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Abstract

My study delves into the English as a foreign language (EFL) reading identities of 20 Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) undergraduates and their experiences of EFL reading interest in class. My project initially started by designing and conducting an intervention that consisted of the use of extracts of literature-to-film adaptations of 2 short stories in 2 consecutive, routine EFL extensive reading (ER) sessions at a university in Chile. Participants were assigned to either join a film or no-film group; only the former watched these extracts before reading the source, written texts in class. I realised that participants’ reading practices and interest to read in English were rooted in their identities as EFL readers. For this reason, my project also delves into EFL reading identity, namely self-efficacy, self-perception, self-esteem, and motivations for reading in English to get a deeper understanding of their general EFL reading practices, as well as behaviour in the intervention.

This study followed a qualitative research design, employing both qualitative and descriptive quantifiable data. A multilayered data analysis approach was employed for answering the research questions (RQs), including descriptive statistics, thematic, narrative, and discourse analyses. I argue that there is an interconnection between EFL reading identity and behaviour in their general EFL reading practices, nevertheless only self-efficacy seems to correlate to EFL reading behaviour in the intervention. I illustrate the connection between EFL reading identity and behaviour by means of an EFL reading tree. The roots represent the influence of widespread beliefs about English in Chile and preconceptions of reading, the stem represents their EFL reading personae, and the top represents their reading behaviour. I argue that literature-to-film adaptations do not show significant differences to written, short descriptions of the texts in relation to participants’ reading interest in class. It was found that textual, psychological, and cognitive factors, such as imagination, are more influential in their reading behaviour.
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Chapter I: Introduction

This introduction outlines my doctoral study, which delves primarily into reading interest in English as a foreign language (EFL) among teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) undergraduates in Chile. My project consists of examining their English as EFL reading identities, i.e., self-concepts, self-esteem, and self-efficacy, to examine potential links between EFL reading identity and reading behaviour (i.e., experiences of reading interest) during 2 consecutive, and routine, EFL extensive reading (ER) sessions. In this intervention, 1 group of participants was exposed to written descriptions of 2 short stories, and another group to literature-to-film adaptations of such stories before them reading the written, source texts. Literature-to-film adaptations were used as a pedagogical tool to enhance their reading interest to read in class.

My study hence aims to a) examine and discuss potential benefits of employing literature-to-film adaptations in the EFL classroom in enhancing reading interest and b) examine and discuss potential connections between EFL reading identity and reading behaviour. In this chapter, I describe the motivations behind my study. In chapter II, I present a narrative literature review, where I critically explore the existing body of literature concerning English Language Teaching (ELT) in Chile and Latin America., chapter II also explores theories and interconnection between first (L1) and second language (L2) reading, theories concerning reading for pleasure and the psychology of reading, including reader-response theories, theories around interest, engagement, and motivation in foreign language (FL) reading. Lastly, it explores literature on multimodality in FL reading, precisely the use of literature-to-film adaptations. In chapter III, I describe my methods; I describe my philosophical and theoretical position and outline the rationale of my project and each one of my methodological decisions, including research design, intervention, data collection and
analysis. In Chapter IV, V, VI and VII, I present my data and discuss my findings relevant to my research questions. Lastly, in chapter VIII, I present my concluding thoughts.

I. An overview of my study

My project is a qualitative study which investigates EFL reading identities and experiences of EFL reading interest among 2 groups of TEFL undergraduates at a prestigious and large university in Chile. It was designed in 2020 and conducted in October 2021 via Zoom, due to restrictions concerning Covid-19 pandemic. My study comprises an intervention which consisted of 2 ER sessions with students who were undertaking an undergraduate degree in TEFL. The students who volunteered to participate were allocated in either a film or no-film group, without previous notice, and without any previous information about the texts and/or literature-to-film adaptations used in each session.

My study was initially designed to focus on participants’ experiences of EFL reading interest in 2 consecutive ER sessions. Nevertheless, my findings suggested their EFL reading practices and behaviours were highly related to their EFL reading identities. Consequently, my study also included the investigation of their EFL reading identities, including their self-concepts, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and motivations for reading in English.

After being granted ethical approval by the Department of Education at The University of York in February 2021, I conducted my intervention in October 2021, and due to the restrictions associated to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, this was conducted online. For this study, I designed the lesson plans for each session, and selected the materials to be used in each, i.e., 2 short stories and scenes of their literature-to-film adaptations. To avoid conflict of bias, I invited 2 qualified TEFL teachers to deliver the sessions. My role in each of the sessions was minimal, as I only intervened to aid students when needed help in filling in the questionnaires. Further details on methods are described in chapter III.
Before the intervention took place, I invited students from both groups to give consent to participate in the study, and I administered a questionnaire to investigate participants’ self-efficacies in reading in English. While in the intervention, I administered another questionnaire in each reading session right before participants were asked to read each story, and another questionnaire once the intervention was completed. These 2 last questionnaires helped me gather information about their general thoughts about the intervention, i.e., class dynamics, for example, their thoughts about the short stories, their responses to them, as well as their experiences of interest to read in the intervention. Once the study was finished, all participants were also invited to take part in follow-up focus group interviews to gather richer data in relation to their EFL reading personae and their reading experiences in the intervention. Lastly, I analysed my data descriptively by employing descriptive statistics, and different layers or approaches to qualitative data analysis to thoroughly address my following research questions (RQs).

II. Research questions:

RQ.1. How do TEFL undergraduates construct their identities as EFL readers?

RQ.2. What are their motivations to read in English, including their EFL reading engagement and interest?

RQ.3. What do these students self-report in relation to their experiences of reading interest in the intervention?

RQ.3.1 How do their interest vary, if at all, when extracts of a literature-to-film adaptation of the EFL text is proposed?

RQ.4. What is the connection, if at all, between participants’ EFL reading identities and their EFL reading behaviour in the intervention?
III. The motives for my project

My project was motivated by both personal and academic reasons. I am a Chilean TEFL teacher, a former TEFL undergraduate in Chile, and a person who regards pleasurable reading in English an extremely important dimension in her life. Hence, my research has its roots in my biography, interest in the field of EFL and my intention to contribute to the research of ER and reading interest in a FL.

In 2013, I became a qualified TEFL teacher in my home country, Chile. I have had the chance to support EFL learners in their development of English language skills in primary, secondary, and tertiary education in Chile. Since 2017, I have been a lecturer in TEFL in 2 TEFL undergraduate programmes at 2 prestigious universities in Chile, taking the responsibility of guiding, supporting EFL pre-service teachers in their acquisition and development of EFL and ELT skills for their future practice as EFL teachers.

During my years of teaching experience, I could witness the challenges my students faced in their language acquisition journeys— and also having been in that journey myself— I empathised with them. In Chile, due to the widespread belief that English is a language that opens doors to new and enriching opportunities in connection to social and economic advancement in the modern world (Ferguson, 2006; Park, 2011; Phillipson, 2009, Tollefson, 1991), our practice as TEFL teachers has been generally understood as guides in students’ language journeys to become proficient speakers, listeners, writers, and readers. Consequently, TEFL programmes in Chile give significant importance to the development of advanced levels of proficiency in the 4 strands of English language, development of knowledge of linguistics domains, such as grammar and phonetics, and pedagogical content knowledge (Martin & Rosas-Maldonado, 2019). As reported by Barahona (2020) in her study about how 3 pre-service teachers developed and enacted their pedagogical responsibility
while doing their teaching practicum in secondary schools in Chile, a lack of awareness in relation to the pedagogical responsibility that pre-service teachers have as agents of change was observed. Similar findings are reported in Barahona and Ibaceta-Quijanes’s study (2022), which examines 7 Chilean pre-service teachers’ discourses in connection to their sense of pedagogical responsibility and social justice in their roles as educators. This study reinforces the argument that there is an urgent need to educate pre-service teachers in their roles to promote equity in Chile. Precisely in TEFL, developing a sense of social justice in teachers would relate to their awareness of the relevance of assisting language learners in their development of literacy skills, not only in L1 but also in L2, for individuals’ positive development in society, including their academic achievement, access to employment opportunities, financial development, while considering their motivations and interest to succeed in the global world.

In relation to reading in EFL, this is predominantly targeted intensively through the development of skills and strategies for comprehension. Presumably due to the approach of instruction, I recurrently witnessed learners being reluctant to participate and engage in reading sessions and having very low predisposition to read voluntarily at home. As an advocate of the importance of motivation for improving reading skills and of the promotion of reading enjoyment, I attempted to build reading habits among my students inside and outside the classroom, nevertheless most of the time, with little success. My positionality as Chilean and TEFL teacher allowed me to examine my participants’ experiences critically, as I went through a similar journey vis-à-vis language learning, in connection to the socio-cultural influences of English as a lingua franca (LF) in Chile, where English is a FL (Kashru, 1988).

My motives to bring this project alive also lie in the fact that reading for pleasure is generally conceived, and thus mostly explored, in L1. Reading for pleasure has become a topic of growing interest due to its relevance in bringing significant benefits for both
educational purposes and personal development (Clark and Rumbold, 2006). Numerous studies have demonstrated that children who read for pleasure develop empathy, self-confidence, and positive attitudes to reading, as well as stronger writing, reading and mathematical skills (UK Department of Education, Education Standards Research Team, 2012). Hence, vast and growing research in the topic have focused on setting up interventions to investigate ways to build reading habits among children and adolescents in L1, however, little attention has been given to reading for pleasure in FL among adult EFL learners.

The originality of my work is rooted in its novelty, and in my curiosity to investigate a particular group of participants: TEFL undergraduates who have chosen EFL teaching as a profession in Chile, who have decided to devote an important dimension of their lives to the instruction of English, and also to the cultivation of reading habits and practices among EFL learners. Hence, it becomes extremely necessary and interesting to investigate both the reading identities of future TEFL teachers, their motivations to read in this language and their experiences of interest to read extensively in FL in an academic setting, which reflects the predominant situation of many other local and international contexts where English is taught as a FL and where reading is approached intensively.

With my doctoral project, I intend to bring up findings, reflections, and suggestions on the relevance of reading motivation, particularly interest, as a propeller for L2 and FL literacy by exploring the use of literature-to-film adaptations as a pedagogical tool to enhance the experience of reading interest of EFL learners in EFL extensive reading sessions. Therefore, I decided to focus on and delve into the experiences of reading interest from 2 groups of Chilean TEFL undergraduates by systematically examining their reports from different angles to aim at deep and rich understanding of reading interest and identity.

Chapter II: Literature Review
My study asks questions in connection to identity, reading in EFL, language ideology, reading for pleasure, the act of reading and multimodality, and to the interconnection between EFL reading identity and EFL reading behaviour. In this chapter, I examine, synthesise, and critically discuss the body of literature that guides my RQs and data analysis.

My literature review starts by looking at the context of my study. I look at ELT in Chile and South America, and I examine the history of ELT and English language learning (ELL) and the way this has influenced the public speech and discourse about the ELL in the region. From the context of my study, I move on to reading. I delve into the characteristics of L1 and L2 reading, their similarities and differences, as well as reading in ELT and approaches to reading instruction.

A key aspect of my study is reading for pleasure. In this chapter, I also discuss what is understood by reading and pleasure, and I delve into reader-response theories. Additionally, I give attention to the psychology of reading, examining theories on motivation and motivational variables, such as engagement, interest, curiosity, and habits. As another important aspect of my study is EFL reading identity, in this chapter I also explore existing literature related to a reader’s identity, such as self-efficacy, self-conception, and self-esteem. Lastly, I look at multimodality and the use of literature-to-film adaptations in FL education.

I. English language teaching (ELT) in Chile and South America

South America is a continent that comprises twelve countries and due to the historical relationship with Spain, Spanish is the first official language in 9 of these countries. English did not occupy any historical role in the continent before the XIX century. Hence, in Kachru’s terms, South America belongs to the ‘expanding circle’ (1985). This means that the status of English is mostly related to its instrumental use for international communication,
mostly related to the interest South American countries have in establishing economic relations with other continents.

Due to the predominance of English in the region, people have a generally positive attitude towards English. They acknowledge the importance and benefit of learning it for the labour market and for the development of nations; however, there is also the counterargument that English is detrimental for minority languages and cultures in the region (Rajagopalan, 2009). This ambivalence originates from the role that English has played in recent years in South America and from the predominant role of the US in the continent after the Second World War, making this language the number one FL in South America (Rajagopalan, 2009).

ELT in South America has an extensive history. Specifically in the Chilean context, the presence of English has been significant, and it has been given an important place in education and economy. The presence of the English language in Chile can be traced back to the 19th century, when British immigrants established economic actions with Chile, and who became more influential in the 20th century, when they established a settlement in north Chile for the exploitation of nitrate (Barahona, 2015). English since then has become very influential, even in aspects seen in today’s variation of Chilean Spanish, which has adopted to expand the lexicon and to replace nouns or verbs, for example.

English has become a mandatory subject in schools, and in many South American countries, especially Chile, English has mainly been targeted to develop communicative skills, not only to permit citizens to be competent in the global market, but also to access information and knowledge, and to be hence able to interact with individuals in a multicultural society (Ministerio de Educación, 2014). In consequence, English in Chile has been highly demanded in all levels of education.
Due to the active influence of English in Chile, the instruction of English has undergone changes for allowing Chileans to interact successfully in this global world and be competent in the global market (Barahona, 2016). The instruction of English in schools in Chile has undergone some reforms for the purpose of accomplishing higher levels of performance to permit economic development in the region. These reforms include the creation of the programme ‘English Opens Doors’ in 2003 and the plan ‘English in English’ in 2019, which I detail in the following subsection.

The instruction of English in primary and secondary school levels has been the equal emphasis in the development of the four linguistic skills, aligned with the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR). Hence, governmental policies encourage the acquisition of English for the access of opportunities in relation to commerce, education, culture, and scientific exchange (Ministerio de Educación, 2019). Students’ learning outcomes in English are assessed every 2 years and measured by the application of a compulsory national standardised test known as SIMCE \(^2\) for both state and private schools.

a) **English ‘opens doors’: ELT and English language learning (ELL) in the Chilean context**

In Chile, English became a compulsory subject in schools in the late 1990s. Back then, the instruction of English emphasised the development of receptive skills, especially reading, to encourage the access to information. This was because approximately 90 per cent of the information, and 95 per cent of all academic literature that is available on the internet is in English (Castro, 2011). Consequently, the instruction and acquisition of comprehension strategies and the acquisition of vocabulary were prioritised in the classroom (Muñoz, 2010).

\(^2\) Sistema de Medición de Calidad de la Educación (National Evaluation System of Learning Capabilities)
Due to more recent curricular adjustments that relate to the adoption of the communicative-teaching approach as a method of instruction, the development of listening, speaking, and writing has been given equal importance in the curriculum. As schools look at achieving high levels of performance in the standardised test SIMCE, due to the monetary incentives provided by the Chilean Ministry of Education, little space and importance is given to the promotion of recreational reading in FL or to the application of teaching practices that would motivate pupils to read voluntarily in this language inside and outside the classroom.

In Chile, the national curriculum has given prominence to the instruction of English in both primary and secondary school levels. The Chilean Ministry of Education made educational reforms in 1996, 2009 and 2012, which made English the only compulsory FL module taught in the Chilean school system, starting from year 5 in primary school until year 12 in secondary school, requiring teachers to follow the communicative language-teaching approach as a method of instruction. From these implementations, English language teachers have been in high demand, resulting in vast offers of TEFL programmes at both public and private universities (Barahona, 2015).

The Chilean Ministry of Education in its attempt to improve levels of English in the country, introduced the programme ‘English Opens Doors’ in 2003. This programme looks at improving the quality of instruction of English, as well as at promoting the use of English in quotidian contexts outside school by allowing participants to communicate with peers, teachers, and native speakers of English in the target language (TL). Additionally, this programme also offers teacher-training development for TEFL teachers to improve their proficiency levels in the TL and teaching methods (Ormeño, 2009). Recently in 2019, ‘English in English’ was introduced; a plan part of the ‘English Opens Doors’ programme. This plan aims to improve the levels of language proficiency of students from year 5 to 6, and
support TEFL teachers in their pedagogical and methodological knowledge of ELT as well (Ministerio de Educación, 2020).

English teacher-training programmes in Chile have an average duration of 5 years and follow the principles of applied linguistics, i.e., TEFL programmes focus predominantly on students’ language acquisition, the understanding of language acquisition processes and linguistic domains, such Morphology, Syntax, Phonetics, Phonology, among others. Modules concerning the culture, literature, and history of English-speaking countries, as well as pedagogy and ELT methods (Barahona, 2015) are usually emphasised in the last 2 years of the programmes.

Academics in Chile have suggested that there is a ‘divorce between training in English linguistics and education’ in initial English language teacher education programmes (IELTEP) (Abraham & Farias, 2010, p. 113). This situation has led to suggestions that TEFL teachers in Chile lack methodological and pedagogical tools for teaching pupils, considering their needs to be citizens of the modern world (Abrahams & Farias, 2010). Consequently, the metaphorical description of English as the opening key to opportunities shows the influence of English as a LF in TEFL teachers’ personae, as they focus primarily on their skills to master the language, rather than on their ELT skills.

Despite the presence of English and the governmental efforts to make Chile a bilingual country, the levels of language proficiency are still very low among the population. It was disclosed by EF Education First, that Chile from 2012 to 2015 moved from ‘very low’ to ‘low’ (Editor, 2016). Consequently, the policies regarding ELL and ELT in Chile have been implemented mainly to make Chile a bilingual country, prioritising the development of language skills, over the benefits of bilingualism and appreciation of cultures.
i. The TEFL programme in the context of my study

My study takes place at a large and private university in Chile. Its TEFL programme aims to train TEFL teachers for primary and secondary school education in the country. As the majority of TEFL programmes in Chile, the modules that aim at the acquisition of language skills run in each semester for five academic years. Meaning-focused input skills (reading and listening) and meaning-focused output skills (writing and speaking) are equally developed in terms of hours destined to the instruction and performance. However, modules that aim to foster language skills are more emphasised during the first 2 academic years for students to accomplish an advanced level of English competence; that is, C1 or C2, following the CEFR.

Concerning EFL reading, students are encouraged to acquire and apply reading comprehension skills. Reading skills are cultivated by fostering active and analytical reading skills on familiar topics or topics related to the profession, as a means of accessing, learning, integrating, and restructuring existing and new knowledge. Therefore, the primordial focus is to strengthen strategic reading in the three following styles: skimming, scanning and intensive reading (IR).

TEFL programmes in Chile generally include 2 modules on literature and culture, mostly from the British Isles and The United States. According to a study by Bobkina and Dominguez (2014), students’ perceptions concerning literature modules in some TEFL programmes in Chile are negative, suggesting that these are tedious, demanding, and pointless. Similar to other TEFL programmes in the country, the programme at the host university offers 2 literature modules, starting in the third year, and the reading list generally belongs to canonical, classic literature (Bobkina & Dominguez, 2014). Considering the challenges of exploring canonical literary texts in a FL, reading strategies for text comprehension are targeted early in the degree. Also, and even though literature is an integral
component of TEFL curriculum and primarily seen as a tool for students to develop cultural awareness, literature is not seen as a chance to read extensively and respond to texts affectively. Reading in TEFL programmes is, hence, mostly limited to IR (Romero, 2016).

II. What is reading?

Defining reading can be a complex task (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). According to Gough and Hillinger (1980), reading— unlike listening and speaking — is not a natural act. Reading requires the acquisition of strategies for comprehension through constant exposure and it can be understood from mainly two perspectives— IR and extensive reading (ER)— comprising different purposes (Nation, 2009). IR relates to cognitive processes, such as decoding speech sounds, alphabetic systems, or associating meaning with orthography, which are developed strategically. Whereas ER perspective entails engaging with texts voluntarily to find enjoyment or pleasure in the act of reading. Nevertheless, these perspectives are complementary, as to find pleasure in reading, readers should be able to apply IR strategies for comprehension (Frankel et al., 2016).

Grabe and Stoller (2011) suggest that reading has multiple purposes; it can be useful for accessing information, for learning or for enjoyment. It hence involves a few principles that, according to Frankel et al. (2016), go beyond the understanding of reading as a process of meaning making from written texts (Anderson et al., 1985). Frankel et al. (2016) suggest that reading should be understood as a transactional activity (Rosenblatt, 1994), where the focus is on the text, the role the social context plays in the process of meaning-making, and on the reader, whose reading identity is also influential. Frankel et al.’s propose the following principles to reading: a) reading is constructive and a socially situated activity b) reading fluency relates to language processes and contexts c) reading is strategic and depends on disciplines, and d) reading depends on motivation and engagement.
These principles regard reading as a socially situated act, where the process of comprehension is informed by readers’ conception of the world and by the context where reading takes place. Consequently, meaning resides in both the reader and their understanding of the world and the text as a source of cultural and social experiences in a cultural transaction or dialogue. Nevertheless, for this transaction to happen, it is necessary to acquire reading strategies for fluency or automatism.

These strategies relate to decoding, word recognition, and prosody; the latter suggests that spoken language is key in enhancing the process of meaning making in both phrase and passage levels. Frankel et al. also suggest that reading depends on the discipline, and hence strategies readers find for comprehension are dependent on the type of text in relation to their structure, discourse patterns, and vocabulary specific to fields or disciplines. Lastly, reading is also an activity that needs motivation and engagement. This means that reading depends on personal aspects in relation to the reader’s identity; that is, their biographies, motivations, as well as beliefs about reading and themselves as readers. These aspects, Frankel and colleagues argue, contribute immensely to the practice of reading.

From the Frankel et al.’s work, I take the aforementioned principles as the foundation for my study, as I adopt the perspective of reading as dialogic practice, where meaning construction is transactional (Rosenblatt, 1994). Consequently, I explore some of these principles in the following subsections, and I expand on these principles in relation to (E)FL reading, reading for pleasure in FL, and reading instruction in EFL.

a) **Interconnection between L1 and L2/FL reading**

Reading comprehension can be understood as a ‘general cognitive skill’ (Walter, 2007, p. 16). A common reading comprehension model is Ann Morton Gernsbacher’s Structure Building Framework (1991), which explains some cognitive mechanisms that are involved in
comprehension. On the one hand, Gernsbacher points out that comprehension should be a coherent, mental representation of what is being comprehended. Therefore, this process is unconscious and automatic, and it involves ‘memory nodes’ (p. 218). These are activated when the comprehender receives linguistically comprehensible information, and when this information triggers existing knowledge of the outside world. This model, hence, suggests that reading comprehension does not only contemplate the reader’s level of language knowledge or skill proficiency, but also other aspects that are involved in conceptual meaning processes and representation. Susser and Robb (1990) agree and suggest that reading in ELT contexts should not only aim to promote a set of skills and strategies, but also to the fostering and construction of conceptual networks regarding cultural background through textual features and rhetorical devices.

Research on reading has primarily focused on L1, and investigations have revealed that reading comprehension in both L1 and FL is a complex process which entails decoding skills, use of strategies and activation of prior knowledge (Orellana, 2009). Very frequently, pupils who are fluent readers in their native language find difficulties when reading in a FL, not only when it comes to comprehension, but also when it relates to reading automaticity. This is because, even though L1 and FL reading entails similarities, they hold differences associated to linguistic differences, or levels of proximity, between the L1 and L2, for example, or with problems pertaining reading skills and subskills acquired through L1 reading practice. Cummins in 1978 proposed the developmental interdependence hypothesis, which states there is a common relationship between L1 and L2/FL reading. This hypothesis suggests that L1 reading provides the basic cognitive skills and mechanisms that are transferable in FL reading. Consequently, L2/FL reading performance depends on readers’ L1 reading skills, which in turn correlate to their reading practices in their native language (Alderson et al., 2015).
As L2/FL reading might be the result of the transfer of L1 reading skills, this means that if a reader struggles to read in a FL, this might be related to an insufficient development in L1 reading skills. From this, L2/FL reading performance can be improved by fostering reading performance in a native language in the first place. This point is supported by Cummins (1991), who claims that SL (second language) or L2 reading skills have their roots in L1 reading skills, despite the phonological, morphological, syntactic, orthographic, and semantic differences that might exist across languages (as cited in Keung & Ho, 2009). There are also universal aspects involved in reading, such as the cognitive processes associated with language conceptualisation and language knowledge (Day & Bamford, 1998) that are transferable to both L1 and FL reading as well. Consequently, learners who maintain an active reading behaviour in L1 might experience an easier reading process when encountering a text in FL.

Yorio (1971) provided an opposing view to Cummins’s, advocating that proficiency in FL reading depends on the level of language knowledge. Nonetheless, Walter (2007) demonstrated that regardless of how proficient and knowledgeable pupils might be in a FL, they are still likely to find difficulties in grasping meaning. Alderson (1984) agrees with Walter by arguing that text comprehension can still be achieved, even if learners do not possess knowledge of the FL system or when there are notoriously contrasting features between L1 and TL. For example, depending on the differences between languages, L1 could have positive or negative transfer effects in L2 or FL reading, for example where there are grammatical variations across languages, as these might cause problems in text processing.

An aspect that is also acknowledged to facilitate or detriment FL reading comprehension is true and false cognates, which are connected to the reader’s L1 mental lexicon. The identification of false and true cognates does not only influence lower-level processes, such as word recognition, but also to higher-level processes of comprehension, as in interpretation...
and inference (Grabe, 2008). Alderson also claims that learners’ vocabulary repertoire in L1 helps learners to amend their lack of linguistic competence in the FL, meaning that lexicon repertoire is fundamental for reading fluency.

i. **Reading in ELT: Intensive (IR) and extensive (ER) approaches**

Reading instruction in an L2 or FL classroom can be taught and/or learnt from the principles of mainly IR and ER. The former is an approach applied to increase language learners’ knowledge of the TL and to foster their reading strategies to improve reading comprehension skills (Norton, 2008). IR usually emphasises the instruction of strategies for comprehension, hence reading comprehension exercises are fundamental. In the language classroom, teachers generally use translation as a strategy to make sure learners understand what they read. They also enhance the exploration of language items, such as frequent grammatical structures or lexical items, or the examination of correspondences between sound and spelling, among others (Nation, 2008).

Concerning ER, this is widely associated with reading as ‘a source of learning and of enjoyment’ (Nation, 2009, p. 49). Nevertheless, learning in ER happens mostly incidentally, as readers do not focus on specific information or items, but on content or narratives. This means that ER is mostly associated with texts that, Palmer (1921) suggests, are ‘for ordinary real-world purposes of pleasure and information’ (Day & Bamford, 1998, p. 5). As ER encompasses an emphasis in the exploration of content rather than language, it has been mostly associated with the encouragement of reading habits and individual reading experiences (Day & Bamford, 1998).

The elements that characterise ER are reading frequency, reading enjoyment and language acquisition. According to Grabe (2008), high levels of reading frequency and enjoyment incite reading *flow* (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), which is a very beneficial process in the
acquisition of the TL. This is because flow, or absorption, seems to allow vocabulary acquisition, structural and semantic awareness, breath of background knowledge, the increase of reading comprehension skills, as well as self-efficacy and motivation. In turn, ‘materials, reading ability, attitudes, and sociocultural environment’ (Day & Bamford, 1998, p. 28) are key factors in the emergence of reading motivation, as they argue that materials and reading ability correlate to expectations of success in reading. I present a further account on reading motivation in section III, subsection c of this present chapter.

