly touched upon this problem, stating that if a task is beyond a student's ability, this can lead to anxiety, and hinder writing. However, they also state that one should make tasks as complex as possible, as a lack of challenge can lead to boredom and less motivation.

Nora did not mention a concrete situation but stated that "I always have a notion that movie/music/game-related tasks work well, which is why I am surprised at the students who don't get motivated at all by tasks related to these."

Jakob: "At the start of the year, I chose to make a cool task about Clash Royale {a mobile phone game}... ..and I thought this would be great, I found cool pictures from Clash Royale with known characters that the kids also used, made empty speech bubbles and informational scrolls next to them. They were supposed to figure out who this was. Instead of inventing a fictional person, what does this character like to do, what does this person say here. I was super psyched, and then we got there, and the students could barely string two words together in writing. A few could, but most of them 'how do you write 'play', or 'I want to'... ..and then the motivation was gone for the students."

This illustrates perhaps the many factors of motivation in play, and how you might have done some things right in order to motivate students, but one must also consider other motivational factors. It is therefore good to be aware of a wider perspective of motivational theory. In Jakob's case, both examples were instances where the task was too challenging for the students, and they did not feel like they could master it at all. If one is to think in terms of Bandura's theories, while mastery experiences can promote positive efficacy beliefs, not experiencing mastery of something can be detrimental to efficacy beliefs. In terms of Vygotsky's theory, one could say that the tasks were outside of the zone of proximal development, and thus not conducive to learning and motivation. In Nora's case as well, while the subject they are writing about might be interesting, there would be many other factors affecting student motivation, and if one is not consciously aware of those, they might contribute negatively to students' motivation for writing.

I also asked each of them if they felt that it is possible, and if they are able, to motivate every single student. I was interested to know how far they felt motivational methods could reach, and to know the perceived limitations of what one could do with these methods.

Nora: “To write, yes. But that is uninteresting, because everybody has to write, otherwise they don’t get graded in certain subjects... ..For some, this is what motivates... ..So, most can be “motivated” (forced) to write something... ..But it is not possible to motivate everyone to practice writing, or at least I have problems with that.”

Jakob: “No, no, we have twenty-nine students in both our classes... ..and often we’re alone in that class and have to teach. And you can’t reach everyone with the same task. You have to choose tasks that are so wide that everyone finds something they are interested in within that task then.”

Emma: “I can’t motivate everyone, that’s completely impossible. But I think through having a good relationship with my students, there are a couple that I might be able to get to, who I otherwise wouldn’t be able to. But if you don’t know what you want, no there are always someone who you can’t get to. And then it’s just like, you have to go and tell them that they at least have to finish it. So, it’s like eat your broccoli.”

What is interesting here is that they all have slightly different takes on “no, it can’t be done”. While Nora did say that she was able to motivate everyone to write, in the sense that they had to write to get assignments done and pass the class, motivating everyone to practice writing, and striving to get good was still seen as impossible. Emma seemed to share the view that you can get students to do their tasks, but it is impossible to actually get everyone motivated for writing. Jakob also found it impossible due to for example the sheer size of a class of students and the variety of individuals. So, while it is clear that while there are many techniques and methods for motivating students to write, the reality is that many simply have no interest and finding time to motivate everyone might not be within the capacity of the teacher within the parameters they are given.

The topic of limitations also came up. Factors that hinder or limit opportunities for motivationally focused writing, motivating tasks, and creative writing. Also on this topic the teachers contributed several different views:

Jakob: "...and many of them don't know the alphabet in English, many of them don't know the alphabet in Norwegian. So then writing in the subject is suddenly limited. And I think that's a shame, because I love writing. So, we work on basic sentences, where we for example make sentences out of the ten, twelve words we have on the weekly plan, or write short things about what they like to do, but other than that, there is much grammar learning, word learning, and basic spelling."

Emma: "The problem with the tasks we do in school is that they are mostly part of an assessment basis. And in English you have, if you choose English as a subject, you have to have both an oral and written grade basis. This means you need maybe three assessment situations in oral and three in written every six months... ...And then there's no room for very much motivationally oriented writing. Sadly. And that influences everything. So, the motivation the students have for writing is more about finishing the assignment, and solving it in a satisfactory way, not so much because they take any joy from it."