Selection of reading materials in L2 or FL is fundamental in ER, as it is a key factor in enhancing reading motivation and enjoyment. Additionally, evidence has suggested that students’ free choice of texts also promote reading motivation (Briggs & Walter, 2016). Selection of texts might be a challenge for many FL teachers, as deciding what texts to implement in a language class is a thoughtful process. For instance, texts should agree with students’ level of proficiency in the TL, as well as with the students’ cultural preferences. Consequently, deciding on what texts to use for promoting reading pleasure in a SL or FL class would imply clear linguistic criteria and vast cultural, and also generational, awareness to offer interesting texts for students (Day, 1994).

The principles of ER in the L2/FL classroom agree with Krashen’s Monitor theory (1985), which entails different theories in relation to second language acquisition (SLA). Krashen advocates that to progress in the acquisition of the TL, it is necessary to be exposed to comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). This input should be slightly more advanced than the learner’s current level of language proficiency for the learner to progress in the TL. This means if ER is employed in the EFL classroom as a means for developing language skills, texts should, on the one hand, be accessible or easily understood for learners, and have a degree of language or semantic complexity, on the other.
Language level, in turn, influences what Krashen advocates for the affective-filter hypothesis (Kirin et al., 2012) which, in ER, means that comprehensible input influences voluntary reading or enjoyment. Consequently, if a text does not agree with learners’ proficiency levels, pupils might experience frustration, as they would have then to face challenges that go beyond their capacities. Conversely, students who are invited to read and experience a text that is in accord to their linguistic levels, then there will be higher probabilities of reading enjoyment to occur (Day & Bamford, 1998). Their reading would not be interrupted by negative responses, such as frustration or discouragement, or the use of dictionaries.

Krashen’s affective-filter hypothesis entails the influence of affective factors, such as motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety, in language acquisition. This means that if affective factors are not optimal, learners are likely to struggle to comprehend texts and engage with these for pleasure. They might also avoid engaging with reading tasks, for example.

Day and Bamford claim that socio-cultural factors are also important in relation to reading motivation. EFL teachers are thus advised to create and promote safe and comforting environments for learners to develop their reading attitudes, inclinations, and skills. For this to happen, it is fundamental that the EFL classroom and its environment offer opportunities to perceive reading as a valuable activity. This will be key in positively developing learners’ self-concepts, self-esteem, and self-efficacy as readers of the TL tremendously.

Lastly, Day and Bamford (1998) offer some guidelines to successfully promote ER in the EFL or SL classroom. These guidelines are a) the purposes for reading should be determined by the learners’ interests b) it is advisable to invite students to experience reading without aiming at a specific objective, but for its own reward c) following Krashen’s views, it is recommendable to use of materials that are linguistically accessible for students, to limit the
use of dictionaries, and d) reading naturally entails a personal and silent experience; thus, language teachers should create a safe environment where students can read without pressure and to follow their own reading pace. In addition, teachers should encourage learners to read outside the classroom, as it is significant to enhance reading as a leisure activity, rather than a school duty or obligation.

In all, the application of ER in EFL classrooms depends not only on students’ levels of language competence and performance, but also on psychological and socioemotional factors, as well as the teachers’ awareness and expertise in deciding criteria for the selection of appropriate and interesting texts, and for enhancing positive attitudes in pupils when reading in L2/FL. It is also important to note that promoting out-of-class reading is fundamental to build up learners’ reading habits outside formal education. ER ultimately aims at experiencing enjoyment from a variety of texts and contexts for learners to discover by themselves what, when and where they like to read, so that they become life-long readers.

Finally, as linguistic competence can affect students’ self-concepts as readers negatively, it is also significant to cultivate L2/FL reading progressively, since becoming an advanced reader involves a long journey; therefore, learners should advance at their own pace and prevent them to experience challenging texts, especially in early stages, as frustration can result in a predominant negative attitude towards voluntary reading of literature (Day & Bamford, 1997).

III. What is reading for pleasure?

According to Nell (1988), reading for pleasure is a ludic activity that is pursued for relaxation. Optimal experience, or flow, is a concept which was coined by Csikszentmihalyi, which refers to ‘the optimal mental state of operation in which a person is fully immersed in the process of activity and thus forgets the flow of time, space, and even the thought of
him/herself” (1975, pp. 41-63). Although it is true that different types of texts can serve for ludic reading, such as magazines, newspapers or textbooks, fiction is mostly associated with pleasure reading. On the one hand, fiction can offer the most playful experience, and on the other, it is thought to readers enhance absorption (Nell, 1988; McQuillan & Conde, 1996).

According to Nell (1988), the process of ludic reading entails three stages: antecedents, ludic reading, and consequences. To experience reading as a form of play, the reader needs to choose an appropriate text, have the reading ability and a positive attitude towards reading (Nell, 1988; Minguez-López, Alfonso-Benlliure 2022). These antecedents will enhance a ludic reading experience. In this stage comprehension, attention and the overall reading experience will boost a pleasurable reading experience. The ludic action is hence mostly based on the interaction that emerges from the reader and the written word. Finally, the consequence of the ludic reading is the final stage which relates to the physiological and cognitive outcomes of reading for pleasure, which might result in a positive or negative inclination for reading.

As Frankel et al. (2016) suggest, reading is a social and cultural practice that can be developed in varied contexts and moments throughout our lives. As mentioned above, the action of reading can be regarded as a dynamic and transactional experience which can provide social and cultural exchanges between the reader and text. The literary theorist, Roland Barthes (1975) suggests that literature can offer transactional experiences by means of Plaisir or pleasure, or jouissance or bliss. Barthes hypothesised that if literature was genuinely transactional, then reading could establish a dynamic relationship by the text inviting the reader to experience pleasure or bliss and to respond to these encouragements.

Additionally, Barthes’s categorisation of reading experiences is based on what is familiar and strange for the reader. Barthes argues that plaisir can be regarded as pleasure by means
of the familiar; the reader’s experience becomes euphoric due to their agreement with the text’s ideas and conceptions. On the other hand, jouissance is the pleasure of the unfamiliar; experiences that are likely to provoke a confrontation between the readers’ views, cultural or psychological assumptions with the views conveyed by the text (1975; Kang & Eune, 2015). These two different categorisations of reading for pleasure imply a communicative and interactive act, which might entail social and cultural exchanges (Nodelman & Reimer, 2003).

Additionally, plaisir or jouissance might also entail a personal journey to the reader’s internal world. Part of the discussion around the concept of pleasure— and its relation to literature— lies in the fact that pleasure should be predominantly experienced by complete involvement or absorption in what is being read, as opposed to thought, which is a conscious action that would imply analysis and interpretation of meaning. Therefore, the experience of pleasure offered by narratives should not be a conscious action, but an experiential act of flow. Nodelman & Reimer (2003), nevertheless, suggest that pleasure can be experienced and turn it into a conscious action, as narratives have the power to make the reader think and consequently reflect on what they read, which in turn triggers pleasure. This means that the power to liberate the reader from existing assumptions (jouissance) by exerting critical reading would imply a thoughtful process that can stimulate a pleasant experience originated by the resulting tension between the readers’ assumptions and the views offered by the text.

a) Reading for pleasure in FL

Reading for pleasure has multiple benefits for both L1 and L2 acquisition mostly associated with cognitive and affective domains. Intrinsic motivation, or an individual’s ‘motivations, beliefs, and personal needs’ (Cox & Guthrie, 2001, p.117), is likely to ensure
reading for pleasure, which can induce and develop cognitive, linguistic, emotional, and social skills.

Cox and Guthrie (2001) claim that reading amplitude and frequency predict reading success, or a growth in levels of reading comprehension. Additionally, reading, especially in a FL, also benefits the cognitive and linguistic realms. Reading, fostered by intrinsic motivation, brings the advantages of increased vocabulary, reading fluency, automaticity in decoding and interpreting semantic meaning, the development of writing skills, accurate spelling, and a breadth of general knowledge (Grabe, 2008; Cox & Guthrie, 2001). These benefits are also likely to bring advantages pertaining to reading performance and attainment, nevertheless, benefits of pleasure reading also relate to the encouragement of affective and social skills, such as empathy, being this one of the most acknowledged qualities that readers acquire in ER (Bal and Veltkamp, 2013).

According to Bal & Veltkamp (2013), experiencing fictional narratives encourages affective domains, mainly empathy, as readers who are emotionally involved in narratives will develop personal insights. As a result, reading for pleasure in the FL classroom provides a valuable opportunity for students to evolve in their affective facets by responding to their own ideas, and by receiving, responding, and valuing other learners’ and teachers’ ideas and interpretations that emerge from their reading experience. Reyes-Torres (2015) and other scholars (Mediavilla, 2015; Wang, 2012) claim that pleasure reading also relates to the development of literary and creative skills, such as flexibility or ‘plasticity to adapt to alternative interpretations that move from a literal reading to a critical one’ (Mínguez-López, Alfonso-Beníliure 2022). On the other hand, reading literature would also enhance the characterisation of—or the ability to internalise, develop and value—cultural diversity, perception and multiple perspectives of the world, and social values depicted in narratives, as readers will refine their interpersonal sensitivity (Cox & Guthrie, 2001).
On the other hand, reading enjoyment also relates to individuals’ development of positive attitudes towards the efferent-aesthetic experience of the narrative (Sanacore, 2002). Readers who find pleasure in reading may be invited to get diverse responses and interrogate their views or assumptions (Rosenblatt, 1970). In the FL learning context, ideas may be formulated or reformulated from the reading experience and interaction with others. Social interaction can be induced through reading discussions; where the exchange of ideas will not only imply a suitable environment for language development, but also for the exploration, exchange, and expansion of interpretations of texts, which will aid readers’ critical thinking development and the spread of values among them, such as empathy, acceptance, and tolerance.

Flow is usually considered to be a facet of pleasure, and the act of reading is generally regarded as the main activity that provides this opportunity to be completely immersed in the written word (Towey, 2000). As fiction is generally associated with pleasure reading, since it is typically selected for and generally associated with, leisure time, they have the potentiality to hold readers’ attention easily. This happens especially when readers have the opportunity to select their own texts based on their needs, curiosity, knowledge or expertise.

It also important to note that to examine phenomena associated with reading for pleasure, it is necessary to define the generally conceived source of reading pleasure, i.e., literature. Scholars in literary linguistics such as Peter Stockwell have agreed that literature presents difficulties and complexities when defining and categorising it. Generally, descriptions of literature are based on different categorisations. On the one hand, literature can be described for its use of language, mostly regarded as literary, which implies creativity and imagination. This understanding agrees with formalist visions of literature, such as Roman Jakobson, who claims that ‘literariness’ is the core essence of any literary work (as cited in Caton, 1987), that is frequently associated with linguistic deviation and foregrounding, due to its unconventionality and conceptual prominence over factual language (Short, 1996). Literary
language is mostly associated with genres, such as poetry, prose, and drama, which in turn can be classified into different sub-genres; as sonnets, ballads, novels, or short stories (Stockwell, 2002; Carter, 1999).

Lastly, in my study, I refer to literature based on its genre categorisation, i.e., fiction, more precisely, short stories. Short stories are the most appropriate genre for the context of my study, as for time constraints, these are shorter and generally easier to comprehend, and consequently more likely for EFL learners to engage with, in comparison to poetry (Khatib, 2011), which are generally more challenging for EFL learners to read and comprehend in class.

b) The reader and the text: Theories on reader response

Theories on reader response focus primordially on the relationship between reader and text and how readers create meaning from the literary experience. One of the foremost exponents of the reader-response theory was the German literary scholar Wolfgang Iser, who propose a dialogical perspective between the reader and text. According to Iser, this connection emerges from a communicative realisation between the artistic pole (or author’s text) and the aesthetic pole (or the reader’s meaning-making process). Iser’s main argument (1978) is that a literary text is brought to life when the reader fills in gaps of indeterminacy, which are completed by the reader’s personal experiences, though guided by the text.

The reader’s action of filling in gaps depends on varied factors, such as time and space, experiences, background knowledge or even present desires, which will later be stored as part of the reader’s mental repertoire of experiences. Additionally, at the same time the text might also provoke changing views in the reader that might result in the readjustments or altering of existing experience by questioning assumptions. Consequently, the action of the reader permits a dialogic relationship between the reader and text.
The literary critic and semiotician, Umberto Eco, similarly acknowledges the relevance of the interaction that exists between the reader and the text in the literary experience. However, he posits that readers have the freedom of ‘deciding how to activate one or another of the textual levels’, i.e., narrative, and non-narrative texts, and in ‘choosing which codes to apply’, for example basic dictionary lexicon or rules of co-reference (Eco, 1979, p. 18). This means that a text is the result of the reader’s participation, precisely from the reader’s semantic-pragmatic creation, based on their linguistic competence, background knowledge and existing schemata for comprehending and interpreting the written word.

Wolfgang Iser (1978) also claims that the dynamic interaction between text and reader is triggered by the reader’s imagination and empathy, as a fictional world can be only perceived by the reader’s creative power. Iser claims that for the literary work ‘to exercise its effect’ (p.34), the ‘implied reader’ (p.35) should take the role of exploring and constructing the meaning of the different visions presented by the text and by his or her imagination and personal background. The notion of the implied reader suggests the author’s invitation to readers to take active participation in giving the text identity. Thus, the reading process is enriching and available only for those who are willing to participate, interact and fill in such gaps of indeterminacy.

As outlined earlier, Wolfgang Iser refers to cognitive processes involved in reading such as embodiment and activation of background knowledge or schemata. From the perspective of cognitive sciences, the conversation between text and reader is dependent on the contextual and linguistic cues that are available in the text, which provoke an activation of the reader’s semantic network or image schemas (Evans, 2007), which in turn derive from embodied experience. The linguistic and contextual elements present in a text might trigger different perceptions, as well as ‘beliefs, knowledge, memories, hopes, intentions, and imaginations’ (Stockwell, 2002, p. 136). This very last point is generally understood as
common ground, a notion that refers to the entirety of information available in the reader’s mental repertoire that is relevant for processing the information that is being read (Stockwell, 2002). As the reading process entails the activation of huge amounts of simultaneous information, context is pivotal in reading processing, as this allows the focus of only necessary background information, and the avoidance of substantial amounts of information which can become unmanageable for the reader to process.

Embodiment is significant in reading processing. This notion refers to the ongoing and dynamic interaction that individuals maintain with the outside world and to their perceptions that arise from this interaction to make sense of the world (Stockwell, 2009). ‘Construal of reality is likely to be mediated by the nature of our bodies’ (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 45).

This means that human experience is thus rooted in the interaction between the human body and the environment and conceptualised through language. Consequently, the interaction the reader maintains with a text is purely experiential, as reading enhances embodiment by the activation of image schemas or semantic networks. As earlier suggested, reader-response theory primarily examines the reader’s construction of meaning and their literary experience. Louise Rosenblatt, an advocate of the experiential reader response theory, claimed that affective and intellectual facets are closely involved in literary experience, since the experience that originates from the relationship between text and reader permits the reorganisation and readjustments of the reader’s thoughts and feelings about a literary work (1970). Rosenblatt adopted an experiential perspective which entails the emotional reaction of the reader towards the visions, characters, and occurrences in the fictional world. Consequently, meaning construal emerges from the reader’s action of taking information, making sense from the linguistic cues in the text and of reflecting on their personal responses.

Rosenblatt’s perspective suggests that meaning is contained neither in the reader nor in the text, as the reader’s initial expectations of a text may adjust depending on the linguistic signs
Consequently, construction of meaning is transactional; when a text is approached, the reader provides their assumptions, attitudes and expectations about the fictional world that is being read, which in turn are reflections of the reader’s embodied experience. The reader might bring personal attributions, memories of the past, or interests to the transaction, that according to Rosenblatt, are brought together in a ‘never-to-be-duplicated combination’ (1970, p. 30).

Rosenblatt also refers to the process of attention; a cognitive mechanism that starts operating when the transactional relationship between reader and text begins. Selective attention refers to the selection of specific information (the reader’s feelings, ideas, beliefs, or values that are activated in the reader’s mind) that is triggered by the textual cues. Selective attention might either entail cognitive or affective facets of meaning. Rosenblatt referred to the cognitive facet as efferent and aesthetic to the affective dimension. These two components are not mutually exclusive, conversely, they form a continuum. Readers may fall into the efferent or aesthetic dimensions of attention or both, depending on the reading purposes. Readers who focus on the efferent aspects of a text process information which can be later stored in the reader’s mental repertoire and subsequently remembered. However, the readers who are in the aesthetic stance and adopt an experiential attitude focus on the feelings and experiential responses to the text.

The dynamic relationship between the text and the reader is also discussed by the literary theorist Hans Robert Jauss (1970), who proposes a historical intertextual relation between readers and texts. His perspective entails the historical relation to the readers’ aesthetic reading experience, including their understanding and evaluation of works. He posits that the implications of intertextuality in readers’ reception of texts is relevant in their aesthetic response, as they compare and evaluate the texts they engage with in connection to their previous literary engagements. In consequence, the reading experience is dialogic, and it
involves the active participation of readers. The dialogic nature of literary responses, Jauss claims, derives from the idea that the literary reception is dynamic. The literary work, hence, does not have a fixed interpretation, but multiple ones as a result of readers' construction of past literary history. Their past engagements with ‘literary data’ (p. 9) build up a repertoire of experiences that contribute to the formation of readers’ ‘horizon of expectations’ (p. 13). This horizon becomes the ‘context of experience’, or assumptions, for readers’ aesthetic and interpretative response.

Considering the aforementioned visions within the theories of reader response, readers’ creation of meaning from the reading experience is purely individual and unique. Meaning-making processes and literary responses might evolve or change depending on the reader’s stage of life and literary experiences, and a literary text can enhance unique interpretations as a result of the reader’s current state during the reading transaction. Consequently, these visions of literary response acknowledge a creative role from the reader’s past.

As Rosenblatt suggests, the advantages of literary reading can only emerge from the reader’s creative power, hence the exploration of literary texts should by any means contemplate the author’s voice. Considering these perspectives to reading in language education, instruction of reading should provide opportunities for learners to take their own powers as interpretative agents and reflect on their emotional attitudes from their reading experience (Rosenblatt, 1970). As the French literary theorist Roland Barthes suggests in his well-known article ‘The Death of the Author’ (1977), the author loses its authority when the reading begins, since the reader is the one who provides meaning to the written words. The text is also ‘a multi-dimensional space’ (p. 146), or a ‘tissue of quotations’ (Barthes, 1977, p.146), since the text is never original, but an intertextual creation derived from a mixture of cultural perspectives. From these theories, thus, Barthes’s vision agrees with both Iser’s and Rosenblatt’s, suggesting that a reader’s interpretation is triggered by their selective attention,
which depends on their experiential embodiment and cultural relations with the outside world.

c) The psychology of reading

The ability to grasp meaning does not solely depend on cognitive mechanisms, but also on other psychological factors such as motivation and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Guthrie et al., 2000). Research suggests there is a close connection between motivation, self-efficacy, reading abilities and attainment in L1 and SL or FL (Wigfield et al., 2004; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). It has been reported that students who enjoy reading perform better than those who do not (Mol & Jolles, 2014). This means that students who perform negatively in reading in their L1 might not only be because of the limited opportunities to develop their reading skills, but also due to their low self-efficacy—negative self-evaluation of their reading abilities—(Bandura, 1977; Wigfield et al., 2004) or lack of enjoyment in their reading process.

Due to the close connection between L1 and L2/FL reading, as follows I discuss the interconnection between reading motivation and the evidence standardised tests have shown in relation to reading attainment or comprehension in ER and IR in L1. Due to the lack of standardised tests in L2/FL measuring and exploring reading from ER (i.e., IELTS or TOEFL), examining these findings might be useful to predict FL reading motivation and habits.

i. Reading motivation and attainment: Standardised tests in Europe and South America

Reading attainment is not exclusively related to intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy. It is also related to reading strategies, developed for automaticity of reading tactics and for effective main-idea comprehension skills. Despite the efforts to promote reading habits in
children and adolescents worldwide, international evidence suggests that pupils in some countries are reading less and finding reading less pleasurable. According to Krashen (1993), readers who read for pleasure incidentally develop and acquire language and comprehension skills that help them achieve ‘an acceptable level’ (p.85) in reading tests. Consequently, low levels of reading for pleasure might explain low levels of reading attainment in international standardised tests.

McGeown et al. (2015) suggest that reading motivation correlates to reading quality and proficiency. However, and according to PISA results, quality of reading performance could also be linked to reading habits (OCDE, 2010; Grabe, 2008; Artieda, 2017) and enjoyment (Artieda, 2017). Evidence regarding reading behaviour in European countries, such as Spain, suggests that low levels of reading habits could explain the low scores of reading attainment in this country and other member countries of the OECD (Vera Valencia, 2017), as PISA results in 2000, 2010 and 2018 have revealed. Krashen also suggests (1993) that reading voluntarily cannot ensure high levels of attainment. This might explain the case of British pupils who, in The Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) in 2017, were reported as proficient readers in comparison to the international median, but as readers who do not find enjoyment when reading independently (Twist et al., 2007).

In the South American context, similar efforts have been made for enhancing reading habits among the young population. Policies around the measurements of reading behaviour have been created, for example, the creation of CERLALC, an organization sponsored by the UNESCO, which supports Latin American countries in creating methodologies for exploring and measuring promotion of reading habits in schools. CERLALC results in 2012 disclosed
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that Argentina had the highest percentage of book reading activity, followed by Chile. Nevertheless, Chileans were the least to show enjoyment in reading.

The Chilean National Council of Culture and Arts\(^4\) (CNCA) in 2011 conducted a study which explored reading habits among Chileans between 9 and 65 years old. Results stated that 76% of Chileans prefer to watch television, listen to music or to browse the internet instead of reading a book, whereas only 6.7% of the population declared to read books as a frequent leisure activity. Additionally, among the people who participated in the study, 11% considered themselves as non-readers, 38% considered themselves as infrequent readers, and only 3% of the population reported themselves to be frequent readers.

The CNCA also reported that the internet might be influencing the levels of interest in book reading among Chileans. 90% of them have claimed to use the internet daily mainly for communication purposes, whereas only 44% for reading varied types of texts (Departamento de Economía, 2011). As suggested in this study, reading in print form texts is not a preferred activity among Chileans (Fundación La Fuente/ Adimark GFK. Chile y los libros. Santiago: Fundación La Fuente, 2010) and consequently, reading motivation might seem to be a paramount factor in explaining low levels of reading quality in Spanish.

It is important to note that, studies investigating reading habits and enjoyment mainly disclose levels of reading motivation and enjoyment in connection to reading habits. For example, studies such as the one conducted by the CNCA refer to as ‘engaged’ or non-engaged’ readers in connection to their reading habits and practices. Nevertheless, reading habits might not necessarily be the only factor influencing frequency of reading or general reading practices. It is important to raise awareness of the boundaries of such conceptions,

\(^4\) Consejo Nacional de la Cultura y las Artes (The National Association for the Arts and Culture)
especially among participants, to aim to an in-depth understanding of reading motivation and enjoyment.

This point is particularly useful for research in reading for pleasure. For example, findings concerning self-evaluations or descriptions as readers in connection to readers’ motivation might entail participants’ views concerning the understanding of what reading is and reading identity, which might vary from reader to reader. For this reason, it is necessary to bring consensus of key concepts, such as what reading means or what a good reader is like, for example, as well as to bring awareness of the complexity of these concepts to aim at more valid findings and generalisations. Additionally, this point is also helpful for research in reading for pleasure in L2 or FL reading. It is important to delineate the boundaries of visions concerning L1 and L2/FL reading, as descriptions of reading practices and evaluations of these might be done from how reading is understood in L1, which might differ from L2 or FL reading.

Similarly, delineating what practices are regarded as reading can help to understand reading motivation deeper. For example, if reading printed, written texts is considered as the ‘expected’ reading practice, participants might not consider, and hence not disclose, other reading practices such as reading online blogs, for example (McGeown et al., 2015). Evidence has shown the increase of digital media for mostly online communication. For this reason, awareness of what literacy practices involve is fundamental (Clark, 2006; Pitcher et al., 2007). A breath of research scope might be necessary for the conceptualisation of literacy practices and experiences individuals maintain in this digital era and for the understanding of the existing relationships among reading motivation, engagement, habits and reading skills.

ii. Motivation and motivational variables: Interest, engagement, and reading habits
Motivation has been generally described as a driving force, energy, goal, and sustained action. Action is a manifestation of motivation, which should be understood as a human behaviour which encompasses simultaneous emotional considerations, ‘attention, and goals’ (Skinner et al., 2009, p. 225.). Therefore, motivation, as Schunk et al. claim, is a driving and internal force, rather than a result of a process (as cited in Unrau & Quirk, 2014). Motivation is what triggers observable actions, which respond to private thoughts, sets of beliefs and emotions.

Despite the varied definitions of motivation, scholars who have researched motivation in educational settings have agreed that this concept entails some core characteristics: motivation is an internal process that comprises multiple thoughts, self-beliefs, perceptions, goals, and emotions. This driving energy also triggers and inspires actions which are likely to result in future—and sustained—motivation. Even though that durability of actions is a feature of motivation, this facet can change over time; therefore, motivation is also dynamic, since ‘its direction, magnitude, and quality may vary moment by moment’ (Unrau & Quirk, 2014, p. 263). Consequently, motivation has been a research area of great interest, especially for educators who find continuous difficulties in triggering long-term motivation in students (Hidi & Renninger, 2006).

Despite the general view of motivation as an internal force, there are also fundamental differences on how this notion has been formulated in the last decades. There are researchers who consider motivation and its manifestations as a cognitive construct, whereas others understand it as a result of sociocultural factors. Gardner and Lambert’s (1959) research in SLA contributed significantly to the conceptualisation of motivation; they generally describe it from two opponent poles; intrinsic, or integrative, and instrumental motivation. The former explains the connection between language learning and the learner’s desire to know more to meet and interact with members of the language community; whereas the latter, it implies the
practical and functional value regarded to language learning. Gardner and Lambert accept the influence of culture in language learning as a main construct of intrinsic motivation; hence, they claim that for a learner to succeed in their language acquisition, their degree of proximity to the TL community is needed, as for intrinsic motivation will be triggered by the learner’s desire to be accepted as a member of the linguistic community. This point also correlates to Schumann’s acculturation model of L2 acquisition (1986), who regards the context to be a crucial factor in language learning as well.

Schumann’s acculturation model suggests the need of a level of social and affective identification with the culture of the L2, as an important factor in integration or assimilation with the L2 community (Schumann, 1986). However, social, and affective factors do not necessarily determine language acquisition. According to Schumann, acculturation is the learner’s wish to integrate and assimilate in the TL community, due to their social and psychological proximity towards the language community. In other words, the learner will acculturate in the TL group once they adopt values or the predominant lifestyle of the TL group. However, the learner will only be able to successfully acquire the FL if they find advantageous social and affective factors in their language acquisition process.

Social factors can influence language acquisition in different levels. The social interaction between the language learning and the TL groups may or may not induce language acquisition, as levels of interaction may relate to established power relations pertaining dominance, subordination, assimilation, or acculturation. According to Schumann, social conditions and acculturation can be recognised in periods of colonisation in world history, when dominant groups mostly resisted to assimilate the language of the colonised group and when the colonised communities rejected to acculturate to the culture of the dominant group.
Similarly, affective variables can also influence language acquisition; Schumann categorised these as language and cultural shock, motivation, and ego permeability. Regarding language and culture shock, these two have to do with the fear concerning the impossibility to accomplish language correctness and thus result in the feeling of inferiority when making linguistic mistakes, and to the stress, anxiety, and fear of adapting to a new culture. As suggested, motivation also plays a role in an effective acquisition of another language. Schumann also acknowledges both the integrative and instrumental poles of motivation in language development, suggesting that instrumental motivation involves social variables, such as fear of adaptation, which can result in the rejection of the L2/FL’s culture and in the refusal to acculturate. Lastly, Schumann refers to the degree of confidence when receiving the language input, claiming that a learner’s linguistic limits should be more flexible to linguistically assimilate with the TL more effectively.

Schumann (2001) also defines language learning motivation as stimulus appraisal. This appraisal is described as an important function within an individual’s neural system, and it involves the judgements and reactions towards the learning environment; the learner’s evaluation of SL or FL situations based on their possibility of achievement and engagement (self-efficacy) or their enjoyment towards the linguistic task. Schumann suggests that to accomplish language learning goals, it is required to perceive these goals as a positive reinforcement to accomplish them; thus, motivation works as a pleasurable and rewarding process that results from external stimuli.

Another approach on language learning motivation was suggested by Dörnyei (2009), who developed the L2 Motivational Self System. Dörnyei’s view of motivation was introduced as a rejection from the limiting view of Gardner and Lambert’s notion of integrative motivation. The motivational self-system suggests that learners will be driven to learn the TL depending on the varied contexts and motivations; therefore, the self would entail a dynamic system
which conciliates and controls self-regulation. Within this framework, individuals are thought to possess possible selves, and these work as self-conception thoughts that are based on fantasies and desires of a future. Therefore, learners’ imagination becomes a powerful tool in this respect, as images of themselves and their world will germinate their motivating powers to learn effectively.

Consequently, imagery and context are central factors in the theory of possible selves. Goals or purposes are what trigger actions towards desired intentions of a still intangible future depending on the contexts. Images are crucial in the conception of goals, as these will determine the learner’s motivations. In addition, possible selves can be understood from two poles: the ideal and the ought self (Dörnyei, 2007). The former refers to the representation of the aspiring characteristics that a learner would like to possess, whereas the latter entails the attributions that ought to be possessed by an individual based on varied contexts or beliefs. Therefore, within the possible-selves theory, these two ideal and ought selves work as ‘future self-guides’ (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 13) in the accomplishment of wished goals.

The more recent approaches to SLA have questioned the conception of motivation and have permitted its reformulation. Bonny Norton (1995) has significantly contributed to this in her studies about identity in language learning. They have permitted the acknowledgement of a more complex and sociocultural concept of the language learner and their driving forces towards the learning of the TL. Norton’s sociocultural perspective of motivation agrees with Dörnyei’s view, as it encompasses a poststructuralist view of language.

Language in this poststructuralist framework is defined as discourse, and thus it involves sociocultural practices resulting in the emergence of identities (Norton, 2010). Language and identity are two interdependent notions; thus, they cannot be regarded as two separate constructs. They involve stable and unstable dimensions, which are actively and
cooperatively created, shaped, and negotiated in social interactions. Consequently, socialisation becomes crucial in understanding language learning and its motivations since socialisation and participation in communities of practice allow constant transformation of learners’ identities.

Norton provides a sociocultural complement to psycholinguistic views of motivation, as this notion traditionally embraced a limiting, structuralist, unidimensional view in the understanding of the language learner. As a result of this view, learners are generally perceived binarily, and hence categorised as motivated or unmotivated. Therefore, the notion of investment was introduced to expand the understanding of motivation by acknowledging its complexities, especially the relation between the learners’ sense of self and their desire to perform in the TL. Norton’s notion of investment relates to the language learner’s desires, choices, efforts, and contexts in which the learning takes place; the learning resources that are available to learners, as well as the systematic patterns of control; in other words, ideology, and capital. Additionally, investment is also connected to power, as it plays a role in the way learners feel towards socialising when learning a language, or whether they perceive themselves as contributors in language interactions.

Norton’s vision perceives the learner as an individual who contains ‘multiple desires’ and who possesses ‘a complex social history’ (p. 9). Consequently, learners who are committed to learn the TL are usually driven by their personal desires pertaining economic, cultural, or even economic resources. Thus, their ambition to learn and perform in the TL relates to the value they give to these cultural, economic, and social capitals, which are dictated by their ideologies. Hence, the learners’ efforts to accomplish language learning is derived from the possible gains and returns that are available for them from the result of engaging with their language learning and transformation of identity.
In addition, investment also relates to the feasibility of L2/FL fluency. Learners who are engaged will make efforts to participate in language tasks depending on the context, environment, or resources available. For example, investment will be triggered by the learner’s thought of the possibility of accomplishing goals in a specific task, by their resources available to them, or by the appropriate environment in where they will be participating. Therefore, L2 or FL competence and performance will emerge from their engagement and willingness to participate in the learning context, considering the varied sociocultural factors that are involved.

Unrau and Quirk (2014) suggest that motivation and engagement are frequently misused concepts and mistakenly conceptualised due to their close relationship and blurred conceptual boundary. Some scholars have defined engagement as a central construct and a reflection of motivation (Skinner et al., 2009), nevertheless, engagement and motivation should be distinguished to avoid vague measurements and aim at accuracy in findings.

Engagement is a complex notion with unclear consensus on its definition (Fredricks et al., 2011). Guthrie in 1996 defined it as ‘the motivated use of strategies for reading’ (as cited in Guthrie et al., 1997, p. 439), suggesting that engagement comprises affective, behavioural, and cognitive dimensions (Unrau & Quirk, 2014). Engagement has different domains; affective engagement, on the one hand, relates to the emotional connection and reaction—either positive or negative—with the environment. For instance, sense of belonging to a school, bonds with teachers or classmates, and other emotions such as interest, excitement, enjoyment, or attachment (Fredricks et al., 2011).

These affective connections are thought to foster or negatively affect the learning process and disposition to work (Finn, 1989). Fredricks et al. (2004) claim that behavioural engagement, on the other hand, is easily observable through actions of positive conduct,
involvement in tasks and participation (as cited in Unrau & Quirk, 2014). Guthrie et al. (2012) defined it as the ‘willingness to exert the mental effort needed to comprehend [texts] and accomplish difficult [reading] tasks’ (p. 602). Cognitive engagement, hence, is to do with ‘the students’ level of investment’ (Fredricks et al., 2011, p. 2) in a particular task or the learning process in general or to the strategies applied to learn. Hence, students are cognitively engaged when they are purposeful and have an impetus in taking academic challenges and in succeeding in academic life, and when they use strategies and develop their metacognitive abilities for achieving academic goals (Unrau & Quirk, 2014).

Engagement and interest are also regularly used interchangeably. Although some scholars suggest that engagement and interest hold clear conceptual boundaries, as it is the case of Renninger and Backrach (2015). Firstly, engagement entails cognitive, affective, or behavioural foci, as opposed to interest, which only represents the cognitive and affective facets of engagement. Even though interest and engagement should be regarded as two separate components, these still interact dynamically with each other. The behavioural dimension of engagement needs to be generated by affective and cognitive factors—or interest—which will determine the continuance of the action. Consequently, interest and its maintenance are regarded to be crucial in the germination of future actions or behaviours.

Regarding interest, Hidi and Renninger in 2006 proposed the Four-Phrase Model of interest Development, which explains the developmental and sequential quality of interest. Renninger and Hidi point out that teachers frequently conceptualise interest as a possession, thus categorise a student as someone who either possesses interest or do not possess it, consequently ignoring its complexities. Within this model, interest is described as a psychological state of engaging with specific content, or what Renninger and Hidi call ‘objects, events, or ideas’ (p. 112).
Interest is mostly triggered by external factors; consequently, for interest to be generated, an interaction between an individual and content is needed. One of the most relevant characteristics of interest is that it develops and might evolve gradually and progressively into four phases: from triggered situational interest to a maintained situational interest, which in turn might develop into an emerged individual interest to a well-developed individual interest (Renninger & Hidi, 2006). This progression will be dependent on the environment and the individual’s self-regulation, as these will determine the possibility of development of interest over time.

Situational interest results when a particular environment and its stimuli invite a person to give attention and focus on the content they are experiencing. Therefore, this initial phrase of interest is characterised by its short life, as this will not be sustainable in time if the amount of affect, knowledge and value towards the content is not significantly triggered. Additionally, situational interest can be germinated when the stimuli or environment is particularly surprising for the individual, thus, for their attention to be activated and then induce a long-term maintained situation or individual interest. As previously outlined, this model suggests that each phrase of interest development stimulates the subsequent stage progressively, therefore, a maintained situational interest is encouraged by the previous situational interest stage. This stage can also be induced by the environment, though interest is deepened by the person’s value towards a task or content, as their involvement and meaningfulness they will give to the action will allow a prolonged feeling of interest.

Concerning the two last stages, these pertain to deeper levels of interest mainly as a result of a continuous positive feeling and value towards a specific content. These two are referred as emerging individual interest and a well-developed individual interest. The former refers to an already stored value, knowledge, and appreciation of the content. This means the person’s involvement in a task will be triggered by their stored interest, previously induced, and
developed. Emerging individual interest will not yet be well developed, until the individual feels the predisposition to engage and reengage in different points and contexts in time. If the individual feels positive predisposition, has a deeper value for this specific content, and appreciates the opportunity to reengage, most likely they will have deeper knowledge of the content stored. Unlike the previous phases well developed interest is, in most cases, self-generated. This means an individual will show perseverance and will manage frustration positively by finding strategies for accomplishing objectives in the tasks they engage with.

Reading motivation, interest and engagement could lead to a frequent habit of reading. According to Iftanti (2015), a reading habit is a permanent and intentional activity that is processed and cultivated by individuals through their courses of life. The acquisition of a reading habit would allow constant and even unconscious inclination to continue reading in the long term, making reading part of someone’s identity. The repetition of reading practices, hence, is essential for the development of reading habits in the long run.

Reading habits are developed and processed by an internal inclination to act repeatedly, which are also be promoted by external factors, such as school environment, social background or learning artefacts. The concept of habit is multidimensional, and it can be constructed by internal, social, and cultural facets simultaneously (Iftanti, 2015). As reading requires strategies for comprehension, as well as focused and sustained interest, reading motivation and engagement are core ingredients for developing reading habits. Thus, the relation among reading motivation, engagement and habits lies in the fact that the latter is usually a result of a process that is triggered by reading motivation and engagement, which can endure through time or cease in case motivation and engagement get negatively affected.
iii. The reader’s identity: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-esteem

Wigfield (1997) states that self-beliefs, expectations, and self-efficacy are dimensions that greatly influence motivation. Eccles et al. (1983) developed the expectancy-value theory, which argues that individuals’ expectations about how successful they will be in performing a particular task, as well as their inclination in performing tasks they like or consider important, are determinant in explaining individuals’ willingness to make effort in tasks and persist in the activities (Wigfield, 1997; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000; Day & Bamford, 1998). As expectancy-value in reading refers to self-efficacy, beliefs, and expectations of how competent or efficacious someone can be will determine positive or negative attitudes towards reading, which will consequently result in levels of reading engagement (Wigfield, 1997).

In Bandura’s terms (1986), self-efficacy refers to ‘people’s judgments of their capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances’ (p. 391). Self-efficacy has been reported to influence attainment and performance (Schunk & Pajares, 2009), which in terms of reading would be mostly connected to reading comprehension. Additionally, the existing literature also reports the influence of self-efficacy in motivational aspects of reading, such as engagement. This means, readers with low levels of self-efficacy are likely to withdraw from or avoid reading activities that might result challenging for them (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000).

From the current body of research, self-efficacy is usually employed interchangeably, or sometimes confused, with the concept of self-esteem (Carroll & Fox, 2017). Even though self-efficacy and self-esteem are closely related, these two constructs denote two dissimilar aspects. On the first hand, according to Rosenberg et al. (1995), self-esteem refers to an individual’s feelings about themselves in connection to their performance or achievement, as
in ‘feeling good or bad about themselves because they can or cannot read a book’ (Carroll & Fox, 2017, p. 2). On the other, self-efficacy is associated to an individuals’ ‘judgement of their capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances’ (Bandura, 1986, p. 391).

Rosenberg (1979) defined self-concept as ‘the totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object’ (p.7). Just as self-efficacy, self-concept is ‘presumed to explain and predict one’s thought, emotion and action’ (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003, p. 5). Hubner and Stanton (1976) point out that the perception that someone holds of themselves influence their acts, which in turn influence the perceptions that individuals have of themselves. Consequently, self-concept originates from the interaction with the outside world and relationships individuals maintain with others (Shavelson et al., 1976).

I propose that self-concept, self-efficacy, and self-esteem are constructs that relate to someone’s own being and thus can be related to their identity construction. This reflection of someone’s own being is constantly constructed, developed, and emerged from past and current experiences, and from their self-reflection, their interaction with the environment and with their relationship with others (Huitt, 2009). Regarding reading identity, this is formed generally, though not always, in primary school (Janks, 2010). Reading identity entails learners’ understanding of what it means to be a reader (Hall, 2010; Guthrie & McRae, 2009), and hence this understanding might be highly influenced by teachers’ set of beliefs regarding types of reading identities, as well as what it acceptable in reading, which results in learners’ self-appraisals and self-categorisation of themselves as readers (Wortham, 2010).

It has been reported that reading identity correlates with reading behaviour (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). This means that if readers identify themselves as bad or poor readers, they might prefer to avoid reading or might experience lack of engagement while reading. This
correlation is rooted in the reader’s beliefs about their abilities to complete or succeed in reading tasks. Readers who perceive themselves as good readers might still struggle comprehending texts, but they would still experience motivation to read. This means that readers’ relationship with reading and their self-perceptions of themselves as readers highly mediate their reading behaviour and practice, and not necessarily their cognitive abilities when reading (Hall et al., 2016).

Lastly, the interaction between reader and text may be mediated by their identity and their investment (Norton, 2010). This means that reading practice can bring opportunities for the transformation or possibly the reformulation of reader’s identities. FL reading can bring opportunities to readers to interact with the target culture and assimilate and acculturate with the values shared through the reading experience (Galda & Beach, 2001). Consequently, reading as transactional practice can be a source of affective engagement and enjoyment due to its experiential benefits in relation to the obtention of cultural capital through a particular language or content, and through the exploration and formation of own’s construction of identity as a reader.

iv. The interconnection between reading and emotional response

As earlier discussed, reader response is based on the interaction readers maintain with texts. Benefits associated to reading have been widely reported in the literature from empirical studies. It is well known that reading improves cognitive skills, such as comprehension skills and strategies, as well as vocabulary acquisition (Dore et al., 2018). Nevertheless, it has also been found that reading is beneficial for emotional development.

Mumper and Gerrig (2017) have reported the influence of recreational reading and development of empathy and social understanding (theory of mind). Similarly, Mar and Oatley (2008) suggest that when reading fiction, readers experience a simulation of the real
world through characters and the story’s course of events. This phenomenon, also known as transportation (Gerrig, 2018), hinders the immersion into the fictional world, inhibiting, in turn, readers’ understanding of characters’ inner states and experiences. Mumper and Gerrig (2019) have theorised on the emotional processes that readers go through when engaging with texts. On the one hand, reading inferences and involvement are based on readers’ resonance, i.e., readers’ memory of, for example, unpleasant real-life experiences influence their responses when characters in narratives go through negative emotions. On the other hand, readers’ participation or involvement in narratives highly influences readers’ emotional reading experience. This means, readers transfer similar personal, real-life experiences to the reading experience when characters go through similar situations in narratives. Consequently, due to resonance and affective engagement, reading hinders empathy development (Johnson, 2012) by accessing and identifying characters’ thoughts, feelings, and inner states.

From the empirical contributions to the theorisation of emotional development in reading, it can be concluded that reading does not only offer opportunities to developing emotional skills, but also social ones. Reading can be beneficial for identifying own emotional states and real-life experiences, and simultaneously useful for the acknowledgement of others’ inner states, honing readers’ adaptation skills to social environments. Reading immersion, readers’ emotional connection and affective engagement while reading is also discussed by Daniel Pennac in his work ‘The Rights of the Reader’ (2006) (see appendix J). In his work, Pennac discusses the pleasure of reading and factors that discourage children to read. For Pennac, reading for pleasure is the result of imagination and its outcome in readers’ response; it is the absolute ‘gratification of the senses’ (p.163), experienced though adrenaline or high heart rates, for example. Imagination, thus, becomes crucial as this allows the loss of the ability to distinguish fiction from reality, which is ‘almost a universal experience’ (p.164).
Pennac also discusses promotion of the pleasures of reading among children in educational settings. He makes concrete connections teaching practices that might encourage or discourage children to read. His general discussion posits the importance of comprehension, but also relaxation, attention, imagination, and foremost, the enjoyment in reading. Nevertheless, it is relevant to point out that the general discussion of promotion of reading for pleasure, as well as the empirical examination of the connections between reading and emotional or affective response to narratives comes from the angle of L1 reading. As I previously stated in section III in chapter I, reading response and its connection to socio-emotional development and response is not generally conceived in L2/FL reading, and consequently it becomes relevant to explore whether psychological processes defer in relation to L1 reading. This examination can immensely contribute to L2/FL reading practices and understanding of affective and cognitive benefits of reading in L2/FL.

IV. Multimodality: Literature-to-film adaptations in FL reading instruction

Multimodality refers to ‘the combination of different ‘forms’ [or modes] of communication’ (Bateman et al., 2017, p. 7). The notion of mode is understood as the resources or mediums that are organised and utilised for articulating meaning depending on social requirements from a particular community (Kress et al., 2001). Readers, or viewers, of multimodal texts take an active role in the construction of meaning, since they employ a variety of experiences that make the interpretative process unique, including cultural and societal information (Fish, 1980). Consequently, the integration of decoding and interpretative skills is fundamental for proficiency in multimodal reading (Serafini, 2012).

Becoming a fluent reader is of great importance for personal and academic development in this globalised world (Grabe, 2008). The daily contact with multimodal texts, such as magazines, leaflets, posters, blogs, or websites implies challenges for readers since
interpretation and perception of the world is made through a combination of different modes of communication (Bateman et al., 2017). Consequently, in recent years, research has been given attention to multimodal literacy and technology in both L1 and L2/FL language reading.

Acts of communication that mostly involve multimodality are now considered the norm (Bateman et al., 2017; Yi & Angay-Crowder, 2016; Walsh, 2006). The increasing use of ‘e-books, social media, mobile technologies, and multi-player online games’ (Eshet-Alkalai and Soffer, 2012, p. 1) is requiring users to be digitally and multimodally literate to cope with the necessities and expectations of today’s society. Consequently, these skills have been tackled in secondary education, as many school curricula are now considering the promotion of these skills by including and combining different semiotic modes in varied media, such as image, text and films, the latter being given now much more attention (Bateman et al., 2017).

Considering the demands for promoting multimodal literacy, Bateman et al. (2017) questions whether it is possible to teach multimodal skills at all. Walsh (2006) claims that for proficient monomodal readers, the process of decoding—that is, the identification of words and their orthographic, phonological, and semantic representation processing (Kendeou et al., 2014)—happens unconsciously, as these operations are enhanced by the reader’s background and linguistic knowledge, culture, and any other general knowledge that the individual might possess (Serafini, 2012). Therefore, intertextuality and intratextuality are essential strands in the exercise of comprehension.

Correspondingly, when it comes to multimodality and (E)FL, it is said that a reader would generate similar unconscious responses when reading a monomodal and multimodal text. For example, monomodal texts imply the decoding of words, and multimodal texts the interpretation of image, colour, movement, or shape, and the conceptualisation of ‘space and
simultaneity’ (Kress, 2003; Walsh, 2006, p. 26). Nevertheless, both monomodal and multimodal reading processes involve an activation of schemata, as background knowledge is needed to aim at comprehension (Walsh, 2006).

Films are very good examples of multimodality; they display and communicate stories, experiences, real or fictional realities through simultaneous and synchronised modes to audiences (Bateman et al., 2017). Literature-to-film adaptations, on the other hand, have been vastly used in educational contexts for being accessible for language learners (Paran & Robinson, 2016) and more engaging (Gareis, 1998), on the other. As Thompson suggests (2003), literature-to-film adaptations allow easy access narratives and develop narrative comprehension in the language class by the experience of different semiotic systems.

Nevertheless, literature-to-film adaptations can be a source of criticisms, mainly due to fidelity (Stam, 2005). When cinematic adaptations are described as unfaithful, it means they have failed to realize or portray the source text’s plot, characters, or themes (Stam, 2005; Marciniak, 2007; McFarlane, 1996) accurately. Consequently, when an adaptation is referred to as faithful or ‘good’, it reconstructs the ‘spirit’ of the source text (Marciniak, 2007, p. 59). However, questions around fidelity are highly debatable; audiences might or might not evaluate a film production as a violation of the original book, since mental images and perception of fictional worlds are likely to differ from individual to individual. Hence, constant comparisons between the filmmaker’s and the individual’s images are held, and consequently contrasted (McFarlane, 1996). For that reason, the evaluation of literature-to-film adaptations from the perspective of fidelity is limiting.

Conversely, literature-to-film adaptations should be examined and evaluated from the audiences’ perspectives and responses (Marciniak, 2007). From this perspective, the implementation of printed-form, written source texts and their corresponding literature-to-
film adaptations in the FL classroom can be positive in encouraging communicative and linguistic competence in FL readers and learners. It can also be useful for encouraging a multimedia experience; a potential triggering factor for reading engagement of written source texts as well (Cremin, 2007).

Another point of debate around the use of adaptations in ELL and ELT is the inclination to regard literary texts as superior over their cinematic adaptations (Marciniak, 2007). According to Robert Stam (2000), this hierarchy originates from logophilia, or the valorisation of written arts, which provokes a tension that relate to the assumption that seniority in arts is regarded as genuinely better (Stam, 2005). Due to this, in FL or ELT, literary written-form texts as class materials have been mostly used on their own to develop reading and literary competences in learners; however, films are also vastly used, though only as a complement to the learning process.

Some of the benefits of literature-to-film adaptations relate to their multimodal component as a trigger for engagement, to the opportunity they offer to enhance a multimedia experience and the chance they give of exploring different portrayals and representations of cultures and/or narratives inspired by their corresponding written, source texts (Sturm, 2012; Kaiser, 2011; Zoreda & Vivaldo-Lima, 2008). In connection to FL or ELL, literature-to-film adaptations can be a source of authentic language input (Kaiser & Shibahara, 2014) and they can be more accessible for (E)FL learners, as they can rely on the variety of communicative modes to aim at comprehension.

Authentic materials refer to those materials that are not originally or exclusively made, though used for pedagogical purposes. They provide real or authentic language input; thus, in the (E)FL classroom, they can bring opportunities to be exposed to real, native-like language input (Kirana, 2013). Nevertheless, when it comes to selecting FL or ELT materials,
especially for promoting reading for pleasure or ER in (E)FL, there are some principles that, according to Nutall (2016), should be applied. These are exploitability, or whether a text/literature-to-film adaptations can be exploited as a teaching resource; readability, or whether they can be linguistically accessible; and finally, reading interest, or whether they deal with interesting topics for students.

Consequently, authentic materials can be beneficial or detrimental for the FL or ELL process. If selected appropriately, language learners can be exposed to native-like input; they can expand their knowledge of the language and cultural repertoire, develop their language skills, and enhance their curiosity and interest to engage with the materials. Nevertheless, if these are beyond leaners’ language levels, these can affect students’ motivation. Similarly, if materials contain many cultural references of the source culture, these might also affect students’ comprehension, and trigger lack of interest and engagement.

Selecting authentic materials can be a challenging task, as applying these criteria might be time consuming for many language teachers (Kirana, 2013). Also, targeting all students’ needs, in relation to their language levels or interests, might not always be feasible due to the heterogeneity of language proficiency and topic interests in large groups of students, for example. Literature-to-film adaptations, though, have the potential to increase people’s interest in engaging with fictional worlds (Hutcheon, 2006), which in turn can be helpful in enhancing interest and engagement in class.

Audiences’ attraction to watch literature-to-film adaptations relate the wish to prolong the reading experience they once had when engaging and interacting with the source text, i.e., willingness to reengage with the fascination of a plot, characters, or themes, as well as personal creation of mental images (Marciniak, 2007). Hutcheon, though, suggests that pleasure in watching literature-to-film adaptations originates from the audiences’ encounter
with the familiar and the novel (2006), as the confrontation between the known or unknown might provoke, in Barthes’s terms, jouissance. When pleasure is encountered in reading a print-form, written text, audiences might likely feel invited to relive the narrative in the film media. Consequently, this filmic experience can engender discussions around own interpretations and conceptualisation of the adapted text with the filmmaker’s construction of the source oeuvre (Marciniak, 2007).

As stated above, in the L2/FL classroom, film adaptations can open possibilities not only for developing linguistic, communicative, and receptive skills, but also for metacognitive abilities. The contrasts between the written source text and its literature-to-film adaptation allow both products to be regarded as different and independent creative works. Thus, using literature-to-film adaptations in L2/FL classrooms can invite learners to participate in analysing and understanding their private responses in relation to the author’s creation of the fictional world in the source text, as well as the filmmaker’s recreation of the adapted text.

Readers who find pleasure in reading literary source texts can experience interest in watching their filmic adaptations as well (Cremin, 2007). In the FL classroom context, it can be hypothesised that literature-to-film adaptations have the potential to trigger interest to read written source texts, and that readers experience pleasure from the FL reading experience in similar ways to reading in L1. Even though, further evidence is needed to assert this point, I look for contributing to discovering this uncertainty through this study.
Chapter III: Methodology

In this chapter I describe the methodology I adopted for my study, as well as my research design. I start by presenting my positionality as a qualitative researcher in the field of EFL literacy where I describe my epistemological standpoint. I then move on to describing my participants and context of study, my data collection tools and the approaches I employed for data analysis. I also describe how my findings and discussion will be presented in the chapters to follow.

The rationale of my study was initially based on my interest to explore their experiences of EFL reading interest in 2 consecutive ER sessions. Nevertheless, EFL reading practices and behaviour seemed to be linked to my participants’ EFL reading identities; hence, I decided to include this focus later in my study. In this project, I delineate the concept of identity as their construction of EFL reading personae based on self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-esteem as EFL readers. Thus, I look at my participants’ individual trajectories to draw further conclusions concerning the interconnection between participants’ EFL reading identities and general EFL reading practices, as well as reading behaviour in the intervention.

I. My positionality within the field of EFL literacy

My study is rooted in my academic and personal background as TEFL teacher from Chile, philosophical assumptions, i.e., my ontology, or my view of reality, epistemology, (Creswell, 2013), as well as theoretical perspective that relates to the ‘basic set of beliefs that guide[d] [my] action’ (Guba, 1990, p.17).

Being the researcher of my project helped me to reflect on my identity as a qualitative researcher in a topic that has been fundamental in my personal and academic spheres. It posited the challenge of acknowledging my philosophical assumptions, views, beliefs, and
assumptions on this topic and reflecting on my past and current reading experiences in English to prevent my own voice interfere in my analysis of my participants’ experiences.

As Creswell (2018) states, deciding to whether incorporate such beliefs and assumptions into research projects is fundamental. When designing my study, I decided to rely on writing as a tool for registering similar experiences to those of my participants’ and to hence reflect on my positionality (Creswell, 2013) as an ‘insider’ of my own project. I thought that by registering my thoughts, reactions, experiences and even opinions on participants’ reports, I would become aware of my assumptions and experiences and hence prevent my own identity permeate my analysis of my participants’ reports.

My reflective writing process occurred while transcribing my data, and while reading and re reading my complete transcripts. I registered my thoughts and experiences as flying comments in the body of my transcripts. My reflections comprised mainly of my understanding of what reading in English entails, my conceptualisation of a FL reader and my self-evaluation of a positive reading model, my biography in relation to EFL reading, my early experiences of EFL reading, and my experiences of affective and cognitive engagement in EFL reading. I consulted my reflective writing while analysing my data to become conscious of any potential pre assumptions and beliefs about the topics reported and discussed by participants, especially in relation to understanding of EFL reading and conceptualisation of a FL reader, and hence be aware of the boundaries between my own beliefs and of my participants’ to then examine the data as objectively as possible.