Jakob: "We are working toward national tests for the most part of the rest of the spring. How you read a text, how you find information in a text, what is a preposition, by the window, on the chair, under the bed. Because you have to move things around in a picture and stuff like that, so that is what we'll use a lot of time for now. So, not much time for writing."

Nora: "Motivation is, like I said, one of our most important tasks. A lot more important than before, because we have a generation of youths who are used to a digital life with repeated stimuli, and who maybe lack a "drive" for doing something that seems boring and doesn't have an immediate reward. As a teacher I wonder about the fact that we have teaching that is supposed to be practical, varied, challenging, and relevant, but that the students increasingly experience school life as something distanced from the life they live. We have never had more varied and exciting teaching, and students have never been more demotivated."

From this, we can gather that these teachers experience several potential limiting factors when it comes to consistently working on motivation for writing. Anything from students' competence to expectations from school and society to how the world works today.

Mercer and Dörnyei (2020) in fact suggest that focusing on *engagement* rather than motivation might be more well-suited for the twenty first century. Young people are bombarded with all kinds of different impulses and information, and while one might think that motivation equals success in school, this might no longer be the case. There are simply too many competing influences on a student's mind. Engagement is a multifaceted concept, containing both behavioral, cognitive, affective, and social aspects. In their book, they view engagement as always associated with external action, but also ideally combined with internal engagement. The concept of engagement can be said to both address motivation and the realization of that motivation. They also suggest that engagement is particularly effective in L2 acquisition.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Motivation and learning the skill of writing are both emphasized as important in the Norwegian curriculum and other government documents on education. However, little research has been done on what teachers know about motivation, what their experiences tell them, and how this knowledge guides their classroom practice. By investigating this on an individual level through interviews, this study found that the teachers largely rely on personal experience for guiding the methods they use for motivating students to write. Only one of them could even remember anything about motivation from their education. They each touch on several key points of motivational theory, such as engaging the students' interests and creating authentic writing tasks, building good teacher-student relationships and praising the students to provide extrinsic motivation, or promoting efficacy beliefs in students by setting them up for mastery experiences. However, the methods they use are only the tip of the iceberg of what is known about motivation for writing. The goal of this thesis is not to fault these teachers, as in my humble opinion they are all experienced, skilled teachers, who are good at what they do. The teacher must fulfill many roles and obligations and be able to relate to a multitude of factors every day, and as mentioned by the teachers, tests and exams provide a constant pressure to get students to perform. They do not feel like there is enough time to focus on motivational aspects of writing. With the implementation of a new curriculum comes new exam arrangements, including for the subject of English. After year 10, there will be one joint grade for written and oral performance in English, instead of two separate ones as is the case today. One may hope that this will give more room for teachers to practice motivational methods for writing and explore new ways of helping students feel joy in the writing process. As Emma said, with having to achieve a separate grade basis for oral and written English, not much time is left to focus on motivating students to write. Teachers must work within the educational system that they are given, however, so with the implementation of the new curriculum coming up, how things will change remains to be seen. It is possible that teachers will find a bit more freedom, and that good teachers could be able to use this freedom to implement some of the methods referenced in this study.

Part of being a good teacher is the will to constantly developing and learning. It is this will which this thesis seeks to direct in the productive direction of motivation for writing. It is such a central part of the school system and it deserves more attention. More research is needed to

further our knowledge of both how motivating students for writing is practiced in Norwegian schools, and how we could improve this practice by implementing some of the research which has already been carried out in the field.