Nevertheless, while analysing my participants’ reports in relation to affective engagement, I concluded that my background and past experiences could offer some insightful conclusions and hypothesise on some EFL reading phenomena, which I describe in my subsequent chapters of this thesis, precisely due to the scarcity of literature and empirical studies in this matter that could enhance my interpretation and discussion of findings.
a) My ontological and epistemological stance

Acknowledging philosophical assumptions is a fundamental step for the research process (Huff, 2009). These guide our inquiry and influence our methodological decisions to answer our RQs. The philosophical assumptions that guided my study lie on my ontological stance, which acknowledges the existence of multiple realities (Moustakas, 1994), and on my epistemology which is constructionism. This purports that ‘meanings are constructed by human beings as they engage with the world’ (Crotty, 1998, p. 43). To answer my RQs, hence, I relied on my participants’ views of EFL reading based on their experiences to ELT and ELL in Chile. Also, on their construction of their EFL reading identities as a result of their ELL experiences and personal views of themselves as EFL readers.

i. My theoretical perspective

The researcher’s theoretical perspective is what guides the researcher’s methodological decisions. My theoretical perspective is interpretivism; I made sense of my participants’ personal experiences from my own experiences and background (Denscombe, 2010; Creswell, 2018). To make sense of my participants’ experiences of reading, I asked open-ended questions in the focus groups, and I gave participants the space and time to freely disclose their experiences, opinions, and views, making sure my questions did not guide their answers in any way. In addition, focus groups helped enhancing interaction and discussion among participants. The data collected was rich as while they shared their visions and experiences of reading, they disclosed how their identities were constructed as EFL readers. Concerning my data analysis, my interpretation process started by reflecting on my positionality by writing my opinions, views and interpretations while approaching my data. This helped me engage and understand my participants’ subjectivities better (Counsell, 2013), without bringing my predetermined assumptions to my interpretation.
II. Rationale of my study

The motive of my study is to contribute to the field of (E)FL literacy and education, particularly to the area of (E)FL reading. I aim to do this by discussing the understanding of (E)FL reading and the (E)FL reader and exploring the interconnection between both. I also look to contribute to qualitative research concerning the psychology of reading in (E)FL by looking at EFL reading interest and other motivational variables, such as engagement and curiosity. Also, to research in (E)FL reading identity by examining EFL readers’ internal worlds, i.e., their self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-esteem. Finally, to (E)FL language education by examining the use of literature-to-film adaptations at an EFL classroom, employed as a pedagogical tool to enhance (E)FL reading interest, and by discussing and suggesting key aspects in the encouragement of (E)FL reading interest in classrooms.

As I understood that my participants’ internal worlds were mostly rooted in their present and past experiences with ELL and EFL reading, I decided to investigate their EFL identities in the first place to then move to their present EFL reading personae, looking at their reading behaviour when they generally engage with EFL reading, and when they read in the intervention.

III. Ethical approval

I was granted ethical approval by the Department of Education ethics committee at The University of York (RE: 205040388/1) in February 2021. After ethical approval was granted, I requested permission to the head of the English department and TEFL programme coordinator at the host university, who in turn accepted my appeal.

I invited 2 TEFL qualified teachers to conduct my intervention, who were part of the TEFL programme at the host university at the time of the study. They both signed a consent form (Appendix C), which asked them to deliver 2 reading sessions both in the pilot and main
studies. Once consent was given, I met the teachers to further explain the aims of the project, their roles, and to assure the clarification of any potential query. For my main study, I invited students to take part during one their sessions of a core English modules of their TEFL programme. Here, I also explained the main aims of the study and clarified questions. After the session was over, 20 participants gave consent, who were then invited to take part in the intervention, which was scheduled for the second week of October 2021.

IV. Research methodology

I adopted a qualitative approach. Even though some quantifiable data was collected through questionnaires, these were analysed through descriptive statistics. Due to the aims for this project, and to the limited number of participants, the quantifiable data were not by any means employed to aim at generalisable findings. Conversely, data were used to provide a general description of each of my research foci and to provide a background for my qualitative inquiry. In figure 1 below, I illustrate my research design.

To further understand each one of the methodological decisions, I describe the context where my project took place in the following section.
V. Context of my study

As South America belongs to the ‘expanding circle’ (Kachru, 1985), the status of English is mainly instrumental, used for international communication and economic purposes. Due to globalisation, English has become the number one FL taught in schools and universities (Rajagopalan, 2009). In Chile, English has mainly been targeted to develop communicative skills not only for citizens to be competent in the global market (Barahona, 2016), but also for accessing information and being able to interact with individuals in a multicultural society (Ministerio de Educación, 2019).

My study took place at a Chilean university that offers a B.A. degree in TEFL. These programmes in Chile last approximately last 5 academic years, and once the fifth year is completed, students become TEFL qualified teachers. TEFL programmes across the country share similar curricula. Approximately in the third year, students take British and/or
American literature modules where students explore mostly canonical texts (Romero, 2016).

In terms of instruction of reading, this is approached mostly intensively, however in the literature modules, reading is sometimes approached extensively.

As literature is seen as an integral component of the curriculum, literary modules aim to raise students’ cultural awareness and to achieve higher levels of proficiency in English. Consequently, the role of literature in TEFL programmes across Chile, and of ER, seems to be limited, as little importance is given to the promotion of recreational reading and students’ aesthetic or affective responses to reading (Romero, 2016). Nevertheless, in the context of my study, ER has slowly taken more prominence in the English language skills modules, as students are sometimes invited to freely choose literary texts and hold discussions to share their responses with their peers.

VI. Participants

The participants of my study are fourth-year students of a TEFL programme at a large private university in Chile. To understand their backgrounds concerning ELL, I asked them, before the intervention, to report their current English level, which was assessed by the standardised test Aptis at their institution, as well as the type of institution they studied their primary and secondary education. This information was relevant to understand how long they have been learning English and developing their EFL linguistic and literacy practices for, and to know what type of ELT instruction they received (bilingual or monolingual education) during their school years.

Despite the large number of students enrolled in this programme, only 20 participants gave consent. Possible explanations for the limited participation might be related to the time I

---

5 Aptis is an assessment tool developed by the British Council that tests the four language strands: listening, reading, speaking, and writing.
could set up the intervention, which occurred on 2 Fridays at 8 am (the time slot was scheduled by the academic coordinator at the host university following the institution’s academic calendar), and to the incentives offered. £10 book and £5 coffee vouchers were offered, though this might not have been sufficiently encouraging, as my intervention took place in the middle of a quarantine in Chile when shops were mostly closed. Some participants also reported to have felt fatigue due to online teaching. In Table 1, I present the general characteristics of my participants. Their names have been pseudonymised to protect their identities.

Table 1

Summary of Participants’ Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>School attended</th>
<th>Reported level of English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private/public</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>O¹</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Fee-paying private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Fee-paying private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Subsidised private</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsidised private schools are the most attended schools in Chile. They follow the curriculum provided by the Chile Ministry of Education and are funded by public and private funds. Unlike subsidised private schools, fee-paying private schools are run by private bodies (e.g., bilingual schools) and do not usually follow the national curriculum. Lastly, public schools are run by the state and, as subsidised private schools, also follow the national curriculum.

¹ Other gender.
Participants were purposefully sampled and the technique I employed was homogeneous sampling. I invited participants who ‘share[d] important experience relevant for [my] study’ (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 127). The criteria I followed to recruit my participants were a) students enrolled in a TEFL programme at the time of the study and b) students being in fourth year, to ensure their advanced levels of English (C1 or C2) following the CEFR.

My participants are particularly interesting because, at the time of the study, they were pre-service EFL teachers already working in primary and secondary schools in Chile. Their EFL reading experiences at school and university were predominantly characterised by the acquisition of skills for comprehension. Their experiences were also, though less, enhanced to read for pleasure during their formal education. Consequently, at the time of my intervention, my participants had had different experiences of EFL reading; in relation to both IR and ER approaches to reading instruction to become fluent users of the English language, and in relation to their reading experiences from a perspective of an EFL teacher and the role they are expected to take once they became qualified EFL teachers in this country.

VI. The intervention

The intervention took place in October 2021. Due to the restrictions of COVID-19 pandemic, I set up my intervention online through Zoom. Each reading session was of approximately 90 minutes and was conducted by a qualified TEFL teacher who was randomly allocated to one of the groups of students. 11 participants were allocated to the film and 9 to the no-film groups. For each class and group, I designed a lesson plan which served as a guideline for the TEFL teachers to comply with the learning objectives set for each
session and to ensure the intervention was systematic between groups and reading session 1 and 2 (see Appendix B).

The activities were designed using Power Point, and the sessions were planned and designed following a personal growth model of teaching literature, following Rosenblatt’s (1994) approach to reading, and ER approach in accordance with Day and Bamford’s definition of ER (1998). The learning objectives I set for each of the classes for both groups were a) to read for the overall meaning, b) to respond affectively to the short stories, and c) to discuss such responses with peers. I designed the sessions following this structure: pre-section, while-section, and a post-section (Brown & Lee, 2015). On the one hand, the pre-section was designed to prepare students to read the short stories later in the while-section of the class. I hence designed a vocabulary activity, which was applied in both groups, to enhance comprehension and or flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), while reading the short stories, and therefore, assure the minimal use of dictionaries.

The pre-section stage consisted of students figuring out and discovering the meaning of a list of potential known and unknown words found in each short story, with the aid of pictures which served students as a helping strategy. The only parameter I used for selecting the set of words was to choose words categorised as C1 and C2, following the CEFR. Based on my intuition as a TEFL teacher, words categorised as advanced (C1-C2) were likely to cause interruption in students’ flow of reading, thus, I systematically went through the 2 short stories, looked for and selected potential problematic vocabulary by using the Text Inspector, a software developed by Cambridge University Press and Cambridge English Language Assessment, and the online version of The Cambridge Dictionary.

The while-section of the class was also planned in alignment with the learning objectives described above, however in this stage, I created an activity which was exclusively designed
for the film and no-film groups. On the one hand, the film group was invited to watch some scenes of a literature-to-film adaptation of a short story before reading the source text in printed, written form. On the other, the no-film group was invited to read a very brief description of the short story before reading the source text.

My rationale to decide to show literature-to-film adaptations before reading source texts was that this could enhance reading interest (Paran & Robinson, 2016). No pictures were used during this stage of the class for the no-film group, though solely a written description, to ensure the intervention in this group would not be affected by any other multimodal material to incite other experiences that were not initially considered in this study. Hence, the difference in the activities planned the while-sections between the film and no-film groups allowed for comparison of reading experiences among my participants in connection to their exposure, a lack thereof, to some scenes of both short stories’ literature-to-film adaptations. Further details regarding my selection of short stories and literature-to-film adaptations are described in section VII below.

Lastly, to comply with learning objectives, the post-section of the class for both film and no-film groups consisted of encouraging students to discuss the read texts in a whole-group book circle. In this class stage, I formulated a series of questions oriented to enhance a whole class discussion around their affective responses to the texts, including their opinions about specific aspects of the texts, their reactions while reading, and their emerged appreciations of the topics tackled in each story, among others.

VII. The chosen texts

Following the characteristics of ER, my selection of texts was based on a) availability of literature-to-film adaptations, i.e., texts that have been adapted to films or TV series b) English language, to avoid students facing a language barrier c) texts’ length, to allow
students finish the texts in class, either completely or almost completely, and d) topic or genre interest, i.e., texts would be under students’ topic or genre interest. As suggested by Ghazali et al. (2009), selection of topics becomes extremely relevant in ER, as these should be in alignment with students’ general interests. To meet this goal, I held informal meetings with participants’ module teachers to find out what topics and/or genres they felt inclined to. The chosen texts’ genres were science fiction and horror, and the topics revolved around human identity.

I decided to employ short stories, as these usually comply with the length criterion (Ghazali et al., 2009; Tseng, 2010). They also offer a wide range of topics under all levels of proficiency and more options of literature-to-film adaptations. The process of selection involved to systematically find and read a variety of texts, analyse their language levels by using the Text Inspector software and watch their adaptations.

As a result of an exhaustive search, I selected the short stories The Father Thing (text 1) by Philip K. Dick and Zima Blue (text 2) by Alastair Reynolds; the former was employed in session 1 and the latter in session 2. I decided that both texts had a reasonable length for each session, as they are between 10 to 15 pages long. These chosen texts were within participants’ reading level (B2), and described above, to determine their level of English, I focused on the vocabulary in each text by using the English Vocabulary Profile (EVP) tool on the Text Inspector, which helped me to examine each vocabulary item and their parts of speech. For those vocabulary items categorised as C1 or C2, I decided to substitute them for a more comprehensible synonyms (B2), assuring these new items did not alter the general meaning of the narration, or in the least way possible.

The criteria to select the extracts of literature-to-film adaptations were a) to have easy access to the literature-to-film adaptations, and b) to be from 2010 onwards. For text 1,
adaptation was *The Father Thing*, episode 7 from *Electric Dreams*, an *Amazon Prime* tv series, and, for text 2, *Zima Blue*, episode 17 from *Love, Death and Robots*, a *Netflix* tv series. My selection criteria for the scenes used in the intervention were a) degree of suspense, and b) relevance in relation to the storyline.

**VIII. EFL teachers**

As I described in chapter I, 2 qualified TEFL teachers were invited to lead the 2 reading sessions. They voluntarily consented for both pilot and main studies (Appendix C). At the time of the study, these teachers were part of the staff of this TEFL programme, however, it was their first time tutoring these groups of students.

**IX. Data collection**

To answer my RQs, I collected descriptive data through questionnaires and focus group interviews. I administered the *Reading Self-Efficacy questionnaire* (Burrows, 2012) and *Motivations for Reading questionnaire* (Guthrie & Wigfield, 1997) before the intervention, *The Situational Interest Scale* (Chen et al., 1999) during the intervention, and the *Reading Interest Log* (Guthrie et al., 2005) once the intervention was finished. I decided to administer these questionnaire as they are valid and widely used instruments (Conradi et al., 2014). To comply with the purpose of my study, I edited these questionnaires to give them a focus on EFL reading (see table 2).

My decision to use questionnaires was to get an initial, general picture of participants’ self-efficacies, reading motivations to read in English, as well as their reading experiences as a result of the intervention. This information was examined in depth in the focus group interviews. Lastly, data were collected in the students’ L1, Spanish, to ensure participants’ full comprehension and responses while filling in the questionnaires and discussing in the focus groups.
In Table 2, I summarise the tools employed for data collection and the sequence these were used and administered, and I offer a detailed description of each data collection method employed in the following sections.

**Table 2**

**Summary of the Data Collection Tools Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of data</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Self-efficacy questionnaire</td>
<td>Before intervention</td>
<td>These were administered one day before the first session of the intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Situational Interest Scale</td>
<td>During intervention</td>
<td>The questionnaires were administered after the before-reading activity, and the classroom discussions were held in each reading session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Reading Interest log</td>
<td>After intervention</td>
<td>The Reading Interest log was administered right after finishing the second reading session. Focus groups were conducted 2 days after the end of the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Questionnaires**

Following Dörnyei’s suggestion (2003) concerning the advice to draw on existing questionnaires, I selected the quantitative data collection tools from some researchers who have contributed to the area of reading motivation and interest. To make them suitable for my study’s aims and context, I adapted the chosen questionnaires (see Appendix D) and translated them into Spanish. For the process of translation, I decided to create a translation committee with 5 qualified TEFL teachers. We translated each questionnaire independently, compared each translated version, discussed the linguistic disparities, and agreed on final versions for each instrument. I pre-piloted the questionnaires with another Chilean EFL teacher and with the TEFL undergraduates during my pilot study (N=14). The main changes to each questionnaire are described in table 3 (see appendix F).
b) Focus groups

I decided that focus group was the most pertinent data collection method for my study. They allowed me to gather rich data and examine profoundly each student’s reading identity, motivations and general experiences when reading in English, on the one hand, and their individual and group-level responses in relation to their experiences of interest during the intervention, on the other (Dörnyei, 2007). To gather rich data from these individual and group perspectives, I held 6 focus groups of 3 participants, and 1 of 2 participants in total, and moderated each one of them. All participants (N=20) took part in the focus groups and each session was approximately one hour and a half long. I randomly allocated participants to any of these 7 focus groups, providing all the members belonged to either the film or no-film groups, and arranged each session in accordance with participants’ availability. Table 4 below describes the arrangement of each session.

Focus groups took place during the last week of October and first week of November 2021, and due to the existing Covid-19 restrictions, these were carried out via Zoom. To gather relevant data in accordance with my RQs, and at the same time avoid suppressing participants’ reports, my focus group interviews were semi-structured. I thus designed 2 focus group protocols in Spanish for each the film and no-film groups. These consisted of 22 questions which were aligned with the questionnaires described above and were structured around three main topics: a) identity as an EFL reader, b) motivations to read in English and c) reading experiences in the study. The topic of ER in EFL connection to its relevance was not included in the protocol, as this topic, as well as their beliefs and perceptions about ER, went beyond the scope of my project. To ensure the suitability of the protocols, I also pre-piloted these with 2 Chilean EFL qualified teachers with the other 14 TEFL undergraduates, who served as participants in my pilot study. My decision of creating focus group sessions with a small number of participants was beneficial as it allowed me to ask of each question I
included in the protocol and gather reports from each participants in relation to their biographies, as well as personal and group experiences during the intervention successfully. Accordingly, each member had sufficient time to share perceptions, beliefs, and experiences in relation to each topic in the protocol thoroughly. I could hence gather a very rich and extensive data set which allowed to answer each RQ in detail.

**Table 4**

*Description of Focus Group Arrangements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Maria, Alberto, Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>No-film</td>
<td>Catalina, Sofia, Andrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>No-film</td>
<td>Isabel, Marcela, Enrique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>José, Josefina, Alejandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Teresa, Andrés, Eva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>No-film</td>
<td>Luz, Alejandro, Héctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Daniel, Sara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c) Creation of my qualitative data**

As I collected data online, this was video recorded through Zoom. Due to ethical reasons, participants were invited to voluntarily turn their cameras on and/or off at any moment during the sessions. I explained participants that the data collected were going to be revised solely by me and reminded them that their reports were going to be anonymised to protect their
identities. During the intervention, all participants kept their cameras on, and only one student decided to engage in the focus group with their camera off.

Once the focus groups were conducted, I transcribed my data verbatim without omitting any words from the participants, however, only in the focus groups, aspects which were not relevant to the focus of the interview, and were said by me, were omitted. During my transcription, I did not employ any software to aid me create my data; conversely, I took this process as fundamental phase to familiarise with my participants’ reports.

X. Data analysis

I employed different layers of data analysis, which were in accordance with each RQ (Appendix A). On the one hand, the questionnaires were analysed on a statistical basis. Hence, the measure of central tendency I used was the mean and standard deviation. Concerning transcripts of focus groups, these were analysed by applying Thematic analysis (TA), considering Braun and Clarke’s (2021) insights; Discourse analysis (DA), following Taylor’s (2001) model; and narrative analysis (NA), following Labov’s (1997) and Richmond’s (2002) perspectives. Table five summarises the approaches to data analysis applied for each study and research question.

Table 5

Summary of Approaches Employed for Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of study</th>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Approach to data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFL reading identity</td>
<td>RQ.1</td>
<td>Reading self-efficacy questionnaire (Burrows, 2012)</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ.2</td>
<td>Motivations for Reading questionnaire (Guthrie &amp; Wigfield, 1997)</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group transcripts</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL reading interest (intervention)</td>
<td>RQ.3</td>
<td>Focus group transcripts</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ.4</td>
<td>The Situational Interest Scale (Chen et al., 1999)</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Reading Interest Log (Guthrie et al., 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data to answer RQ1 was analysed by applying descriptive statistics, TA, NA, and DA. Through TA, I generated themes, which in turn guided the identification of stories through NA. Lastly, DA served to zoom into my participants’ individualities by analysing salient discourse patterns or cues; these helped me understand their construction of identities. Regarding RQ2, data was analysed by also applying TA and DA. Similarly, TA helped me generate themes in connection to their motivation for learning and reading in English, and DA served me to go deeper in their discourses in connection to their motivations and motivational variables in EFL reading.

As for RQ3 and RQ4 these were answered by applying descriptive statistics and TA. TA was the most suitable approach to analyse participants’ responses to the intervention, and their experiences of EFL reading interest in class. In the following sections, I offer a more detailed descriptions of the approaches to data analysis I employed.

a) Thematic analysis

Thematic Analysis is an approach to qualitative enquiry that is characterised by the development, analysis, and reflexive interpretation of descriptive data through the generation of codes and themes (Braun & Clarke, 2021). This method has been widely used for its flexibility, since it is ‘characterised by its independence from any particular epistemological and ontological base’ (Terry et al., 2017, p. 20-21). For my project, I decided that TA was the most pertinent approach to comply with my studies’ aims, as through this, I could reflect on and interpret—from a group level perspective—constructions of identities in EFL, motivations for reading in the TL and the general experiences of interest during the intervention.

The first stage of my data analysis was transcription. To aim at accuracy in describing my participants’ reports, I read and revised my transcripts multiple times, paying attention to
their pauses, use of expressions, interjections, among other instances of language use. This process was fundamental, as it allowed me to familiarise myself with my data and register initial reflections alongside my transcription. Once I created my transcripts, I started to re-read each data set and break them into sections based on the foci of each of my overarching and sub-research questions, which were divided into different projects—or documents—using the software NVivo. As I described earlier, my analysis was in Spanish and I decided to conduct TA for exploring my data from a group-level perspective, i.e., individual reports in study 1, were analysed also through NA and DA, which I will subsequently describe in the upcoming sections.

I analysed my data inductively, as I generated codes and developed themes from my data set itself. As my process of data analysis was iterative—meaning I adjusted my codes and themes multiples times as I interpreted my data—I decided to create a codebook (see appendix X) to ensure a much more organised and systematic analysis, enabling me to also identify patterns of meaning across the data set more exhaustively. My coding process was both latent and semantic, since participants’ reports were sometimes very explicit—which led me to interpret meaning superficially—and sometimes ambiguous, which required a deeper interpretation. My codebook was useful to identify the codes that were reiterated among my participants and helped me to subsequently conduct NA and DA. As for my development of themes, I identified patterns of shared meaning among my generated codes, and I organised them into conceptual themes (Braun & Clarke, 2021).

b) Narrative analysis

Narrative analysis is an approach that has been widely used for examining the construction of identities through individuals’ discourses (Georgakopoulou, 2007; De Fina, 2018). I did not initially consider a fully narrative approach to data analysis, as my interest was
predominantly looking at how language use reveals my participants' identities as readers of English. However, after having engaged with my data several times, I realised that a salient discursive pattern across my participants which related to the narration of stories. These stories were about their past experiences on how they became language learners and English readers, expanding on details about what lead them to learn and read in English, how and when these experiences happened. For this reason, I decided that applying a narrative enquiry would be beneficial to delve on their identities through the examination of discursive aspects in each of the stories narrated.

The question of what constitutes a story guided my analysis. My criteria to categorise stories from my participants’ discourses were based on Labov’s (1997) traditional approach to narratives. As my data was not originally collected to examine my participants’ past experiences in depth, I only used the criteria of time, temporality, and orientation to identify stories. In other words, stories which focused on past experiences, on temporality of events, and on the participants involved in actions were considered. The stories were briefly told, meaning that my participants shortly described their origins with language learning and reading in English, without expanding on details concerning who participated in their past events and what happened in detail in these situations narrated. They narrated general past experiences when they started their English language learning journeys, as well as when and how their English reading emerged.

My narrative analysis was inductive and consisted of three levels of analysis: a) generation of salient divergent and convergent themes across participants TA, and the identification of key stories within each theme that would relate to biographical experiences. To organise my stories, I used a story map developed by Richmond (2002) to organise the ‘worlds’ where these stories took place (see table 6) b) identification and analysis of participants' positionalities in the narrated stories, i.e., their roles in each story and how they position
themselves in these stories. To explore their positionalities, I delved into participants’
discursive features, such as their use of metaphors, or any other salient language feature that
would reveal their self-presentation, and c) identification and analysis of ideologies and sets
of beliefs concerning the English language, specifically reading in FL (Lucius-Hoene &
Deppermann, 2000).

Table 6

*Story Map Developed by Richmond (2002)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past experiences</th>
<th>The world of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experiences</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present experiences</td>
<td>Current status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future intentions</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Discourse analysis

DA is ‘the study of language in use’ (Gee, 2014, p. ix). For the objectives of my study, DA
helped me to analyse each of the participants’ language use to aim at a more precise and
exhaustive interpretation of their language use vis-à-vis their constructions of identities as
EFL readers, and motivations in EFL reading.

DA allowed me to delve into my participants’ construction of identities by studying their
use of language. In my study, I adopted a concept of identity, whose roots lie on social
interaction, since identity is socially and ‘actively constructed, contested and negotiated’ (Taylor, 2006, p.95) by individuals. As Taylor suggests, the assumption lies in the fact that meaning is generated through language in talk, therefore, from this assumption, language is not regarded only as a channel for expression, but most importantly, as an instance where identities are constructed (Taylor, 2006).

In my study, DA was conducted inductively by mainly looking at two aspects of discourse (Van Dijk, 1997): a) language use and b) communication of beliefs. TA was particularly useful in my discursive analysis, as I went through each of the codes I generated previously and reorganised my codes by speaker. In other words, I generated a table to identify what codes were associated to each of the participants’ reports. Subsequently, I explored my transcripts again and studied the repetitive and distinctive patterns of language, mainly the use of vocabulary, expressions, and grammatical structures.

XI. Structure of my analysis chapters

In the following chapters, I offer an analysis and discussion of my findings after having systematically analysed and interpreted my data set from different perspectives. I have organised my findings and discussion chapters by RQ. I decided that this organisation would guide my readers through a detailed and clearer understanding of my participants’ trajectories and backgrounds, which will serve to make sense of the main objective of this thesis: travelling from my participants’ EFL reading identities to their reading behaviour in the intervention.

Hence, chapters IV, V and VI relate to RQ1 and RQ2, and chapter VII on RQ3 and RQ4. Chapter IV revolves around my participants’ origins of their EFL reading journeys, while chapter V delves into their self-concepts and self-efficacy as EFL readers. Concerning chapter VI, it examines my participants’ motivations to read in English, including their
reading engagement when reading in English, whereas chapter VII revolves around my participants’ experiences of reading interest from the intervention. Lastly, in chapter VIII, I present my conclusion.
Chapter IV: EFL Journeys and Becoming an EFL Reader

This chapter aims to answer RQ1. Following Labov’s framework (1997), I analyse my participants’ stories, or past events, in relation to their origins of their EFL reading journeys. Here I delve into how and when their EFL journeys started, including when and how they began to learn English. I identified 4 common stories: cultural and linguistic domination, reading at school, reading at university, and access to knowledge, which can be subsumed into two main themes: influence of globalisation in EFL reading and learning and Internal drive to learn and read in English. To answer RQ1, I will present a summary of these themes and stories and discuss the influences of these in their biographies in relation to their construction of identities as EFL readers.

This chapter is structured into III main sections. In sections I and II, I describe the themes generated through my TA, and within each theme, I discuss the stories embedded, looking at some participants’ salient language patterns through the examination of discoursal cues. Lastly in section II, I present a summary of my chapter.

I present a summary of my participants’ stories in table 7 following Richmond’s (2002) story map for a general view of my participants’ biographies (see appendix G). This table includes the main themes where these stories are situated, the people who took part in these events, and the spheres where these stories took place. As observed, stories converge and diverge as participants share similar backgrounds in relation to their approach to the English language. In addition, in figure 2 below, I illustrate a summary of my TA which shows the connection between the themes I generated and the stories I identified in each theme. This summary also informs the structure of this chapter.
I. Theme I: Influence of globalisation in EFL reading and learning

A central theme was the role of globalisation and institutions that have helped the spread of English; these are popular culture and formal education. Globalisation was identified as a main factor in participants’ initiation into ELL and EFL reading. In the following stories, I explore how globalisation and institutions that spread the English language enhanced their initiation of their EFL reading.

a) Story I: One was forced to learn: Cultural and linguistic domination

Cultural and linguistic domination became a key story among participants’ biographies. These share some commonalities that relate to the impact of popular culture and the status of English as LF (Kachru, 1988; Crystal, 1997) in their initial immersion and later persistence in the English language. The convergent points among these stories were the role of video games, music, and fanfiction in FL reading.
i. Video games as the spark of ELL and reading interest

Popular culture motivated Alberto’s immersion in English reading and learning. His early stages of ELL and reading were unintentional and primarily a consequence of his consumption of popular culture:

I think my approach to reading in English was the same as my approach to learning English. I am not sure whether you have seen the scene where Gumball gets on the internet and it’s like ‘¡fuaaa!’... A beam of light. It’s very similar; it was truly like a bombarding of popular culture.

By the noteworthy use of metaphors, Alberto describes his immersion to the English language in similar terms to his early experiences of English reading. Alberto illustrates his experience by referring to popular culture itself, when comparing himself to Gumball, a character from the animated sitcom *The Amazing World of Gumball*. His reference does not only suggest the value of popular culture in his immersion to the English language, but also the dominance of the internet as a door to new information and the consumption of popular culture. This is inferred by Alberto’s comparison of his experience of accessing popular culture with a ‘beam of light’ and with Gumball’s experience discovering the internet for the first time. Alberto’s reference comes from a scene which shows Gumball feeling over-excited and surprised by what he finds on the internet. Hence, from Alberto’s allusion, his experience of immersion in the English language was meaningful and motivating. In addition, his reference to light might explain his understanding of the internet as inspiring, and the content he explored through English was potentially bright, new information.

Alberto reinforces this last point by suggesting video games were key in his approach to English and to his discovery of new information. He narrates that he ‘started with video games and generally video games were in English [...] so [he] had to, by deduction, discover the meaning of everything’. His desire to progress in his gaming skills led him to look for guidelines online:
I got stuck at some point [while I was playing video games], and as I have always liked to complete everything at a 100%; unblock secrets, collectibles—I’m very nerdy! — I used to look for guidelines and I often encountered them in Spanish which were badly written; they were incomplete or were badly translated. So, I had to look for guidelines in English and there it was when I started to read more in the language.

The state of English as a LF encouraged Alberto’s immersion in English language reading. The scarcity of Spanish versions of video games sparked his reading interest. Alberto’s story shows the role of English as the language of globalisation and popular culture, as English is the predominant language of entertainment and internet, meaning popular culture brings opportunities to learn English incidentally (Pennycook, 2010). By the same token, Alberto refers to his primary source of motivation which led him to persevere in his language learning and reading journey. His driving force to look for new information and read in the TL was his willingness to become a skilful game player, rather than an English language learner. Hence, becoming an English reader was a side-effect, as English became Alberto’s channel to get access to his content and topics of interest.

Alberto’s experience is similar to some other stories. For instance, Enrique suggests his initiation to English reading occurred because of his curiosity to explore more about his hobby on the internet and his interest to look for information on how to perform better in video games in online forums. This was because, by the time he used to play video games, ‘there were [video game] guidelines with no Spanish translation; they just didn’t exist’. A similar story is described by Luz who suggests she ‘used to play with game emulators’—or a programme run in a video game system—and ‘it was like being forced to learn the language to be able to play’, and by Andrés who adds that ‘most video games are in English and the only way to play is to know, at least a little of English’, he adds that ‘everything was in English, all the instructions’, hence ‘one was forced to learn’.

Words in italics correspond to said in English.
From these stories, the role of English in mass entertainment in today’s world is dominant. This is translated to the wider range of options of materials available in this language, in comparison to Spanish. Hence, learning English became a necessity to satisfy participants’ curiosity and interest to consume popular culture, however this necessity seemed to reside in their positive predisposition to engage with this language, as in their early stages of their EFL reading journeys, they were active agents in their initiation to EFL reading journeys, who took action to persist in this activity. It can be concluded then that, even though their main trigger to read in English was not the language per se, but their interest in video games and the lack of Spanish translated versions of video game manuals, their initiation in reading was fuelled by their instrumental motivation and their persistence in their interest which was situationally triggered by the role of English as a LF and maintained by their interest for mass entertainment (Hidi & Renninger, 2006).

ii. *English is like neutral*: Influence of Anime and Manga in ELL and EFL reading interest

The amount of content available in English on the internet was a recurrent point made among some participants. For example, Alejandra’s story refers to her consumption of Anime and her search for information online about her hobby which was mostly available in English:

I remember that I used to watch a lot of Anime, at least as a child I used to be interested in the stories, and I could only find these in English. I couldn’t understand much in English [by then], but there was more content available in English than in Spanish, so I think it helped me a lot to access [this type of] material.

Similar to the aforementioned stories, Alejandra’s interest for anime triggered her online search for this type of material in English. Interestingly, Alejandra’s interest for manga did not become a trigger for reading in Japanese; instead, she decided to read manga in English. It seems likely that Alejandra’s predisposition to engage with English instead of Japanese relates to her understanding of English as the language of access. Consequently, I can
hypothesise that Alejandra’s interest to learn and read in English was solely due to the utility of English, as she was more interested in engaging with the genre rather than the target culture, in this case, Japanese.

Even though Spanish is a major language globally (Montoya, 2009; Mar-Molinero, 2002), as it is ‘the third most used language’ (Mar-Molinero, 2002, p. 167) with more than 400 million speakers globally (Moreno-Fernández & Otero, 2008), the domination of English as the LF and current hegemonic language of the Internet and globalisation (Halliday, 2006; Ryan, 2006) is noteworthy when it comes to availability of materials in online platforms. Spanish is becoming now a more prominent language on the internet due to popular culture (Mar-Molinero, 2002); the amount of information available in online platforms is exceedingly superior in comparison to other languages, however, at the time when my participants initiated their EFL reading journeys English was a more undoubtedly more prominent language than Spanish (Kramsch, 2014; Lanvers, 2019). Consequently, English as LF, and the necessity to learn and read in this language to access information, influenced my participants’ predisposition to learn English over other languages.

Josefina’s story agrees with Alejandra’s as it also relates to the utility of English due to the scarcity of Spanish versions of manga. As I mentioned earlier, the dominance of English over other languages on the internet seems to have become the main reason for participants to pursue their English-language journeys (Ryan, 2006). However, the persistence to remain in this journey also seems to be motivated by a level of identification and connection with reading in this language (Pennycook, 2010), interestingly as opposed to Spanish. This point is evidenced in Josefina’s story:

I started when I was in secondary school, [but my interest in reading] started when I used to watch anime. I started to look for manga in English because they were not translated in Spanish and I thought ‘there has to be a way to read these’, and they were in English. I started to read and watch them, and I used to enjoy
them more, because some of the translations in Spanish…! Some of them were [translated] in some very regional [variations] like from Argentina, Spain and I thought ‘how weird!’’. They made more sense to me in English.

Josefina’s disconnection to other varieties of Spanish suggests a high level of identification to the English language as opposed to her L1, Spanish. It is interesting to note that the multiple variations of Iberian and Latin American ‘Spanishes’ (Mar-Molinero, 2002) and their differences led Josefina to feel disinterested to read or listen to other non-Chilean Spanish variations as she did not feel identify with these. The connection between language learning and identity has been vastly studied by Gardner (2001). Integratedness or ‘the interest in learning the SL in order to come closer to the other language community’ (p.5), seems to be Josefina’s experience, as her decision to learn English was determined by her frequent contact and connection to popular culture, which is predominantly in English. Due to globalisation, English has allowed the spread of an ‘international culture’ (Lamb, 2004; Mufwene, 2010) through music and fashion, for example, enhancing a biocultural identity (Kramsch, 1998). This means, Josefina’s identification to English might respond to her sense of belonging to a worldwide culture that is consumed mostly through entertainment.

Alejandra’s report diverts from Josefina’s. Her inclination to read manga in English and not in Japanese, for example, resides in her response to reading in English. She says:

I also read manga and I think English is like neutral. There’re expressions [in Spanish-translated versions] that sometimes don’t make sense or that sound very unnatural when one reads them, and one’s perceptions and feelings change when one is reading these, it’s like…weird!

Even though Alejandra agrees with Josefina regarding their discomfort in reading Spanish-translated versions which are not Chilean, she disagrees with Josefina in relation to her emotional response to English. Interestingly English is a neutral language for her, suggesting her emotional distance to this language. Nevertheless, it is worth commenting on the fact that both Alejandra and Josefina report a rejection to reading in their L1. Even though they did
not comment on the reasons for this phenomenon, I can hypothesise that their positive experience to reading Spanish depends on their level of proximity with the variation of Spanish which denotes the culture where this variation comes from. Consequently, as English is a language that does not carry or involve any cultural baggage for neither Alejandra nor Josefina, it facilitates their engagement in English reading.

iii. *I didn’t like to wait for the translation: Influence of music and fan fiction in language learning and reading interest*

Among participants’ stories, the pleasure of consuming fanfiction was another triggering factor in becoming an English learner and reader. Fanfiction is ‘writing in which fans use media narratives and pop cultural icons as inspirations for creating their own texts’ (Black, 2006, p. 172). Participants who engaged with rewritten stories did it through the online platform *Wattpad*, which is ‘mainly a community of readers and emerging authors who can read and publish texts’ (Pianzola et al., 2020, p. 4). Most of the stories that are shared on Wattpad are in English (Pianzola et al., 2020), meaning the English language again became a necessity to access and enjoy this type of content. Maria narrates:

> I started to read a lot more when I used to read fanfics as a child. They were in English because the stories that I liked were written by American girls, so then I used to follow them, and I didn’t like to wait for the translation to come out, so I read the original stories, and I think that was when I learnt English the most.

From Maria’s story, it can be inferred that two main factors influenced her decision to read in English. Firstly, her value to read in the text’s original language, and secondly, the immediacy it implied to access texts in English. Maria’s value for textual originality, their inclination to read in English might be related to what Sapir’s idea about language and culture: ‘two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality’ (1929, p. 209). As languages represent unique characteristics of societies and cultures, reading in the text's original language might bring a deeper connection between the reader and the text. Hence, for Maria, reading a translation of a re-written story might have
brought a less genuine reading experience due to the incongruency between the text, the societal or cultural aspects of the text and its original language. Another relevant factor in Maria’s experience is the immediacy of accessibility of materials in English on the Internet. This experience is also shared by Alberto:

because you were able to access things that maybe not everyone was able to access, because being able to read in English allowed you to look for things, to read other things that maybe were not translated in Spanish. Through English you could access to pieces of information that were not available to the common people who don’t speak English.

As English is the language of globalisation (Ryan, 2006), the interest to enjoy fanfiction could not depend on the rapid availability of Spanish translations. Hence, once more, English became a side-effect from the impact of globalisation. Additionally, Alberto’s report suggests that knowing English allow individuals to access a wide array of possibilities, which are not accessible for those who decide not to learn this language. From his report, a social element to bilingualism is inferred as well, which suggests that only the people who are proficient in English have the power of access, but not ‘common’, less advantaged people. From this is also inferred that Alejandros’ inclination to learn English was also informed by societal and political aspects in connection to the ideology surrounding English.

b) Story II: I used to like English class: Reading at school

English language instruction in formal education stands out among my participants’ experiences. Due to globalisation, English has become the predominant FL taught in schools (Chang, 2006) in other countries that, in Kachru’s terms, belong to the expanding circle (1985). From my data, I could identify a common experience among my participants which relates to the time point their initial stages of their English reading journeys occurred, mostly at secondary school, during their teenage years. Reading in the EFL classroom is the second most frequent factor that allowed my participants to immerse in their English reading and language journeys. This is described by Maria:
I started—truly—with English, like feeling truly interested, with music when I was a young girl, and then I used to like English class at school. In my school they made us read books in English each term. We used to read like three books a year.

From Maria’s story, there is another aspect that relates to the identification and acknowledgement of the time point when the English reading journeys started. I could identify that some participants regarded their initial practices of reading during school years as the starting point, even though most of them suggested having had previous experiences reading in English on the internet by the consumption of popular culture (Lenhart et al., 2008). In the case of Maria, this might be due to the formal instances where reading took place in the EFL classroom.

Similarly, Marcela’s description of her story suggests she struggles to identify the starting point of her English reading journey:

**Marcela:** I started as a young girl, like in kindergarten. I remember I was very young.
**Valeria:** Did you start to learn English or to read in English as a young girl?
**Marcela:** No, I think I started reading when I was around 15 years old.
**Marcela:** What do you mean specifically by reading? Because maybe I started 4 years ago, I don’t know… I used to enjoy singing, so I used to learn lyrics, I used play music with a friend of mine, and I needed to learn some lyrics, so I used to take my time to understand what the songs were saying and learn them by heart, but reading, like a book, for example…

From this excerpt, it is possible to conclude that acknowledging reading as a practice might entail conceptualising what reading means in the first place (Moyer, 2011). From Marcela’s discourse, it seems that, even though she acknowledges to have read in English during her teenage years, her confusion to identify the starting point of her reading journey lies in her conception of reading as an activity. It can be inferred that reading for Marcela depends mostly on the type of texts, presumably by the format of reading and the value of certain types of texts. Hence, some participants—as in the case of Marcela—EFL reading journeys might be associated with formal education, as she states to have started 4 years ago, when she became a TEFL student.
Reading at school was, in overall, a positive experience. Carolina narrates her origins in English reading at school as inspiring: ‘I also started at school, in secondary school. There, we used to read shorter stories. I remember that most of them were of fantasy, and there it was when I started to feel interested in English’. Catalina, meanwhile, suggests:

I remember that when I was a young girl, like in kindergarten, I attended a bilingual school. So, we had to read texts in English and so then we started to learn English, only through readings. They were very entertaining, and then, in another school I attended, in the English class we only used to read texts. I remember having read The Phantom of the Opera, Huckleberry Finn, something like that. So, that was entertaining…

Additionally, Alberto says: ‘also at school, they always made me read books in English; I’m very grateful for that; they were very good books, so… great’. From these excerpts, it can be inferred that, for Carolina and Catalina, reading in English as school enhanced her enjoyment in reading. Similarly, Alberto expresses his appreciation to having been introduced to English reading at school, even though his experience seems not to have been voluntary at first, as he metaphorically refers to reading as a forced, but at the same time positive, experience (siempre me metieron libros en inglés- they always made me read books in English). Carolina’s, Catalina’s, and Alberto’s stories suggest that school became a significant influence in enhancing reading habits in English, which are described as a positive experience.

It seems likely that the role of the school in English reading does not only relate to the systematicity of promoting reading behaviour, but also to the influence of encouraging this practice overtime. This is concluded because these narrations place reading at school as a past event which marks the beginning of their ongoing English reading journeys. Additionally, it is important to highlight the emphasis Carolina, Catalina and Alberto give to their positive
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9 The fragments in italics were not translated as these were said in English.
10 I have selected the verb make as the closest translation of the verb meter in Spanish. In informal Spanish meter implies a forceful invitation to do something, although its implication is not entirely negative in this context.
responses to reading texts at school, which seem to be connected to the impact of selection of texts and genres. On the one hand, Maria suggests that her reading fantasy might have promoted her imagination and enhanced pleasure reading, and on the other, Alberto expresses his positive response to the selection of books chosen to be read in class.

Sofia’s story also relates to the impact of selection of texts in English reading. She adds:

There was a Spanish teacher who she knew I liked English, but she didn’t know how to enhance reading. I felt she obliged only me to read a book in English, while the rest of my classmates were reading in Spanish. So, I had to read Animal Farm in English. I didn’t understand it very well because I was very young as well; I was like 14 or 15 years old and I didn’t understand it very well, because to be honest, back then I only read song lyrics, small things, I wasn’t prepared to sit and read a book.

Even though Sofia’s story does not agree with Maria’s or Alberto’s stories, it can be concluded that selection of texts seems to play a pivotal role in engaging students to read in a FL and in creating a positive predisposition to read. From Sofia’s story, her reaction to reading in English was negative, as the teacher’s decision to ask her to read Animal Farm was beyond Sofia’s level of English. She adds: ‘I also think I was very young, and I didn’t have enough vocabulary, so I remember having felt frustrated very easily because it was like ‘ah, I don’t know this word!’ and I had to stop and look it up in the dictionary… and the process was very slow’. As Day and Bamford (1988) suggest, when encouraging reading in FL, inspecting the texts’ language level becomes a crucial aspect, as this might affect learners’ motivation to read in the TL. On the other hand, the topic or genre of the chosen text might have also influenced Sofia’s experience, as she suggests she felt reading the text was an obligation rather than for pleasurable experience. Later, in theme II, I offer a more detailed account to topic interest as another story connected to theme II or Internal drive to learn English.

As previously seen in Sofia’s story, my participants highlight the role of teachers as models of reading. Unfortunately, it is not certain whether teachers solely helped them to start
their English reading journeys or influenced them in a deeper level that made them stay in and continue in their journeys. Despite this uncertainty, secondary school, especially teachers, was inspiring and motivating factor for reading in English. Sara describes this point in her story:

I used to have a teacher in secondary school who always motivated me to read things in English, because I didn’t use to have any other space (to read) and she motivated me a lot. She used to give me books, she used to recommend texts, and she used to say ‘look, I can find this book for you’ and then she found them and got them for me.

Teresa shares a similar experience: ‘I think that in year 8 or year 9 my teacher got me a book which was Alice in Wonderland in English’. From these stories, it is seen that teachers incentivised reading in English by making books in English available to their students. Even though reading in English was likely to be accessible by the time my participants studied at secondary school, this availability was only possible through the Internet, meaning the type of content might have been restrictive when it comes to literary texts.

Lastly, it is significant to highlight instances of translanguage in some of the excerpts previously explored. According to Garcia and Wei (2015), translanguage refers to ‘the flexible use of linguistic resources by bilinguals as they make sense of their worlds’ (p. 26). Connections between language and identity have been discussed by Riley (2007), who claims identity is constructed through social and communicative interaction with other speakers of a community. As for the instances of translanguage in my participants’ discourse—which are marked in italics—it is worth reflecting that, even though these instances are not strictly related to their experiences reading at school, their linguistic choices convey a significant message concerning their EFL reading journeys and identities as bilinguals. As I have highlighted throughout these stories, globalisation has allowed a fluent and rapid interaction through diverse online and offline environments, where they have constructed and negotiated their identities. As Garcia and Kleifgen suggests, individuals ‘decide who they want to be and
choose their language practices accordingly (2010, p. 524). This might hence suggest that, in the case of Catalina, for example, who is the participant who shows the most repeated instances of code-switching, English has become an integral aspect of her life, which shows her sense of belonging to her globalised environment.

II. Theme II: *I used to choose books: Internal drive to learn and read in English*

Another central theme was the role of intrinsic motivation in participants’ initiation into ELL and EFL reading. In this theme, one main story was identified: interest to read in English. Even though this is an embedded story within Cultural and Linguistic Domination, interest is a component that deserves to be analysed separately as it takes a primordial role in the maintenance in the participants’ initial stages of language reading journeys. In the following section, I shed light on the role of interest in EFL language reading.

a) **Story I: Interest in reading in English**

As I described in theme I, participants’ inclination to read in English relate to the big influence of popular culture in their lives. In this story though, participants’ initiation –and their maintenance in their reading journeys –also relate to their inclinations to certain topics. Topic interest is an ‘anticipatory response triggered by the presentation of topics and themes’ (Kerger et al., 2011, p. 608). This can be seen in the following excerpts, where Sara and Maria describe their inclinations to certain topics. Sara, on the one hand, describes her interest in dystopian works of fiction: ‘I like dystopia very much in English, many of my friends got me some books, so that’s how I started’. Maria, on the other hand, likes novels: ‘I always liked novels, so I used to read novels in English, and that’s how I learnt’. Sara and Maria’s stories convey an internal drive or positive predisposition to read in English as they describe a connection to certain topics and literary genres. The role of topic interest in my participants’ experiences is, one the one hand, the attraction force to start reading in English,
and on the other, the internal drive to maintain themselves in their reading journeys. Sara and Maria’s experiences depict interest as an energy that allowed them to engage and re-engage in reading regardless of the potential challenges that reading in a FL could entail.

The power of interest to facilitate engagement and re-engagement with reading in FL is a significant aspect conveyed in my participants’ stories. Andrea narrates the impact of interest in her persistence to read in a FL:

**Andrea:** I used to struggle to follow the thread of the story sometimes; like stopping to look up a word in the dictionary, all that… I had to come back to the reading to understand the whole idea so many times. I used to feel confused with what I was reading; I understood a word, but I couldn’t understand the story. So re-reading was tiring.

**Valeria:** and why did you persevere?

**Andrea:** I like reading in English and I felt interested. I mean, generally I used to choose texts or books, it wasn’t imposed.

From Andrea’s experience, reading in a FL entails challenges that relate to controlling or coping with emotional states such as frustration. Sofia suggests: ‘I also think it has to do with interest because then one can pass that stage of frustration and continue because if it wasn’t then I’d say ‘oh, how boring!’, if I were very frustrated then I’d have left the book and I wouldn’t have given time to look up words in the dictionary and come back to reading to get the full idea’. Hence, it seems that interest to read is linked to emotional experiences that depend on the ease of comprehension.

Hence, interest to read and persist in this activity seems to depend on the readers’ personal interest— or positive predisposition to engage with the text as a result of the reader’s orientation towards a topic, for example— or on situational interest, as in the case of textual characteristics that would enhance comprehension (Silvia, 2006). According to Silvia (2006), aspects such as textual coherence and ease of comprehension – identified as the coping dimension of situational interest – lose relevance when learners give topic interest ratings before reading a text, as opposed to
giving “post hoc” ratings, which are given after they have read it. In the case of Héctor, topic interest was relevant in his immersion in EFL reading:

When I started to read more —before it was nothing— was when I started to like the topic of computers and video games. Well, almost all the information in English and I was forced to understand. I wasn’t forced really because it was like a necessity and something that I liked to do a lot as well, so it was pleasurable to read and… it was great! it wasn’t like ‘how awful! I must read!’

As Héctor suggests, feeling ‘forced’ to understand implied not only the relevance of learning English to satisfy his interest in video games, but also suggests the linguistic barrier and the difficulties that EF reading implied. However, his reading practice became pleasurable as topic interest seemed to be a powerful initial influence that encouraged Héctor to overcome his challenge to comprehend texts.

Carolina also refers to her emotional experience when starting to read in English. Her interest to continue in her reading journey was triggered by her initiative to look for strategies to become a proficient reader in English.

I also remember that at the beginning it felt frustrating, and I felt that maybe I needed to do so much yet to achieve and be able to understand a text, but with time, I think I got motivated because studying English pedagogy was always my goal. This goal incentivised me to look for tools to get better at reading. I was always immersed in the English language because I would always watch films in English, Youtubers in English and little by little I felt that I could understand them, so then I got even more motivated; ‘I’ll try to apply this into reading’. Sometimes listening to English helped me more than to read, because when listening allowed me to familiarise myself with the pronunciation and, after when reading, I could understand the context. So, that was a technique that helped me, listening and then reading.

From this excerpt, it can be suggested that Carolina’s interest to read does not relate to an orientation to a particular topic or theme, but to her engagement with the language learning process instead. Hence, her driving force to maintain herself in her journey is related to her motivation to achieve a future goal of becoming a TEFL undergraduate. Possible selves, according to motivational theory, relate to an individual’s views on themselves at present (Dörnyei, 2009), and the motivation to achieve an ‘ideal self’ (Higgins, 1987) which becomes
a guiding force to find learning strategies that would reduce the L2 discrepancies between her current and future self. From Carolina’s story, her driving force to maintain herself in her English reading journey is connected to her ‘Ideal L2 Self’ (Dörnyei, 2010), and her integrative motivation might be due to a ‘psychological and emotional identification with the L2 community’ (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 30).

As Gardner suggests, L2 motivation is highly related to the learner’s attitudes towards the TL. In Carolina’s case, having been ‘immersed’ in the English language through popular culture and global online platforms, led to a voluntary disposition to receive such input in English. She adds that her integrative motivation led her to find strategies to develop her reading skills, which resulted in stronger motivation to pursue in her aim, regardless of the existing challenges and discrepancies she acknowledged to become her expected self.

III. Summary of chapter

In this chapter I have explored and analysed my participants’ stories. I began by analysing the role of institutions in the spread of the English language, i.e., globalisation and school in English language reading and learning journeys. My participants’ journeys have their origins mostly in their teenage years, when they were secondary school students. This time point is relevant to understand the global contextual factors that play a role in their interest to take the path of bilingualism; English has a status of FL in Chile, and it has a hegemonic status as the predominant FL taught in schools. Popular culture is identified as a main factor in participants’ initiation to learn English; then, school and lastly family.11

The second story I analysed was related to their internal drive to learn and read in the language. Interest and motivation seem to be key in their persistence and commitment with

11 The role of family was narrated by only one participant, hence, as this is not a representative story from my data, it was not explored in this chapter.
their language learning process, as a coping dimension to face the challenges of reading in the TL. I can conclude that my participants took an active role in their stories and journeys, as little intervention from other characters were identified, which suggests their reading and learning of English started as a personal and intimate journey. Lastly, the analysis I have shared in this chapter allows me to answer my RQ1, which relates to how my participants became EFL readers.
Chapter V: Self-Efficacy and Self-Concepts as EFL Readers

In this chapter, I shed light on my participants’ self-efficacy and self-concepts as EFL readers. I examined my participants’ self-reports from the questionnaire through descriptive statistics, and processed my qualitative data through TA and DA. As described earlier, through the generation of themes, I identified my participants’ thematic self-representations as EFL readers, which in turn, helped me guide my analysis of their general discursive patterns. DA was a helpful approach as my participants’ language use disclosed deeper insights on their self-concepts – or participants’ perceptions of themselves as EFL readers (Shavelson et al., 1976) – and of their self-efficacies to boot, i.e., their beliefs about their EFL reading capabilities and skills (Bandura, 1977). DA was helpful for cases where self-concepts were not conveyed explicitly.

My participants described their self-concepts mostly by means of an adjective or by an illustration of their reading behaviour and competence. As reported in the existing literature, self-concept is formed ‘through the experiences with the environment’ (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). From the data, participants’ general beliefs of themselves (Shavelson & Bolus, 1982) as EFL readers were influenced by standards or preconceptions about EFL reading – including their beliefs of an ideal EFL reading model – which they used to judge their own traits and practices as EFL readers. In addition, their discourses disclosing their self-concepts and self-efficacy were sometimes accompanied by references to their self-esteem, or feelings about how they feel about their reading personas (Carrol & Fox, 2017).