References

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*, New York: W.H. Freeman
- Blikstad-Balas, M., Roe, A., & Klette, K. (2018). Opportunities to Write: An Exploration of Student Writing During Language Arts Lessons in Norwegian Lower Secondary Classrooms. *Written Communication*, 35(2), 119-154. doi:10.1177/0741088317751123
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21
- Bruning, R. Horn, C. (2000) Developing Motivation to Write. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 25-37, DOI: 10.1207/S15326985EP3501_4
- Cornish, F. Gillespie, A. Zittoun, T. (2014). *Collaborative Analysis of Qualitative Data*. In Flick, U. (ed.) (2014). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. (p. 79-93) London: SAGE Publications.
- Diskin, E. Winsvild, K. (2017). *Enter 9, Learner's Book*. Gyldendal Undervisning: Oslo
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The L2 Motivational Self System*. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. (p. 9-42). Retrieved from: <https://www.zoltandornyei.co.uk/chapters-in-edited-volumes>
- Edwards, E. Et. Al. (2017) *Explore 7, My Textbook*. Gyldendal Undervisning: Oslo
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. (2004). *A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing*. *College Composition and Communication*. 32(4), 365-387. DOI: 10.2307/356600
- Gilje, Ø, Ingulfsen, L. Dolonen, J.A. Furberg, A. Rasmussen, I. Kluge, A.....
- Granum, K. (2016). *Med ARK&APP – Bruk av læremidler og ressurser for læring på tvers av arbeidsformer*. Universitetet I Oslo Retrieved from: https://www.uv.uio.no/iped/forskning/prosjekter/ark-app/arkapp_syntese_endelig_til_trykk.pdf

Horverak, M. O. (2016). *English writing instruction in Norwegian upper secondary schools - a linguistic and genre-pedagogical perspective*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Agder, Oslo, Norway). Retrieved from: <https://uia.brage.unit.no/uia-xmlui/handle/11250/2458188>

Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. United Kingdom: Pearson Education Limited.

Ivanič, R. (2004). Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write. *Language and Education*, 18(3), 220-245. doi:10.1080/09500780408666877

Kvale, S. Brinkmann, S. (2010). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk

Lund, R.E. (2014). *Writing in EFL teachers' education*. Acta Didactica Norge, 8(1). Art. 1

Lund, R. E. & Villanueva, M. C. (2018). Writing in English. In: Bøhn, H., Dypedahl, M. & Myklevold, G-A. (Eds). *Teaching and Learning English*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm akademisk.

Manchón, R. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. (p. 1-10) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.zoltandornyei.co.uk/books>

Newman, F. Holzman, L. (2005). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist*. Routledge: New York

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. [Udir] (2013). *English curriculum*. [Læreplan i Engelsk] Retrieved from: <https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03>

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. [Udir] (2019). *English curriculum*. [Læreplan i Engelsk]. Retrieved from: <https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04>

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. [Udir] (2017) Overarching part – values and principles for base education. [*Overordnet del – verdier og prinsipper for grunnopplæringen*], retrieved from: <https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/>

NOU 2015: 8 (2015). *Fremtidens skole — Fornyelse av fag og kompetanser*. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2015-8/id2417001/>

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Olson, D.R. (2020). Writing. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/writing>

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. USA: SAGE Publications.

Roulston, K. (2014). *Analysing Interviews*. In Flick, U. (ed.) (2014). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. (p. 297-312) London: SAGE Publications.

Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Boston: Pearson.

Simensen, A.M. (2014). Skolefaget engelsk. Fra britisk engelsk til mange slags ”engelsker”– og veien videre, *Acta Didactica Norge*. 8(2). Art. 15 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.1138>

Stewart, M. Walker, K. Revelle, C. (2018). Learning from Students: What, Why, and How Adolescent English Learners Want to Read and Write. *Texas Journal of Literacy Education* | 6(1) 23-40 Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=stewart+walker+revelle&id=EJ1183970>

Vygotsky, L.S. (1979). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press: London.

Vygotsky, L.S (1986). *Thought and Language*. The MIT Press: London.

Wernet, A. (2014) *Hermeneutics and Objective Hermeneutics*. In Flick, U. (ed.) (2014). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. (p. 234-246) London: SAGE Publications.

Young, R., (2019) *What is it Writing For Pleasure teachers do that makes the difference?* The Goldsmiths' Company & The University Of Sussex: UK Retrieved from:
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED598609.pdf>

Ørevik, S. (2018). *Mapping the text culture of the subject of English Genres and text types in national exams and published learning materials*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway) Retrieved from: <https://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/19266>