I made sense of their self-concepts as interpretation of their reading practices. These were mostly conceived as ‘good’ or ‘bad’, based on salient perspectives of reading in their discourse, i.e., IR or ER, at the time of reporting. Concerning their self-efficacy, only those participants who disclosed their self-concepts from an IR perspective described their self-efficacies, as this construct delves into their beliefs of their reading skills only. In
consequence, self-efficacy was not reported by all participants in focus group interviews. For this reason, The Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire was helpful to grasp an understanding of their beliefs concerning certain EFL reading tasks. From my analysis, self-concepts were conveyed multidimensionally, i.e., aspects such as motivation, IR, and socialisation were highlighted, whereas their self-efficacy were mostly related to their fluency in reading—which translates into acquisition and mastering of vocabulary— and reading comprehension.

In this chapter, I present a summary of participants’ self-efficacy and self-concepts, including their self-esteem. I have structured this chapter into 6 subsections. Section I delves into participants’ reports on their self-concepts as EFL readers, where I look at preconceptions of EFL reading, and their visions of their ideal EFL reading models. Section II revolves around their self-efficacy as EFL readers. In section III, I present my answer for RQ 1 which is my interpretation of my participants’ constructions of identities that is supported by my analyses offered in chapters IV and V. My answer to RQ 1 brings together my analyses concerning their EFL reading journeys, their self-concepts as EFL readers and self-efficacy. Lastly in section IV, I present a summary of this chapter.

I. Participants’ self-concepts as EFL readers

During the focus group interviews, I reminded participants to focus on English reading, however, their visions about EFL reading might be informed by their visions on L1 reading as well. When disclosing their conceptions of reading, they neither made any explicit distinction between L1 and L2 reading nor discussed the origins or roots of these visions. They report school and university as an influence in their EFL reading personae; concerning parents, they are not mentioned as a source of their EFL reading visions, apart from José.
(The) sins of a reader: Preconceptions of EFL reading

As I was examining my participants’ self-concepts as EFL readers, I identified that they appraised their reading practices and habits frequently. These were sometimes evaluated positively and/or negatively, and it seemed these appraisals had connections to preconceptions about reading in the TL. To capture a more precise understanding of their self-concepts as readers, especially for those who were not explicit, I decided to examine their ideas concerning what EFL reading means for them, in the first place. In table 8 (see appendix H), I summarise my participants’ visions of EFL reading in accordance with their language use.

Judgments about good and bad practices were salient in some of my participants’ discourses. During the group interviews, participants were asked to share their opinions and visions with regards Daniel Pennac’s 10 rights of a reader from his seminal work The Rights of the Reader (2006) (See Appendix I). Interestingly, some of their responses showed that reading is conceptualised as a moral activity; hence, good readers should avoid certain practices, such as the ones described by Alberto in focus group I:

I felt that more than rights these were like the sins of a reader. I am very against the idea of skipping parts. People who skip parts... it’s like a big no! I cannot understand why people do this12, but I also fit in number three (‘the right not to finish a book’ (Pennac, 2006, p.156). Many times, I start books and I only read the bits I’m interested in, and I never finish them. I also sometimes don’t read in a long time, so I feel that these are more like sins, even if these were things that even one does.

In this excerpt, Alberto describes his understanding of reading as a rigorous activity. His reference to reading as a moral act discloses that readers should accomplish a set of expectations integrally, since practices such as not finishing a book are sinful. However, Alberto conveys a dichotomy between his sets of beliefs about what he thinks it is acceptable
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12 In Spanish, this sentence carries a metaphorical meaning. It would be literally translated as ‘this idea does not fit in my head’.
in connection to Pennac’s rights and his reading practice. This dichotomy arises from this failure to accomplish the expectations of a good reader, and it is exemplified when he mentions he ‘fits in (right) number three’. That is, he is against certain reading practices, such as leaving books partially unfinished or being inconsistent in his reading habit but happen to be a description of his own practice. Nevertheless, by stating he ‘fits’ in the ‘right not to finish a book’, Alberto suggests he is still flexible when it comes to reading; he does not mention he oblige himself to finish books to accomplish his expectations as a reader. From Alberto’s discourse, it is not possible to assert, though, how his moral vision of reading makes him feel. However, from his language, I can predict that his understanding of ‘wrong’ or ‘sinful’ practices bring negative emotions in him, as guilt or dissatisfaction, which might reflect his self-efficacy in EFL reading.

Similarly, José in focus group IV shares a moral vision about reading when referring to his own practice. He says:

In this case of not finishing a book, for me it is sometimes frustrating, because I do want to know how a story unfolds, but for whatever reason—because of not having enough time, life distractions—I don’t finish it and that, to me, feels like being a bit cheeky to the author, because that person put so much effort, so much work into writing that book, thinking about characters, the plot and then write, and everything for me, to enjoy this book and I don’t read it. That for me, is very disrespectful.

As Alberto, José’s ideas about reading denote a moral act. However, unlike Alberto, José refers to morality concerning the reader’s sense of respect towards the author’s work. His vision of reading entails a set of expectations on readers, which seem to affect José’s self-concept as EFL reader. His description of feeling frustration seems to denote an emotional state that arises from the lack of acceptance of his own reading practices. José’s evaluation of a reader—as someone who is disrespectful for not finishing a book—also conveys a vision of reading as a dialogic act. José identifies the reading act as a dialogic and intimate activity where the author creates an oeuvre for the reader to connect, read and appreciate. Hence, a
reader should be continuously open and receptive to what an author is conveying through their work. Examining José’s journey as an EFL reader, he does not mention the roots of his visions. It is not clear either whether José visions are informed by L1 or L2 reading. If visions of EFL are informed by L1 reading, these might have been inculcated in his formal education at school or his education from his parents.

The practice of not finishing a book was negatively evaluated among the participants who disclosed views and preconceptions about EFL reading. Catalina and Alejandra (fous groups II and IV respectively) were not an exception:

**Catalina:** I think they (all the rights) are true. They are common things that can happen when reading and I identify myself with *the right not to finish a book. That is my common mistake, I think*…

**Alejandra:** I think my problem here is that I usually don’t finish the texts either. So, I think to myself: ‘no, I should finish it because I’m already here’ and I keep on reading and I think, ‘this is not what I was expecting’ and then I just leave it there, to be honest.

Just as the previous excerpts, Catalina and Alejandra share views that also give attention to readers and the expectations placed on them. They evaluate the act of not finishing a book as an undesirable practice to boot. Hence—and from examining Catalina’s and Alejandra’s language use– their reading act is sometimes a ‘problem’ or ‘mistake’. Their self-evaluations of their reading practices might suggest that their conceptualisation of reading is connected to an activity placed at two ends of a spectrum. That is, EFL reading is either performed ‘well’ or ‘badly’, implying that reading is an activity that might as well be ‘fixed’, or ‘worked on’.

Rather contrary visions of reading were also shared in focus group I. Maria’s and Carolina’s ideas suggest an opposition to Alberto’s conception of reading:

**Maria:** I agree with all of these ‘rights’ and I don’t like the word ‘sin’, because I feel it is very connected to guilt. I feel that when someone does something with guilt, (that person) doesn’t genuinely enjoy it. I don’t think we should set those limits to ourselves when it comes to reading. Sometimes reading relates

\[13\] This fragment in italics suggests an instance of translanguaging.
to (my) emotions, to (my) mood. I think neither there should be like ‘rules’, nor things to follow strictly when it comes to reading; it should be free.

**Carolina:** I also agree with that (idea) about sins, I feel like it doesn’t contribute too much to this hobby of reading. No one can feel guilty because of not finishing a book and say, ‘oh well, maybe I should have finished it, and I made a mistake’. I feel like this poster\(^\text{14}\) helps a lot to realise the errors—between quote marks—that one makes, because they describe a process that is to explore the world of books and get immersed in the characters, the stories, and plots.

Carolina and Maria challenge Alberto’s and José’s visions of reading. It is interesting that Carolina and Maria’s visions are opposite to Alberto’s and José’s by suggesting the purpose of reading is joy. They both react to Alberto’s reference to ‘sins’, as they seem to relate the act of reading to a religious belief, where the feeling of guilt limits readers to experience reading at its fullest. Reading grants the opportunity to readers to experience flow or the chance to immerse in fictional worlds, and it relates to a reader’s emotional state or predisposition to read. Consequently, in these reports reading is conceived as a hobby; reading is described from an ER perspective or an activity that is associated to leisure time. Maria agrees with Carolina in finding reading a pleasurable activity; she adds that reading enjoyment is somewhat dependent on the reader’s emotional state and predisposition to read. Hence, reading is organic rather than absolute, and a free rather than a moral activity; no expectations or limitations should be placed neither on the act of reading, nor on readers. Carolina’s disagreement over this religious-like vision of reading as a sinful activity when readers do not meet expectations, and her appreciation towards Pennac’s work depicts her reflection of the understanding of reading and its boundaries. She implicitly suggests that no practices should be conceptualised as errors in reading and gives a call to installed thoughts about L2 reading that seem likely to be mostly inculcated, spread and reinforced in formal education, considering participants’ backgrounds in L2 reading.

---

\(^\text{14}\) Carolina refers to a poster shown during the focus group. It is Daniel Pennac’s *The Rights of the Reader*, illustrated by Quentin Blake (2006).
Maria and Carolina conceive reading as pleasurable. When they expand on their views, they suggest reading also entails a transactional experience. They add:

**Maria:** whether a book influences life… I think this is something very personal, because we read realities which might be fictional or real, but at the end of the day, it’s new information or knowledge that can influence our way of seeing reality.

**Carolina:** I like the person who created these rights, they’re useful to understand we are part of a reading process, and that (some practices) don’t make you a bad reader, they help you to be immersed in this world of narratives.

When they expand on their views about reading, their discourse pays attention to the reader, as an individual who makes sense of the reading experience. Carolina and Maria seem to share a similar viewpoint of reading to Iser’s, who claims readers are ‘situated inside a literary text’ (1978, p. 109). This means that the relationship between a text and a reader is based on a reader’s productivity, which is the source of their enjoyment. Carolina illustrates this view when describing reading as immersive—or a process with high potential of ‘flow’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) –that brings joy. From Maria’s perspective, the reader makes reading a personal and intimate experience and gives the text the potential to profoundly impact their life. As it is seen, these participants’ views also reflect an aesthetic and dynamic view of reading, where the author does not play a primary role (Barthes, 1977). Reading, thus, seems to be far from an ‘efferent’ experience (Rosenblatt, 1994) where a reader solely extracts information from a text.

From the predominant preconceptions I have just presented, I reflect on potential similarities and/or differences between their conceptions of reading in Spanish, as their L1, and reading in English, as their L2. However, it is possible my participants exposed and reflected their visions informed by their views on L1 reading, analysing their reports on reading posits the questions on how different or similar these visions be concerning preconceptions or expectations of reading. Even though examining and reflecting on such
comparison is beyond the scope of my study, it might have been insightful to explore whether L2 reading is informed or influenced by L1 reading, and whether L2 experience depends at some point on experiences emerged from L1 reading. This to understand whether predisposition to read in L2 or L2 reading practices are influenced by preconceptions emerged by readers’ relationship to L1 reading. It would also be insightful to discover the origins of the reported reading conceptions, as these might enhance the discussion of how formal education, i.e., school or university, as well as informal education, i.e., interaction from peers, friends, parents, or foster parents, have in the construction and inculcation of ideas concerning reading in L2.

After having systematically analysed my participants’ reports, participants’ descriptions of their self-concepts reflect their views of EFL reading. In section II, I shed light on their reported self-concepts as EFL reading and self-efficacy by making connections to their recently examined visions of EFL reading.

II. The ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ reader: Preconceptions of EFL in the conceptualisation of an EFL reading model

As explored, while participants disclosed their preconceptions of EFL reading, I could note that they suggested, implicitly and explicitly, a set of expectations that are placed on readers. Their discourses predominantly showed characterisations of EFL reading models and I could identify common dimensions of reading that are connected to their perceptions of a ‘good’ reader. These dimensions are a) IR and motivation to read b) personal interest and reading for enjoyment.

a) IR and motivation to read

Most of my participants characterised a ‘good’ reader as someone who reads fluidly and comprehends most of what they read. Some others, though, suggested that information
processing and criticality were very relevant reading practices to boot. This is the case of Catalina and Alejandro, in focus groups II and VI respectively, who agree with the idea that comprehension is a key skill in a ‘good’ reader:

**Catalina:** A ‘good’ reader is the one who can read anything, they can even summarise what they understand, they can be critical towards what they’re reading; ‘I liked this; I didn’t like this, this wasn’t very good’.

**Alejandro:** ‘a ‘good’ reader can process the information fast, and to be analytic and critical. There’re many people who tend to make this mistake of thinking that what they read is an absolute truth, and there’re people who don’t look for critiques. Also, a ‘good’ reader is critical.

Alejandro and Catalina agree by suggesting comprehension and criticality are key when it comes to define a ‘good reader’. In addition, they point out the relevance of an active role in readers when constructing own truths; readers should not be mere recipients of information, but active agents who constantly evaluate what they read. Alejandro’s discourse implicitly conveys the idea of authors are powerful beings who hold truth, and hence ‘bad’ readers usually take a passive role when reading. However, it is interesting to note that even though Alejandro highlights the relevance of critiquing, it seems to be paradoxical when he implicitly suggests ‘good’ readers should look for critiques. In all, their visions of positive reading models are connected to an intellectual facet of reading, which makes readers take an active role in this process.

When Andrea describes her reading model, she refers to two key aspects: comprehension and enjoyment:

I think a good reader is the one who reads for pleasure but also the one who adapts to any type of text, not necessarily the genre the reader likes. So, a reader reading news, poems, or papers, different things. A good reader is the one who understands a text well, and who is able to summarise [what they read] and explain it to someone else.

Andrea shares a similar vision with Maria and Carolina in connection to reading enjoyment; nevertheless, she also agrees with Catalina and Alejandro by highlighting the role of comprehension in reading. From her discourse, Andrea regards curiosity and freedom in
choosing what to read as traits connected to pleasure, as enjoyment is found in the heterogeneity of texts. From Andrea’s report, it seems pleasure and comprehension are two interconnected factors. This means, a ‘good’ reader finds pleasure when they can comprehend what they read. In addition, comprehension relates to the articulation of ideas that should be understood by a listener. This social interaction with a listener is not reported to be another source of pleasure, as she does not refer how significant it is to share one’s understanding of a text with someone else. From this last point, I can hypothesise that Andrea’s link between reading, curiosity and comprehension suggests a transactional understanding to reading, meaning that a ‘good’ reader is the one who finds pleasure in looking and, comprehending and learning new information or knowledge though reading, and who reinforces their comprehension skills by transferring this knowledge, which is fixed and unidimensional, to other people.

Catalina and Isabel (focus groups II and III respectively) have some common points when describing a ‘good’ reader:

**Catalina:** [A good reader is] someone who is perseverant when reading and committed as well, because it’s easy to say ‘I’m reading this, this, and this’, but if I read badly, I don’t pay attention to details, I’m not really [reading].

**Isabel:** [A good reader] goes beyond the quantity of reading. I feel [this notion of ‘good’] is to do more with the interest a reader has for reading. [To be a good reader] is to be able to understand this new language and persevere, because at least for me, it was difficult at the beginning.

It seems likely that their visions about L2 reading are informed by their own experiences when reading in English. Their reports focus on the challenges associated to reading in L2, as opposed to a vision of L2 reading that is pleasurable. One the one hand, the amount of reading is not a relevant trait when evaluating ‘good’ practices in reading; however, comprehension is a key trait. Consequently, they agree with previous visions about the links between L2 reading and comprehension, as this seems to be the overarching purpose of reading. Nevertheless, their descriptions do not solely relate to a reader’s comprehension
skills, but on the reader’s attitude as well. As Catalina and Isabel believe that reading in English is a difficult experience, ‘good’ readers are motivated and resilient as it seems easy to succumb to the challenges of L2 reading, suggesting at some point, that the personality of this reader, i.e., someone who is determined and disciplined, is what makes them ‘good’ readers.

As previously examined, persistence was pointed out as a relevant trait when describing a ‘good’ reader. Examining Isabel’s description in more depth, she highlights the importance of motivation to overcome potential challenges while reading in a L2. She adds:

I feel there’re many people who sometimes don’t have the perseverance as in ‘ok, we truly have to live the process and keep on going, keep on practicing’, and not just say ‘I can’t do it. I’m just going to stay in my comfort zone of my native language’.

As I previously analysed, Isabel suggests EFL reading is inherently difficult. A ‘good’ reader, hence, has a certain personality trait that helps them persevere in reading. Her discourse suggests that reading practices are not as relevant as a reader’s personality when describing a ‘good’ reader. She adds that a reading model takes reading as a challenge and accepts to go through this challenging journey to accomplish its overall purpose: comprehension. Her idea of reading seems comparable to other highly competitive and demanding activities, such as gymnastics, for example, which require the individual to have internal strength and control over emotional state as well. In addition, her references to curiosity in the previous excerpt and the idea of getting out of own ‘comfort zone’ suggest that curiosity is not understood from an IR perspective, i.e., it is not perceived as an intrinsic predisposition to explore the new, but to a chance to learn more, practice and improve reading skills.
III. Personal interest and reading for enjoyment.

Personal interest and reading for enjoyment were salient themes among other participants’ discourses. Maria and Carolina, for example, picture a ‘good’ reader as someone who is faithful to their reading interests:

**Maria:** A good reader is faithful to what they like and doesn’t push themselves to read things they’re not interested in, not because of ‘I have to read’! There’ll always be someone who will judge you, as in ‘oh, you haven’t read *Heidegger*, or whoever!’ I think a good reader is faithful to the things they like to read and reads for enjoyment and not for complying someone’s expectations.

**Carolina:** A good reader is someone who’s open-minded. I think [reading] is like music, all genres are valid. I prefer horror or science fiction, but I don’t disparage other genres, because all genres have something to good to give. So, a reader can be faithful to their own [reading] tastes, as long as they respect all the other existing types of topics and genres.

They assert that faithfulness is a key trait in ‘good’ readers. This faithfulness seems to arise from preconceptions which are concerned with the social value of reading, as an intellectual activity. Hence, they point out that reading is socially constructed. Canonical texts or authors seem to be socially valued, and thus, readers who read canonical texts are socially respected and regarded as ‘good’ readers. For these participants, evaluation of reading depends on social conventions that, for those who do not follow the canon, might feel judged for their reading selection. As from what reading means in social terms, they highlight the overarching purpose of reading, which is primary associated to enjoyment. Their reading models consequently find joy, providing they satisfy their reading needs based on their personal interests.

As both Maria and Carolina state, reading is a personal experience. Their discourse suggests that reading also depends on your free choices, as an act of respect. When describing a ‘good’ reader as someone who is ‘faithful’ to themselves, it seems that they conceive reading as an act that involves a reader’s acceptance of their own individuality within their social world. This implies, hence, that ‘good’ readers know what they like and are coherent
when it comes to deciding what to read; they respect themselves by prioritising their reading interests over social expectations. Consequently, I conclude that ‘bad’ readers are those who betray themselves for following social standards. It is interesting how both Maria and Carolina implicitly emphasise the role of society in the construction of a reader’s identity. As Maria describes, a ‘reader who does not ‘push themselves’ to read what they do not like describes that social conventions powerfully influence and eventually determine at some point readers’ experiences of enjoyment.

IV. I am a reader who…: Participants’ general self-concepts as EFL readers

My participants reported their self-concepts as EFL readers multidimensionally. However, I am examining only the aspects which were predominant in their discourse and common across participants’ reports. These are: IR and reading interest. In table 9 (see appendix J), I present a summary of their self-reported self-concepts as EFL readers.

a) I’m a professional reader: Self-concept through the lens of IR

IR was a common and salient perspective among participants when reporting their self-concepts as EFL readers. This is the case of Maria and Catalina (focus groups I and II respectively) who focused on their capabilities as readers of English:

**Maria:** I am a professional reader. I feel that there’re many people who can read in English, but the fact that we are so exposed to academic language, or language that is less common, helps us to read things that are not too basic.

**Catalina:** I don’t care [if I read in Spanish or English], because I now know I have the skills to read.

When exploring preconceptions of EFL reading, Maria conceived reading as pleasurable. However, when she describes her self-concept as EFL reader, it is seen that she does not describe herself from an ER perspective, i.e., reading for enjoyment; conversely, she does it

---

15 This was taken from the original translation of Maria’s discourse. She referred herself as a *trained reader*—or *capacitada* in Spanish—however, to convey her point as closer to English as possible, I decided to translate her description as *professional* instead.
through the lens of IR. This dichotomy, however, does not necessarily entail a contradiction, as her discourse seems to celebrate her skills as an EFL reader. Maria’s use of the adjective ‘professional’ suggests a positive self-concept and a perception of someone who has worked hard for developing her reading skills. Her professionalism in reading is connected to her ability to any text regardless of its English level. On the other hand, Catalina’s self-report depicts a technical perspective of reading. Her discourse suggests she has mastered the methods and strategies for reading in both L1 and L2. It is interesting, though, that her reading practices seem to be more frequent in English, rather than Spanish. This point was not explained in detail; however, I hypothesise that her frequency of English reading is to do with her being a TEFL undergraduate at the time of the study. In all, and even though Catalina does not explicitly refer to her self-concept as explicitly done by Maria, both report themselves as confident readers who can comprehend texts regardless of their English level, and level of complexity.

A perspective of IR is also conveyed in Andrés’s discourse. He reports himself as a reader who reads widely and frequently:

I try, at least, to read an hour a day. For example, I’m now [reading] this book in English, and I’ll start another one [soon], because I have many [books] here (he points to his bookshelf). I try to read every day, at least a bit to practice.

From his description, he implicitly describes himself as disciplined and consistent reader. As he does not explicitly describe himself in these terms, it cannot be asserted whether he truly perceives his reading persona as such. What it can be asserted, though, is that Andrés’s objective of reading is connected to his purpose of reading, which is to improve his reading skills in English. The perspective of IR in his reports is connected to his language use, when he says, ‘I try to read every day’, suggesting that frequency is an act of discipline. As in Catalina’s and Maria’s discourse, Andrés’s experience as a TEFL undergraduate seems to be relevant in informing his reports of his self-concepts as EFL readers potentially because of
his constant approach to IR in English at their university, which might also inculcate visions of EFL reading, as in the need of a reader’s discipline to aim at improvement if reading skills.

A similar point is seen in Isabel’s description. In this occasion though, she reports herself explicitly as a frequent reader:

[I am a] good reader, as I read frequently. I always, always try—every day— to spend some time reading in English. I feel like reading in English has been like a process. To be able to be constant in this process, and to acknowledge that there are stages, and that one can keep on improving and getting better\textsuperscript{16}... I feel that the key element here is to really go through this process. I’d say a disciplined reader, and I try to read diversely as well, like different topics, not just one, so I can learn vocabulary from different topics.

Isabel’s discourse shows that she holds expectations about reading in English. Similar to Andrés’s vision, reading is an activity that should be regularly exercised. Discipline and resilience are fundamental qualities to succeed in reading, and ultimately, to learn English. Thus, Isabel’s self-report is connected to a view of EFL reading as instrumental. Her self-concept is multidimensional, as she also perceives herself as a curious reader, since she reads diversely, and has curiosity that helps her expand her lexicon repertoire. In all, Isabel perceives herself as a good reader, as she positively appraises her reading practice as she follows the expectations of a EFL learner and reader. This last point is connected to her self-efficacy and self-esteem, which I discuss in more detail in section IV of this chapter.

My participants’ descriptions were not solely related to reading abilities. Under the framework of IR, participants referred to critical thinking when describing their self-concepts as EFL readers. Teresa, for instance, reports herself as a critical reader:

I always have the necessity to question things, question how things happen to be, how things should be, how one [as a reader] should be, what knowledge we should focus on and what knowledge we should disregard as well.

\textsuperscript{16} Isabel uses the word \textit{superarse} in Spanish. I have decided to translate this as \textit{get better}, as she refers to the improvement of language skills. However, the connotation of \textit{superarse} in Spanish is connected to overcoming (or to beat) obstacles by working very hard. My analysis of Isabel’s description as resilient emerges from this.
Teresa’s discourse suggests that her approach to reading relates to her inquiry about deeper philosophical and fundamental life questions. It might be the case that for her, her purpose for reading relates to criticality, as she feels ‘the necessity’ to question while reading. Her volition to question and interrogate what she reads is not restricted to academic or voluntary reading, as she does not refer to what type of reading she reads. Consequently, I hypothesise that her perception as a critical reader is transposed to any type of text and also to L1 reading, even though she does not explicitly suggest this is the case. As discussed earlier, examining participants’ perceptions as reader in L1 or conceptions of L1 reading might bring relevant information to the analysis of EFL reader’s identity construction, as qualities such as criticality might derive from their conceptions about L1. Lastly, criticality as a characteristic of a ‘good’ EFL reader was not frequently mentioned while discussing Pennac’s *The Rights of the Reader* in the focus groups. Nevertheless, criticality was reported as a key characteristic of an ideal EFL reading self, or as an objective to accomplish.

**b) I’m a seasonal reader: IR vs ER in EFL self-concepts**

Some participants’ descriptions were closely connected to time and frequency. Alberto, for example, explicitly reports his self-concept as a ‘seasonal reader’:

**Valeria:** how do you perceive yourselves? How would you describe yourselves as EFL readers?

**Alberto:** like a seasonal reader\(^\text{17}\), because I have episodes. [There are] certain times in a year that I read more than others. I’m not a very, very active reader. I dump reading sometimes…

**Valeria:** what does your reading depend on?

**Alberto:** time, for certain! and sometimes motivation. If I’m very honest, there are things that come up that are more interesting than reading, because I can do these with someone else. I mean, you read on your own, so if someone asks me: ‘hey, shall we catch up?’ I’d leave the book aside and I’d rather have a video call instead. It’s

\(^{17}\) Alberto describes himself as a *temporero*. In Spanish, this word is used to refer to a part-time or seasonal worker who spends time working in countryside fields to harvest produce.
because of time—manage my free time better—because all the books I have are about topics that interest me, so, it depends on time.

Alberto reports his self-concept based on the perspective of ER or voluntary reading (Krashen, 2004). This is observed when he refers to interest and motivation; aspects he has not yet fully developed. His self-concept as a reader is described by making a comparison to a temporary worker. This comparison seems to be linked to his idea of ‘sins’ in reading, i.e., ER is synonymous of frequency and breadth of reading, as well as interest.

Motivation, interest, and frequency are aspects that usually denote a manifestation of enjoyment; however, Alberto does not mention feeling enjoyment when reading in his leisure time. Additionally, he states his topic interest is not enough for him to finish books. This conveys a paradox between ER and his self-conception based on this approach to reading, as he also places time as the primary factor for his interrupted reading practice. It is observed that his reading interest is dynamic and hence self-concepts from an ER perspective should be understood dynamically as well. This point agrees with the existing literature on interest (Hidi & Renninger, 2006), which states that interest can be gained, sometimes lost and/or regained. Lastly, considering Alberto’s conception of reading as a moral activity, his ideas of reading do not seem to rule his reading practice, at least when referring to voluntary reading in English.

Similarly, Andrea reports her self-concept from the lens of ER, however, she also makes room for IR:

Valeria: How do you describe yourselves as EFL readers?

Andrea: if we talk about reading for pleasure, I’m not too enthusiastic about reading. It happens occasionally. However, if it’s academic reading, I’m fully involved. I’m not too passionate or a big fan of reading, but at the same I’m committed to it.

Valeria: so, can we say university is the main reason to read?

Andrea: no, I mean, there is intrinsic motivation, but reading is not something I’d choose in the first place, because it depends on the priority in that moment. So that’s
why I’m committed to read things, but if it’s about reading for pleasure, I’d [describe myself] as someone who reads sporadically.

Andrea describes herself from two different angles. On the one hand, when it comes to pleasure reading, she reports her self-concept an infrequent, passionless reader, whereas when it refers to academic reading, she is disciplined. From this, I hypothesise that she regards voluntary reading as less relevant, or less valuable, in comparison to other leisure or academic activities or commitments. Andrea’s discourse suggests opposing, and dynamic, perceptions of her self-concept. Even though she does not refer to her self-esteem as an EFL reader, contradictory-looking concepts might result in conflicting self-concepts as a reader sometimes, due to the evaluations these might inflict on her self-esteem as a reader. Lastly, even though Andrea in this occasion does not explicitly mention the reason of her priority to read intensively, I can predict that her academic goal, which is to become a qualified EFL teacher, seems to be her driving force to read frequently and widely.

c) I’m a selective reader: Self-concept through the lens of ER

I could observe that ER was a grounding point to report self-concepts as EFL readers. From this, reading interest was a predominant focus among some participants’ reports, and especially interest in connection to topics. This is the case of Sara:

I don’t consider myself as someone versatile in reading. I’m a selective reader. If I don’t like [what I read], if it doesn’t hook18 me enough, I then just leave [the book] unfinished. I’m very much like this, very selective when it comes to reading.

From the realm of pleasure reading, she explicitly describes herself as a selective reader as her engagement in reading is influenced by topics of her interest. Furthermore, her discourse shows that her interest to read becomes immersive as only some topics invite her or ‘hook’ her attention. As Sara does not make any reference to academic reading, her voluntary

---

18 This has been directly translated from the Spanish word *enganchar*, which in this context, is a synonym of interest.
reading seems to be fully based on an intrinsic motivational factor, and non-academically dependant. Her interest to read is not on the act of reading; this means her reading interest might not always be maintained and prolonged is she explores new texts. Her faithfulness to topics suggests she respects her reading needs and does not place expectations to finish texts if they are not appealing to her.

d)  *I'm a curious reader: Reading identity through the lens of reading interest*

Participants frequently described themselves as curious readers. This is the case of Andrés:

**Valeria:** how do you describe yourselves as EFL readers?

**Andrés:** I’m a curious reader because I always try to explore new genres and read varied authors. I got this book by *Frantz Fanon* and I want to read [his books], because I got motivated reading this one, I want to read theory about decolonisation to understand it a bit more.

When it comes to reading in English, it’s to do with curiosity and resources. I mean, resources because many times I look for a PDF of an English book, because in comparison to a printed book, this is way cheaper. So, because of my curiosity, and because I sometimes don’t have the money to get it physically, I just get the PDF version instead.

Andrés is inquisitive in finding ways to access the materials he is inclined to read, regardless of some obstacles EFL readers might encounter, as it is the case of accessibility and cost of accessing texts in English in a country where English is a FL. His report shows his high level of motivation to read, which seems to be both related to topic interest and to the act of reading itself. In his endeavour to find new topics, Andrés reports himself as persistent. Access to reading in English seems to be relevant as it can challenge readers’ motivation to engage in reading. This means that EFL reading does not only posit challenges related to comprehension and flow, but also on the maintenance of this persistence to look for opportunities to feed curiosity to read in a FL.

Andrés is adventurous, and reading interest seems to be fuelled his openness and curiosity:

**Valeria:** how did you find out what you liked to read?
Andrés: I was experimenting with different genres; literary. I just tried, and tried, and tried until I got to political theory, narratives about colonisation and [I got to the] topics that I like. Sometimes I listened to people saying ‘hey, read this book. Maybe you’ll like it’ and I just gave it a go. [You just need to] take a leap of faith; that can maybe open your mind, so to speak.

From this, his interest seems to be well-maintained. While exploring authors, his interest to read seemed to emerge regardless of the topics of interest, which suggests his interest in reading has been developed and prolonged through time. I hypothesise reading in English is not dependent on situational or environmental factors, but to his well-developed interest to read in L1, as his reading habit might have been developed in Spanish in his early years.

José, on the other hand, reports reading curiosity as a key trait in his reading persona:

I’m a good and bad reader. I’m very curious of many types of stories, but I’m very bad at starting and finishing a book. I start many books and after 20 or 30 pages, I leave them because I find another good, entertaining book, and I start it and then after 30 pages, I just feel the same with another book. I love reading, but I never finish reading, that frustrates me sometimes.

He starts by interpreting his reading behaviour from two sides of a spectrum. His self-concept is conceived from this evaluation and from his vision of EFL reading, connected to the dialogic nature of reading, i.e., readers have a moral commitment to authors that implies their appreciation to the author’s work (his self-appraisal as an EFL reader will be discussed later in section IV). Even though curiosity is generally conceived and perceived as a positive characteristic in reading, José still reports his self-concept as faulty because of his impatience and inability to comply with his expectation as an EFL reader. Curiosity for José, thus, becomes detrimental for being a distracting factor in his attention and persistence in reading.

e) I recommend books: Self-concept through the lens of socialisation

Descriptions as readers through the lens of socialisation were considerably less frequent, although still salient. Sara and Eva (focus groups V and VII) were the only two participants who reported their self-concepts from this perspective:
**Sara:** when I recommend [a text], I can start a conversation, a very enriching one with someone similar reading tastes. I like sharing [ideas] a lot, and it’s been hard to share with people who’d read in English, because there aren’t too many of us here [in Chile].

**Eva:** I have a little stepsister; I recommend her books and she’s getting into reading. I’m guiding her in this world of reading.

The perspectives of socialisation in their self-concepts are seen from two different perspectives. On the one hand, Sara points out socialisation through reading as a joyful experience, as she is confident in her ability to recommend books. Once again, her self-concept is informed by her self-appraisal of her reading practice. From Eva’s discourse, socialisation is seen in her report as a space where reading has helped her to become a guide, and potentially an inspiring reading model. Even though Sara and Eva suggest 2 different perspectives of socialisation, their discourses show their volition to connect, potentially affectively, and with other readers. Their self-reports as EFL readers are connected to their importance of reading as a channel to express their personal reading experiences with others.

**V. Their self-efficacy and self-esteem in EFL reading**

I observed that when my participants were describing their self-concepts and self-efficacy, they spontaneously commented on or described their self-esteem as EFL readers. After an exhaustive analysis of my participants’ self-reports, I realised that their self-concepts, self-efficacy, and self-esteem were connected.

Participants who reported their self-efficacy in EFL reading were only those who reported their self-concepts from an IR perspective. This is because self-efficacy in reading refers to individual beliefs on skills or capabilities in reading (Bandura, 1993). During the focus groups, I prevented directing participants’ reports to neither IR nor ER. Therefore, I conclude participants reported their self-concepts, presumably from their salient understanding of what EFL reading means. For those participants who did not refer to their self-efficacy during the
focus group, their self-efficacy was examined only through their reports from the questionnaire I administered before my intervention (see appendix K).

To assess their self-efficacy, I systematically examined their reports from both the descriptive quantitative and qualitative data. Tables 10 and 11 (see appendix K, L) show information about their reported self-efficacy from The Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire, and which I summarise in figure 3 below. Additionally, in table 12 (see appendix M), I provide descriptive information about participants’ reports on their self-efficacy and self-concepts from the qualitative data. My adapted version of the questionnaire in question included items which focused on EFL reading tasks in relation to academic and non-academic texts.

Figure 3

Summary of Participants’ Highest and Lowest Scores in Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (Burrows, 2012)
From the results obtained, the means range from M= 4.75 to M=5.75, indicating that at least 79% and most about 95% of all participants have confidence in performing successfully in EFL reading tasks. More specifically, the ability to *read and understand the main ideas of an article in a newspaper published in an English-speaking country that is written about a topic related to your major (i.e., economics, law) at university* was reported as a skill that 80% of participants feel confident of performing successfully. In addition, 80% of participants reported to have confidence in the ability to *read and understand the specific details of a magazine article written in English and related to one of my hobbies (i.e., fashion, sports, music, movies)*.

Moreover, 75% of participants have reported to believe they can perform successfully in the ability to *read and understand the main ideas of fiction books written in English*. On the other hand, 40% of participants reported to be hesitant to perform successfully on the ability to *read and understand a poem written in English*, and 45% reported to also feel hesitant in the ability to read and understand the specific details of fiction books written in English. The results of this questionnaire also show that no participants have negative beliefs on IR and ER tasks, such as not be able to *read and understand the main and specific ideas of an article in a newspaper published in an English-speaking country* and *read and understand the main ideas of fiction books written in English*. I present a summary of these findings in figure 4 below.
Figure 4

*Summary Participants’ Responses*\(^{19}\) to the Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (Burrows, 2012).

One of the striking aspects concerning reported self-efficacy is the discrepancy between some participants’ reports in their questionnaire and focus group interviews. Catalina, Andrea, Alejandra, Luz, and Héctor reported to have low levels of self-efficacy during the focus group interview; nevertheless, in their questionnaire reports, they stated to have had high levels. This dichotomy might suggest the influence of their self-concepts in their reported self-efficacy. This means, as the questionnaire explicitly directed them to focus on specific EFL reading tasks, participants did not bring their attention to their self-concepts and self-esteem when reporting. In opposition to the focus group interviews, where participants had the space and confidence to reflect and describe their self-concepts and efficacy more openly. Consequently, the focus group provided the opportunity to collect deeper –and perhaps more genuine– accounts of their internal landscapes. Hence, their general beliefs as EFL reading personae and their feelings about themselves, based on their preconceptions, or

\(^{19}\) This graph summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.
understanding of EFL reading and ideal EFL reader model, might have informed their reported self-efficacy during the focus groups.

Participants’ self-concepts and self-esteem are based on their preconceptions with regard EFL reading and EFL reading models, which work as a reference to self-appraise their EFL reading personae. I observed that my participants’ self-concept, self-esteem, and self-efficacy seem to be congruent, i.e., their self-concepts are aligned with their reported levels of self-esteem and self-efficacy (see table 11 in appendix L). Generally, from the qualitative data, most of my participants reported to have high or positive levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem. As suggested, those who reported low levels of self-efficacy, also reported corresponding levels of self-esteem.

Nevertheless, Alejandro and José in focus groups IV and VI respectively, they reported self-efficacy and self-esteem disagreed:

José: I can read almost all texts without problems. I don’t need a dictionary. I understand everything I read, general and specific ideas of a text. I have all the skills for C2 level, according to CEFR.

Valeria: how would you describe yourselves as EFL readers?

José: good and bad. I’m very curious to read many types of stories. I start many books and after 20 or 30 pages I start another book I find interesting. I love reading, but I can never finish one.

Alejandro: I’m not a good reader, even though I said I try to be critical or read fast—and I generally understand what I read—this is to do with reading for pleasure. I like reading, but sometimes I’m too superficial. Sometimes I skim the text, or I don’t feel like reading. Andrés, for example, buys books and reads them passionately, and I just sometimes I skim, or never finish books because I didn’t feel like reading at that moment, even though they are very interesting.

José, and Alejandro report positive self-efficacy in EFL reading. José focuses on the role of breadth of lexicon in IR in relation to reading comprehension, whereas Alejandro refers to

---

Alejandro uses the word sin to describe his reading practice. In Spanish a veces peco de... is literally translated as sometimes I’m sinful of…. In this context, I decided to translate this by using the adverb too instead.
his capabilities in connection to fluency and comprehension based on his preconceptions of an EFL reading model. He described characteristics of a EFL reading model from an IR perspective, without explicitly mentioning having such traits; however, I infer Alejandro regards himself as an EFL reading model as he is confident about his EFL reading capabilities.

José and Alejandro convey their feelings about their EFL reading personae rather contrarily. It seems that their self-esteem seemed to vary depending on the perspective of reading. That is, as IR and ER comprise different and subjective preconceptions, their self-efficacy and self-esteem denote different aspects to reading for José and Alejandro, who regardless of their positive beliefs of their capabilities to perform in reading, they do not feel positive about their practices when reading voluntarily.

As for the rest of participants, contradictions were not observed. Generally, participants reported to be self-confident in their capabilities to read intensively. This might be because participants had worked on their IR skills for at least 4 years at the time of data collection for their core modules on English Language skills offered by their university.

Nevertheless, some participants reported low self-efficacy and negative self-esteem. This is the case of Catalina:

**Catalina:** To read, it must be about something like ‘oh, how interesting’, I need to read another [similar] book’. That’s why I’m a bad reader, because I don’t adapt myself to topics; I’m not willing to read things that don’t call my attention.

I wish I could read (academically) in Spanish instead, because I can read faster. In Spanish I have all the *subskills* to read fast and to analyse what I read, because it’s my mother tongue. In English, though, takes me longer to grasp an idea and put it into *context*. I never know whether I read well or not. So, I end up looking for summaries online, because I never know if I understood correctly what the author wanted to say […]. I think I can do it; I have the faculty to read anything, and I understand, at least

---

21 Catalina here uses the word *entretenido*, which translates literally as *entertaining*. However, *entretenido* in Chilean Spanish is mostly interchangeably used with *interesting*. I have decided to use the word *interesting* instead, as she mostly refers to topic interest.
the general idea [...]. I am a bit insecure… I think I won’t understand a text, and I just leave it. I always do the same. I think I’m wasting my time or that I’m just not comprehending the text well, and I rather go with a summary.

It can be observed that Catalina has low self-efficacy. She gives attention to fluency in reading, overall comprehension, and interpretation/analysis of implicit ideas; skills she does not feel confident in performing successfully. Just like the rest of the participants, Catalina had worked on her IR for at least 4 years, meaning that her hesitancy might not actually reflect her actual reading abilities. At the beginning of the focus group, she reported her abilities in English are advanced, suggesting her listening, writing, and speaking skills had been evaluated as C1, according to Aptis (see chapter III). Nevertheless, her reading skills were scored as B2 in this same evaluation. Participants reported to have taken this exam almost one year previous the time of the interview; hence, at the time of her report, her reading skills might have been more advanced than what she believes. In consequence, her low self-efficacy and hesitancy of her own comprehension might also respond to her preconception that reading comprehension consists of a transfer of fixed ideas from an author.

Her discourse also suggests low self-esteem. As earlier stated, reports on self-esteem are based on their preconceptions of EFL extensive reading and judgements about what they find acceptable or unacceptable for EFL readers. Her low self-esteem responds to her perceived lack of curiosity to explore texts beyond her topic interest. As Catalina regards curiosity as an expected trait for a ‘good’ reader, she does not comply with her expectation as she requires to feel strong driving motivation to engage in reading, which is usually triggered by her topic interests.

**VI. The construction of their EFL reading personae**

From my analyses and interpretation discussed and presented in chapters IV and V, I here conclude on my participants’ construction of their EFL reading identities. My analysis
initially started by looking at their self-concepts and self-efficacy. I hence delved into their EFL reader self-concepts by examining their understandings of EFL reading, as well as their ideal models of an EFL reader. Concerning their self-efficacy, I examined their beliefs about their reading capabilities (IR). During my analysis, I observed that participants spontaneously referred to their self-esteem, or how they felt about their EFL reading personae in relation to both IR and ER perspectives. Hence, self-esteem was also a construct I included in my overall interpretation of their construction of EFL reading identities.

Some SLA theorists who have worked around language learner and identity define, non-problematically, learners in binary terms, i.e., ‘motivated or unmotivated, introverted or extroverted, inhibited or inhibited, without considering affective factors that are frequently socially constructed’ (Norton, 1995, p. 12). From my analysis, I observe my participants’ identities are dynamic and multifaceted, meaning they cannot be defined or described binarily. These are formed by heterogenous— and sometimes contradictory— beliefs and feelings rooted both in past and current experiences regarding EFL reading and EFL language learning, and in affective factors based on perspectives of reading, IR and ER, as well as their individual understanding of EFL reading.

Past experiences seem to be a key factor in projecting future reading practices. As participants’ self-concepts are rooted in their past experiences (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003), which in turn influence their self-efficacy, their self-concepts to some extent rule their future reading behaviour due to the influence of their beliefs or personal experiences in their self-efficacy (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). This suggests that participants’ stories are a key aspect to understand their construction of identities as EFL readers.

The status of English as a LF highly influenced their identity formation, as these were initially formed by their interest and necessity to explore, access, and read texts in English.
mostly from online platforms. I hence conclude that their interest for the English language generally started as a necessity, as a result of the status of English in Chile, i.e., English being the most preferred LF (Lanvers, 2019) and English being the language of access.

Their EFL reading journeys progressed through time due to popular culture. Their interest to learn English grew mainly because information about mass entertainment were predominantly available in English, and Spanish-translated versions of these were reported to be either little in quantity or of bad quality. It was also found that their interest in English, as well as their EFL reading engagement were connected to their level of identification with English and culture, though not always connected to the cultures of English-speaking countries, but the culture of globalisation. I thus conclude that their reading engagement in English, as well as ELL, grew and developed because of the influence of globalisation, which led them voluntary interact with the language and become TEFL undergraduates. It is important to note the influence of English as a LF and their disposition to learn English was significant to the point of deciding to take the role of EFL teachers and become agents of spread of this language (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007).

In a similar vein, my participants’ identity formation is influenced by informal ELL contexts. Their EFL reading engagement outside the EFL classroom was powerful and emerged from the utility of English when it comes to access and consume materials online in their leisure time. Their EFL reading journeys were characterised by their interest in engaging with their hobbies, which suggests learning and reading in English was a side effect. Considering the challenges in relation to comprehension when reading in FL, it is relevant to point out participants’ agency and persistence to overcome the barriers of learning a FL in contexts where they were not expected to do so. This reflects the importance of motivation and purpose, which might not necessarily be connected to language itself in the first place, in ELL.
Expectations, preconceptions, and perspectives of EFL reading also played a pivotal role in their EFL reading identity formation. I conclude their reading personae are shaped by societal and personal ideas that result in both unique and collective visions of EFL reading, which are manifested in EFL reading models and expectations they set on themselves as EFL readers. Even though it is uncertain where these societal visions and conventions come from, it is important to mention that parents seemed to have very little influence in this. It would be expected that parents would take a bigger role if investigating their influence concerning visions or experiences regarding L1 reading.

Preconceptions of EFL reading are mostly inculcated in educational settings, i.e., school and university. However, I hypothesise that participants’ preconceptions of EFL reading are informed by their visions of L1 reading. This can explain their unique and heterogenous preconceptions of EFL reading, since even though their standards of desirable EFL reading practices were generally common, some individual and personal visions were salient. For example, when making distinctions between IR and ER giving shape to multifaceted identities.

In all, my participants’ construction of EFL reading personae are correlated to their agency and interaction with the social and global world. Their identities are hence influenced by globalisation, the status of English as a LF, and English as the main language of mass entertainment. By the time their EFL journeys started, their accessibility, and potentially easiness of communication, contributed to their identities as English speakers. This means their past experiences as English language learners is still a dominant dimension of their current identities. This is observed in their lack of connection to their profession as TEFL teachers (pre-service teacher at the time of the study), and hence salient self-concept as English speakers. I conclude, thus, that their EFL reading identities is a reflection of a
predominant understanding of reading in English as a tool of access and a tool for ELL (IR), which in turn is reinforced by their current experience as TEFL undergraduates.

Lastly, their preconceptions of EFL reading, mainly from ER and IR perspectives, on the one hand reflect the relation they have with EFL reading. On the other, their set of beliefs about reading in FL influence their self-concepts as readers of this language both positively and/or negatively, which in turn influence their self-esteem. Sociocultural aspects in connection to ELL and ELT, as well as their preconceptions of reading were also considered when examining their motivations for reading in English (see chapter VI).

VII. Summary of the chapter

In this chapter, I have systematically explored participants’ self-concepts as EFL readers and self-efficacy in EFL reading. During my analysis, I observed that self-esteem was a recurrently mentioned construct in my participants’ reports. Consequently, I decided to include this in my interpretation and answer to RQ1, as I regarded this a key aspect in my participants’ construction of their EFL reading personae.

I started by exploring participants’ preconceptions of EFL reading and their conceptualisations of a EFL reading model to subsequently explore their EFL self-concepts. Their self-concepts are connected to different perspectives of EFL reading. Most participants’ self-concepts are connected to either IR, ER or both. Some others’ self-concepts are connected to reading interest, and just a few participants’ self-concepts are associated to socialisation in reading. Generally, it can be concluded that participants’ self-concepts are based on preconceptions of EFL reading and their visions of an EFL reading model, based on perspectives of IR or ER.

In this chapter, I also delved into my participants’ self-efficacy and self-esteem in EFL reading. After having explored their self-concepts, I could observe their self-concepts generally agree with their reported levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem. Additionally, their
self-esteem varies depending on the perspective of reading and their understandings of IR and ER perspectives. Generally, participants report high levels of self-efficacy in IR, as the quantifiable data collected showed all participants are confident in performing reading tasks concerning literary and non-literary texts. Nevertheless, some participants reported contradictory accounts on their self-efficacy during the focus groups. Even though these participants acknowledge their reading capacities, they hesitate in their reading comprehension skills. Additionally, some others reported contradictory levels of self-esteem, i.e., concerning IR they felt good about their reading personas, although felt bad about their reading personas in ER.

I finished this chapter by discussing their construction of identities. I conclude that their construction of identities has been formed by both past and current experiences. The status of English as a LF shaped their purpose to read, and their interest in mass entertainment helped them to maintain themselves in their EFL reading journeys and ELL. In addition, I conclude their identities are based on their understanding of reading, based on mainly ER and IR perspectives. Even though their identities seemed to be highly linked to their experiences as TEFL undergraduates, their identities are not fully connected to their roles as EFL pre-service teachers. Their experiences as TEFL undergraduates have permeated their approach to reading, mostly from an IR perspective. It was discussed that participants’ preconceptions of EFL reading models are not always based in IR. Conversely, some participants seem to construct their identities from an ER perspective instead.

Lastly, their identities as EFL readers seemed to be informed by expectations they place on themselves as EFL readers. Even though it is not possible to assert the roots of these expectations, it is possible to suggest these might have roots in societal and educational ideas about reading, which might have been inculcated mainly at school and/or university. Lastly,
the analysis and discussion I have presented in this chapter allows me to answer RQ1, bringing my analyses and conclusion from chapters IV and V.
Chapter VI: Motivations for Reading in English and Motivational Variables in EFL Reading

In chapter VI, I give attention to motivations for reading in EFL. More precisely, the reasons why my participants decide to read in English, as well as their general experiences of engagement and interest when reading in English. While processing my data, I realised participant present interests to read agree with their past ones, precisely when they initiated their reading journeys. For this reason, I do not go in depth in this construct; I present a summary of their interests from the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997).

Examining reading motivation and motivational variables is useful to understand participants’ attitudes and predisposition to read in this language, especially in the intervention, and to establish connections between participants’ reading personae and reading behaviour. As Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) suggest, reading motivation can predict readers’ reading behaviour, as even though readers might be efficacious about reading, they might not decide to engage in reading if they do not have a goal or purpose for reading.

Motivation is defined as ‘the desire to or will to do something’ (Hidi & Renninger, 2016, p. 71), and it involves ‘energy, direction, and persistence’ (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The body of literature around motivation is vast and wide, nonetheless some scholars have pointed out the need to bring consensus and clarity concerning definitions of what motivation and motivational constructs mean (Conradi et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2021). For this, in my study, I followed the definition of reading motivation presented by Conradi et al. (2014), who state that it is ‘the drive to read resulting from a comprehensive set of an individual’s beliefs about, attitudes towards, and goals for reading’ (p. 154). In addition, to guide my project, I followed the work proposed by Guthrie et al. (2012), Finn and Zimmer (2012), Conradi et al. (2014),
Lee et al. (2021) and Renninger and Hidi (2015). These scholars have significantly contributed to the research on motivation, engagement, and interest, and have posited some consensus definitions. In consequence, I decided that the construct that is originally referred to as ‘involvement’ by Wigfield and Guthrie in their Motivations for Reading Questionnaire, in my study, I refer to it as ‘engagement’, as these terms are used mostly interchangeably.

I have structured this chapter in 4 main sections. In section I, I present my participants’ general purposes for EFL reading, in section II, I delve into my participants’ current experiences of reading engagement. In section III, I answer my RQ 2, and finally in section IV, I present a summary of this chapter.

I. Motivations for reading in EFL

Motivation refers to a desire to do something, and it entails purposes or goals which might influence an individual’s decision to engage in reading. Even though the existing literature on motivation gives great attention to intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of motivation, in this section, I analysed solely participants’ overall goals and purposes for reading which incite them to read and persist in this activity. I present a further account on their sources of motivation in section II, where I delve into their reading engagement.

In table 13 (see appendix N), I present a summary of the quantifiable information I collected from my edited version of Motivations for Reading Questionnaire. This questionnaire included constructs such as purposes for reading in English, as well as reading engagement in relation to academic and voluntary reading in EFL.

From the results obtained, in the construct of purposes for reading, the means range from M= 3.3 to M=3.75, which means that at least 82.5% of participants read for their academic success, and about 94% of all participants read to comply with their academic responsibilities, such as participating actively in class. In table 13, I also summarise
participants’ reports about their purposes for reading. More specifically, most participants read for academic purposes. 80% reported to read to comply with their assignments at university, and 75% to read to participate in class. Interestingly, 45% and 50% suggested to read to improve reading and writing skills, respectively. Concerning voluntary reading, 65% of participants reported to read for enjoyment/pleasure and to learn about other cultures or topics. A summary of these findings are illustrated in figure 5 below.

**Figure 5**

**Summary Participants’ Responses** to Motivations for Reading Questionnaire.
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**a) Reading in English cultivates us: Reading to improve language skills**

Some of my participants’ EFL journeys started from their interest to learn English. When I asked them about their current motivations in the focus group, some of them reported to have the same past motivations for reading in English. Alberto is one of those who stated this:

---

22 This table summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.
I see reading as a way to practice English and improve myself in the language. I like reading in English; I like the pronunciation of words, structures, and when I read, I immerse myself in what I read; it’s enjoyable.

Alberto’s motivation is fuelled by his affective engagement to read, which comes from his love for English; this means that reading is a springboard to achieve higher levels of proficiency. Reading in English does not entail any connection to Alberto’s teaching persona; conversely, reading is connected to his ambition to be, potentially, an English user aiming to reach a native-like level. Alberto’s motivation, hence, is not connected to his perception of pre-service teacher who takes the role of an EFL reading model to his students. His discourse reflects with what Barahona and Ibaceta-Quijanes claim in her study on Chilean EFL student teachers’ discourse to examine their understanding of their professional responsibility (2022). She states that Chilean English language teachers seem to lack critical awareness of their responsibility as pre-service and soon-to-be EFL teachers, which might be connected to the curricula of most Chilean IELTEP, as they foster the ‘achievement of advanced levels of English language proficiency and knowledge of the English language’ (p.2), instead of cultivating a sense of social justice or responsibility for the pedagogical profession.

Similarly, Eva suggests the importance of reading for developing language skills. However, her perspective slightly diverges from Alejandro’s as she links reading with her future profession:

I think reading is very important for us as future TEFL teachers, basically because the language we will teach and use with children in the classroom will be basic. Reading in English cultivates us; it helps us to keep a good level and prevent us from going backwards. So, I think it’s essential to keep reading, because just (using themed-language, like) colours and animals will kill our brains.

Even though she acknowledges the importance of reading for her profession, her discourse is similar to Alejandro’s in that her motivation to read does not relate to her teaching persona, but to her identity as an English speaker. Her discourse suggests she perceives herself as a source of input of English, rather than a teacher, or a reading model. It is important to point
out that by referring to English as an opportunity to cultivate themselves, Eva, like Alberto, sees the fact of acquiring language through a written input as more cultivating than the reading experience itself. In addition, developing language skills through reading is also associated to the development of intelligence, suggesting that the teaching profession is detrimental for her professional and personal growth. It could be argued that Eva’s goal for reading relates to an idea of the ‘idealised native speaker’ (Selvi & Campus, 2016), as her main aim for reading is to progress in her language skills. Once again, this might be due the avid attention curricula in IELTEP give to language acquisition, and to Eva’s perception of the profession which lacks opportunities to teach English in contexts where students have higher levels of proficiency and skills in this language. Eva’s vision of reading does not reflect any link to the inspiring role a EFL teacher might be for their students to cultivate the interest to read either.

Carolina suggests that her motivation to read lies in its usefulness to expand her vocabulary range in this language:

> I find reading important as it is useful for practicing the language. For me, it is always positive because it benefits my process of learning and improving my English level and in my acquisition of vocabulary. It always happens that when I read in English, or when the text is in Spanish, I prefer to read it in English instead, because I feel I am going to feel more interested to read it and I end up feeling more motivated. I read in English as well because there are words that I sometimes do not know, and I look them up immediately, because I like learning new words.

Her report describes the close relation between interest and motivation. Interest is usually confused or used interchangeably with motivation. Renninger and Hidi (2015) claim a motivated reader might not necessarily be interested to read, as interest relates to a ‘psychological state of a position during engagement as well as cognitive and affective motivational disposition of that person to reengage with a particular content’ (p. 72).

Examining Carolina’s report, her motivation for reading in English is also connected to her positive beliefs towards reading, which relate to an opportunity, or channel, to get better in
English. It can be also observed that her belief of reading and passion for English also influence her experience of interest, or predisposition to engage in reading, as it is interesting that she reports to have better predisposition to read in English rather than in Spanish. I present a more detailed account on reading interest in section II below.

b) It is like a third arm: Reading in English is a necessity

Some stated they reading English is fundamental not only for their academic purposes, but for other spheres of lives. José describes this point:

Reading in English is very important for me because it influences all areas of my life: my social life, my free time, my professional and academic life. Without English I wouldn’t be able to take part in any of these spaces; that is why English is extremely important for me.

Similar reports were described in chapter IV in relation to participants’ reasons to engage with English reading when initiating their EFL reading journeys. As seen in this excerpt, motivations for reading seem to have remained the same for some participants at the time the focus groups were held. José’s report suggests a hegemonic status of English over other languages, such as his L1 German or his L3, Spanish. Hence, it seems likely that for José, English has become his default language, or a necessity, to grow in fundamental areas of his life. In all, José’s motivation to read seems to be a springboard to develop himself in life, rather than to primarily engage with narratives in personal or professional levels.

Alberto says that for him, English and English reading are essential for daily situations:

Utility. I feel it is more useful for me to read in English than reading in Spanish. Tutorials, manuals, instructions are clearer sometimes in English than in Spanish. So, for me when I have a query, it is easier for me to look for it in English.

Alberto highlights that the usefulness of English lies in the good quality of translations. In this case, poor quality of Spanish translations incentivises EFL reading and not the availability of materials in English. Following Rosenblatt’s terms (1994), Alberto’s motivation to read is efferent, just as José, rather than aesthetic. He does not describe reading
as a personal, affective, or intimate process, but as instrumental, or as a processed merely characterised by a transaction of information instead.

On a similar vein, the utility or necessity to read in English also relates to the possibility to expand one’s own conceptual framework. This point is suggested in another focus group by Enrique, who metaphorically describes English reading ‘as a third arm’:

**Enrique:** I consider English reading as a third arm. This is because sometimes there’s a piece of information that I need to read, or to know, and it is usually available in English. Reading in English is like having an extra possibility to comprehend. I consider it like a third arm, like another possibility for comprehension, apart from the one from Spanish.

**Valeria:** do you mean comprehending language that cannot be translated into Spanish?

**Enrique:** Yes. Reading in English opens a new door… it is like a third arm; without it, I would not be able to fully comprehend, so reading in English allows us to open our minds as there are things that do not exist in Spanish.

Enrique expresses his awareness of his construal process in his L2, which reflects the root of his reading motivation. Construal refers to a speaker’s creation of a mental image of an event, which in a L2 implies a speaker’s creation of new representations, as ‘learning another language will often involve learning to see things in a different way, both physically and linguistically’ (Littlemore, 2009, p 14). This explains Enrique’s metaphorical description of reading as a third arm; reading in English is a physical experience as a way to interact with new sets of events or phenomena. This excerpt gives some clues about Enrique’s beliefs. When he says reading in English opens new doors, it is implied that there is a widespread —metaphorical— conception of English, which seems to be deep-rooted in the Chilean society, and that relates to people’s desire to learn English to succeed and to access the world.

This point also reflects the great effects of governmental efforts to give predominance to the instruction of the English language in Chilean schools across the country by the creation of the ‘English Opens Doors’ programme in 2003 (Barahona, 2016). Similar beliefs have

---

This metaphor does not correspond to any fixed expression in Chilean Spanish.
been reported outside the Chilean context, for instance, in Niño-Murcia’s study on language ideologies (2003), where she quotes one of her participants suggesting: ‘if you don’t know English nowadays, you are nobody’ (p. 132). In brief, Enrique’s motivation to read relates to his willingness to expand his conceptual representations, which in turn, is linked to his acceptance of English as a language that brings benefits in relation to access, construal, and most likely to opportunities.

From another perspective, Héctor’s and Daniel’s motivation for reading in English is to grow professionally:

**Héctor:** in the case of reading about teaching methodology, I feel it is something that will be useful for my whole future life, because we will plan lessons until we retire.

**Daniel:** even if a text might not be of my interest, I still read it as it might be useful. I think, even if I read a text for obligation, it might still be useful. I will maybe find myself in a situation where I will need this information. When I read for university, my mindset is to read for growing professionally, because it might be useful for my future as an EFL teacher.

Reading motivation, here, is instrumental and relate to their pedagogical awareness and responsibility of their social role as EFL teachers. Their motivation is fuelled by what they find meaningful; that is, topics that might benefit them in their profession and in their development of key teaching activities, such as lesson planning or ELT strategies. Even though Héctor and Daniel disclose their connection to their future profession, their positionality reflects solely their willingness to become agents of social justice, or potentially their unique interest to become competent professionals in the area, but not EFL reading models. This is also linked to the emphasis that TEFL programmes in Chile give on linguistic accuracy, and which has led to ‘an understanding that to be a teacher if English it is necessary to master English at a native-like proficiency level’ (Barahona, 2016, p. 46). In short, they ignore the significance of literacy as a fundamental aspect of their future profession and teaching persona to boot.
c) Reading in English is nourishing: Reading in English to learn

Participants’ motivations also relate to the importance to reading as a side effect of a major purpose. As Luz suggests, ‘[she] consume[s] a lot of information, but [she doesn’t] find reading fascinating. It is an activity that [she does] from [her] interest in engaging with other activities’. Even though, reading can be frequent activity for Luz, the role of reading is still instrumental, as it is linked to other, more valued, activities. Along the same lines, in focus group III Marcela and Isabel comment on the importance to reading for personal and cultural growth:

**Marcela:** Reading in English is for accessing a new language, a new culture, to have access to other possibilities. It brings me new perspectives, new ideas.

**Isabel:** Reading in English for me is like opening a new door to a new world. I see this from a cultural perspective. Through reading in English, I can see how people, from other realities and other parts of the world, live. People who have had other histories and who have printed them through writing. So having access to all these ideas, experiences, cultures, I feel it is like opening a new door to a new world. I don’t think this happens when I read in Spanish, because reading translations is not the same. I think this cultural exchange can only be done through reading in English.

Marcela’s discourse discloses her perception of the role of English in the sphere of translation. For Marcela, English is an essential channel for accessing cultures, visions, and realities of countries where Spanish is not the L1. However, and despite the undoubtable hegemonic status of English over other languages, Marcela’s report suggests an underlying idea that English is the language in which most texts are originally written or translated. Her willingness to read in English, hence, is more connected to her perception of English as the language of globalisation and LF, rather than the actual limited availability of Spanish translations of texts.

A relevant point of analysis in Isabel’s discourse is the use of metaphor of English reading as ‘an opening door’ to new experiences and learning. The ideology connected to the benefits of learning English is widely spread in people’s mind, and especially in TEFL pre-service
teachers, suggesting that ELL is a key to open doors for those whose L1 is not English. Nevertheless, Isabel refers to this metaphor from a personal perspective, as reading in English is key for her personal and cultural growth. Her ideology has permeated this sphere of her life, as she claims that no other language can bring opportunities to expand her cultural awareness. In brief, Isabel’s motivation to read is connected to her personal response to reading and to what reading evokes to her, suggesting that reading is a meaningful ‘transactional’ experience, as Rosenblatt argues (1994). Her reading experience is influenced by her active role, bringing her experience into her understanding of foreign cultures.

d) I read in English for my mental health: Reading for enjoyment and relaxation

Despite of the challenges related to reading in (E)FL, some participants reported enjoyment as a purpose for reading in English. For example, Alejandra explicitly says ‘reading (in English) is mainly for enjoyment’, or José who compares reading in English with his L1: ‘reading in English is more joyful than reading in German’. Purposes for reading were also related to relaxation or personal growth. This is the case of Marcela who explains: ‘reading for me is important; I find the time to read, even if it is for 5 minutes, or 15 minutes. I read anything for my mental health and for getting out of my comfort zone’. Marcela’s report suggests that reading might be associated to relaxation. Even though she does not explicitly state reading is inherently enjoyable or relaxing, she seems to regard reading as a method of escapism. This point is illustrated when she states that reading allows her to get out from her own world to immerse into new, outside worlds.

Moreover, Marcela’s discourse conveys she regards reading as a beneficial activity for her personal growth; her motivation to read is associated to her discipline and commitment into keeping her mental health stable. Nevertheless, her positive perception of reading involves an underlying sense of discomfort, as she suggests that, to be mentally healthy or stable, reading
pushes her to live new experiences. It might be the case that Marcela’s underlying discomfort relates to the challenge of reading in a FL, which might in turn result engaging.

Similarly, Sara’s motivation to read lies in her experience of absorption or flow:

When I read a text that I like, it relaxes me. I can fully focus, and I put my whole attention on what I am reading. I am someone who gets easily distracted, so reading keeps me immersed and focused. I enjoy feeling calm and focused while reading.

Sara’s report shares similarities with Marcela’s, as they both agree with reading bringing calmness. Sara’s discourse also suggests a connection between absorption and mental health, related to her experience of escapism from her immediate surrounding or internal world. Even though Sara does not provide details on whether her experience of absorption is linked to a particular genre, it could be that her motivation is linked to fiction. As Wilkinson et al. (2020) concluded in their study on adolescents’ purposes for reading in English as L1. In this, participants describe similar experiences of escapism in reading, suggesting that feeling of absorption was enhanced by fictional narratives. As research on reading and mental health has been mostly studied in L1, there is a need for further research in FL/L2 reading. It is hence necessary to examine the characteristics of motivation in FL/L2 reading and its dynamicity considering the challenges that exist to read in a FL/L2.

e) I found a refuge in reading in English: Reading for privacy

Some participants reported their main motivation to read is for creating and having a private world, as Eva, Andrés and Teresa in focus group V describe as follows:

**Eva:** reading in English is my world. This is the world that none of my friends or relatives belong to, and it is only me and my ideas that I can relate to. This is very cathartic; I think this is why I feel like reading in English.

**Andrés:** I have this small world with English; not many people around me speak English, so I can speak or read a book in English, and they will not know what I am talking or reading about. This is how my small world is created, between me and English. It is very pleasant because it is like having a secret space with my books.

**Teresa:** I have always felt very uncomfortable about communicating myself in
Spanish and I found refuge in languages and in reading. I don’t feel Spanish as a part of me.

Their motivation relates to maintaining an intimate space. The role of English as a LF has been generally emphasised in participants’ reports, nevertheless English is not yet a widely used language in Chile, despite the governmental efforts in making this country bilingual (Barahona, 2016). As reading in English in Chile is generally uncommon, EFL reading becomes an opportunity to engage with texts privately, as opposed to Spanish, which would imply disclosing (maybe publicly) topics of interest. Even though participants do not expand on the reasons why reading as a private activity is particularly pleasant or interesting, reading in English seems to be a safe space for them. A free space to engage with private ideas and thoughts without feeling judged or scrutinised, suggesting that reading in Spanish is uncomfortable and unsafe.

Their feeling of intimacy when reading is also enhanced by their emotional connection to English. This can relate to their affective engagement, potentially enhanced by the textual elements of a text and the semantics of English. In the case of Teresa, her willingness to engage with English, and especially reading, relates to an association between her L1 skills and potentially stressful or difficult past experiences with communicating or expressing herself in Spanish. This point can be supported by Pavlenko’s ‘identification’ theory (2005), which states that a factor that contributes to connecting deeply with one language over another one is the individual’s personal history of stress or trauma with their L1.

II. Examining participants’ self-reported reading engagement in EFL reading

The current body of literature acknowledges a dual and multifaceted perspective on motivation. Nevertheless, Ryan and Deci, in their self-determination theory (2000), argue that motivation primarily originates from intrinsic and extrinsic sources. Intrinsically motivated readers experience internal, spontaneous interest, and potentially, enjoyment in reading.
without the aid of any external reward. An extrinsically motivated reader, on the other hand, feels inclined to read for a benefit or reward that this activity can bring to them (Wigfield et al., 2004; Conradi et al., 2014).

Motivation variables, such as engagement and interest are domain specific (Gottfried, 1990), this means that some might and might not be exclusive to reading, as for example flow or absorption, highly linked to reading. Variables that are associated, though not exclusive, to reading might strongly influence readers’ decision to engage with texts, as these work as intrinsic motivators. This is the case of engagement, that undoubtedly is a crucial variable in EFL reading as reading in a FL implies surpassing the effort and difficulty of comprehension (Wigfield et al., 2004).

In table 14 (see appendix O), I present a summary of my participants’ reports of their experiences of reading engagement and interest in EFL. From the quantifiable data, and concerning reading engagement, the means range from M= 3.25 to M=3.9, indicating that at least 81% and about 98% of all participants experience engagement when reading in English. In detail, 90% of participants reported to make images in their minds when reading, 65% stated that they like or enjoy reading in English and 55% stated to read in English a lot. In connection with reading interest, the means range from M= 3.35 to M=3.95, meaning that at least 84% and about 99% of all participants reported to feel curiosity for reading in English. 50% of participants reported to enjoy reading about different cultures, however, topic interest seems to be a relevant factor that triggers curiosity, as 95% stated to have favourite topics they like to read about and 80% to read to learn new information about topics they feel interested in. In sum, most of participants reported to experience high levels of reading interest and engagement in English, which seem to be fuelled by predominantly academic interests. I present a summary of these findings in figure 6 and 7 below. Findings concerning reading engagement and interest from the qualitative data are examined in the following.
sections.

**Figure 6**

*Summary Participants’ Responses*[^24] to Reading Interest from the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire.

![Interest in EFL reading](image)

**Figure 7**

*Summary Participants’ Responses*[^25] to Reading Engagement from the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire.

![Engagement in EFL reading](image)

[^24]: This table summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.

[^25]: This table summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.
a) When I find a book I like, I just swallow it: EFL reading engagement

As mentioned in chapter II, Conradi et al. (2014) and Lee et al. (2021) state that engagement has been conceptualised and interpreted in varied ways. Despite the diversity of conceptualisations of engagement in the educational and psychological research (Conradi et al., 2014), Lee et al. (2021) contributed to examining previous studies on reading engagement with the purpose of bringing clarity to the conceptualisation of this construct and to guide future research. For my project, I have adopted a multidimensional perspective of reading engagement, supported by Guthrie et al. (2012), who propose a conceptualisation from mostly a cognitive and behavioural perspective, and Finn and Zimmer (2012), whose work examines affective dimensions to reading engagement. Guthrie et al. (2012) define reading engagement as the interaction with texts ‘in ways that are both strategic and motivated’ (2012, p. 602), and Finn and Zimmer define affective engagement as a ‘level of emotional response characterised by feelings of involvement in a set of activities worth pursuing’ (p. 103). In the following sections, I examine my participants’ experiences of engagement when reading in EFL, which involve cognitive, behavioural, and affective dimensions. During the focus groups, I reminded participants to focus on their EFL reading experiences, however, naturally and spontaneously, they made explicit—and repeated—comparisons between their L1 reading and EFL engagement reading experiences.

i. Reading engagement is internally and externally enhanced

I observed that participants referred to engagement as an experience fuelled by internal or external sources. With regards to external triggers, environmental and textual factors influence reading engagement, as well as the reader’s internal and socio-emotional state when reading.
b) Environmental and textual factors in reading engagement

Engagement to read in English was triggered by external factors, such as writing style and/or textual elements. Daniel, for example, states that his engagement and attention when reading voluntarily were negatively affected because of dense descriptions: ‘(Dan Brown) likes describing everything; reading is very descriptive, and sometimes I get lost’. From this, it is observed that his loss of attention influences his loss of engagement; nevertheless, it cannot be asserted whether his engagement is partially or completely lost when reading dense descriptive texts. Similarly, it cannot be assured whether his loss of attention is either caused by Dan Brown’s writing style (as Dan Brown’s writing style is not particularly characterised by dense descriptions) or by his limited range of vocabulary in English that influences his comprehension. It seems likely though that EFL reader’s engagement highly depends on vocabulary knowledge and interest for a particular writing style. I present a more detailed account on the influence of descriptive language and writing style in chapter VII.

Another influential (external) factor is the channel or the format where reading takes place. Alejandro in focus group VI suggests this as follows:

I feel more comfortable reading from my laptop because I am more involved in own world even when there’s noise outside. The fact that you’re on your earphones, you feel more involved and trapped in the screen and in the book. I get easily distracted by external factors. For example, when I read my printed texts and I decide to read in the sunshine, in a quiet reading place, my dog comes with his toy and distracts me. So, I play with my dog…or when I’m reading and (my parents) see me reading, they call me: ‘Alejandro, could you help me with this?’ or ‘could you please do this?’, so even if I get equally distracted, it’s easier for me to come back to my reading when I’m in my laptop.

Once more, engagement seems to be influenced by attention. Even though reading from a laptop can be highly distractive, for Alejandro a laptop becomes a refuge to avoid external distractors, as the laptop helps him create an environment for immersion, aided by music. Consequently, engagement also seems to be enhanced by the reader’s control over his environment, even if these external factors are distractive. As attention seems to be highly
connected to engagement, the reader’s motivation and decision to engage in reading is key for maintaining their engagement in reading, and in the case of L2/FL reading, their persistence while reading.

The effect of the laptop in Alejandro’s reading engagement is minimal as opposed to reading a printed book. He adds:

I think I get more distracted when people see me reading a printed book, because with my laptop people think I’m working. It’s like ‘you’re reading something important for university’, but if they see me reading a printed text is like ‘you’re reading for pleasure or enjoyment, so you can help me with this, which is more important’.

Even though Alejandro states that distractions are generally frequent when reading, his perception of distractions seems to be neutral when reading from a laptop, as it does not affect his reading engagement negatively. It is observed that engagement seems to be negatively affected when these require the reader’s attention, as in for example, interacting with people. In addition, this excerpt also describes the social understanding or semantics of technology in reading, i.e., reading from a laptop is synonymous of work. Reading through this channel becomes more important and valued and hence less interfered from others.

Participants reported that reading engagement is enhanced and maintained in quiet environments. Sara in focus group VII says:

When I read, I like being quiet in a silent space or maybe in a park. The context is important. I always try to create a space to read quietly, with music because it eases me; it relaxes me because I’m someone who is all over the place. A quiet place disconnects me from what I do in the day and helps me to immerse myself in a different world.

Sara agrees with Alejandro when referring to music as enhancing. Even though Alejandro does not mention the effect music has on him when reading, Sara suggests that music eases her and bring her into a quieter mood, which it can be the case for Alejandro as well. It is paradoxical though that, for Sara, quietness includes music. As background music can become relaxing, Sara’s reference of quietness can be linked to the positive effect of music
on attention and absorption, as this can dissipate the effects of other external distractions, she does not have control of.

Attention also seems to be linked to comprehension. Sara adds: ‘I immerse myself a lot when I read; I’m fully focused, so having other external stimulus distracts me and I lose track and I end up partially understanding the text’. Sara’s experience agrees with some investigations conducted on the effects of listening to music in reading comprehension, for example the study conducted by Johansson et al. (2012), who suggest that readers perform better in reading comprehension tasks when listening to preferred music while reading.

c) Socioemotional factors in reading engagement

Alejandro states that reading engagement ‘is closely connected to a socioemotional factor’. He describes this point further:

I was reading an analysis of God and the State by Bakunin. I read that book long ago but very superficially, so there were many arguments I forgot about and, (when I was reading the analysis), I thought ‘oh, this book! How come I forgot about it?’ This was because I was overwhelmed with assignments at the time; I was a bit depressed about a few other things as well, so I think all these things affect (engagement) because reading requires time and focus.

Alejandro’s report shows the link between engagement and attention, which the latter can be negatively affected by the readers’ negative emotional state. This means a reader will not be able to immerse in the reading experience if attention is not on the act of reading. From this report it is also concluded that lack of attention prevents readers to engage deeper with a text, for example when reflecting on ideas for example and/or enjoying what they read, as a negative emotional estate affects focus. Time is reported as another factor that influences engagement. Time for reading can be related to the reader’s motivation to read, as the higher the motivation, higher is the reader’s inclination to find opportunities for reading.

Nevertheless, time is also related to engagement and attention as this allows readers to focus and immerse in narratives. Time is a key factor in EFL reading, as (E)FL readers might need
more time to absorb themselves in reading due to factors related to demotivation, uneasiness, or anxiety due to the challenges readers might face with comprehension.

d) Affective engagement in EFL reading

Affective engagement refers to an individual’s emotions or feelings which might result in positive or negative reactions when engaging in an activity (Cook, Thayer, Fiat, & Sullivan, 2020). Participants reported affective experiences in connection to reading engagement positively in both the focus groups and the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire.

Through the focus groups, I observed participants’ emotional experiences of reading are rooted in their self-efficacy. Affective engagement is reported generally as gratifying and/or satisfying. Catalina and Isabel respectively say: ‘I feel like I can understand another language; it is gratifying. That’s what I feel most of the time’, and ‘it’s pleasant to read in English, and I think it’s to do with feeling proud of myself to be able to develop this skill and read. This is pleasant’. The feeling of satisfaction and gratification seems to come from their confidence, or high self-efficacy, in their reading skills, as Daniel also explains: ‘it’s satisfying not having to have a dictionary next to you and look up a word you don’t understand, and simply read and enjoy the reading is satisfactory’.

On the other hand, Isabel described her pleasure to read in connection to her pride for developing their abilities in this language. Even though this again relates to having high levels of self-efficacy, she does not go in depth about the reasons behind her pride. Tiedens et al. (2000) claim that positive outcomes in language learning might enhance a feeling of fulfilment, joy, and pride, which in turn affect learners’ motivation or interest to learn. Nevertheless, Isabel’s pride might lie in her value or appreciation for English for its social, global, and local status in Chile, a language that is generally perceived as prestigious in comparison to, for example, other minority or even Chilean aboriginal languages. Similar
findings were reported by Niño-Murcia’s study in Peru (2003), where participants stated that English is more valuable and important language than Quechua, showing the openness and acceptance of societies in the region to English as a result of linguistic imperialism.

From my data, it is not possible to determine whether the sources of engagement— and pleasure and interest— lie in readers’ self-efficacies, appreciation of narratives articulated within the semantics of the English language, or pride for learning English. As suggested by Yin (2021), there is a need to investigate emotions such as enjoyment and pride in language education, as this might bring further insights to understand language, as well as reading, motivation. Additionally, examining the roots of affective engagement when reading in English can be beneficial for understanding what factors fuel engagement in EFL reading.

e) Cognitive engagement in EFL reading

Another dimension of engagement is cognitive engagement. Guthrie et al. (2012) defined it as the ‘willingness to exert the mental effort needed to comprehend [texts] and accomplish difficult [reading] tasks’ (p. 602). Some described their reading comprehension strategies, though mostly from an IR perspective. Alejandro and Enrique describe their strategies as follows:

Alejandro: I read very fast, and my trick is that my reading mixes skim and scan techniques. For example, we’ll talk about this such topic in class, so I read the text and I know what points to highlight. For me, highlighting is very helpful, and as we read from the laptop a lot, I use that function in PDF as well. I write comments in the text, and I tend to mostly highlight. I use primarily use three colours: yellow is the regular highlighting colour, the blue is complementary and the red one is for highlighting very important points.

Enrique: I read the module’s reading list which is about specific topics. I pause my reading per idea. If the author is talking about whatever topic, and when the author talks about one idea and then finishes it, I stop and I maybe I make myself a cup of tea. Then I come back to reading the following idea.

Their descriptions are similar, as they focus on comprehension strategies when reading academically in English. It is observed that Alejandro and Enrique put a good amount of
attention and effort when reading; making comments and /or using visual codes to organise and process information, implying that reading in English is time consuming. Even though not all participants described their cognitive mechanisms when reading, I hypothesise that all of them apply similar strategies, as these are usually taught explicitly in (E)FL classrooms at school or university as ‘an efficient writing-to-learn strategy in reading and re-reading to improve foreign language learning’ (Porter-O’Donnel, 2004). As reading in EFL is generally instructed from an IR perspective, they might transfer their cognitive abilities to reading when reading voluntarily as well, though this might not always be the case, considering the long time and effort that is required.

Even though reading is effortful, surprisingly enough participants do not describe their experience negatively, as tiring, or boring. It seems likely that language is still a barrier for both Alejandro and Enrique, despite the fact they reported to have had a C1 proficiency level in English. Attention in reading engrosses them into reading, which results satisfying, considering that annotation can be a frequent interruption. Developing comprehension enhances positive feelings, as enjoyment or pleasure (Dewaele & Macintyre, 2014), which in turn fuel engagement, as suggested by Schallert and Reed (1997), who claim that reading become engaging when readers comprehend what they read.

Sofia, on the other hand, experiences reading negatively since it ‘demands [her] a mental effort’ because ‘reading [in English] is tiring’. Even though she reported to have a C1 level of English, her cognitive engagement is not as satisfying as Alejandro and Enrique suggest, as her engagement mainly depends on her interest or predisposition to read, fuelled by her topic interest. Her topic interest is an engagement trigger that helps her persist in this activity. As Sofia describes herself as a selective reader (see table 9 in appendix J), I hypothesise that Sofia’s engagement when reading in English relates to her vocabulary knowledge, being topic dependent. Topic interest enhances retention of information, consequently leading to
incidental vocabulary acquisition (Krapp, 2002; Renninger & Hidi, 2011; Schroeder, 2013). Thus, tiredness and lack of engagement can be experienced when Sofia reads texts which are not about topics of her interest.

f) Differences in affective and cognitive engagement in L1 and L2 reading

In the focus groups, participants spontaneously described their reading engagement experiences in both Spanish and English, highlighting the differences in each language. Surprisingly enough, participants reported to feel more engaged and emotionally connected when reading in English than in Spanish. Despite of the fact that only a few participants explained this point in detail, they referred to their experiences when reading voluntarily. Alberto describes reading in English as follows:

It feels different because of English’s linguistic attitude; it fascinates me! Also, it’s like having two personalities; one personality in Spanish and another in English. I like the linguistic attitude that English has; idioms and expressions are better in English. For example, many times when I express myself on something deep- for example with my girlfriend, I prefer to say things in English. Many times, I express myself in English because the language is amazing! It brings me the chance to have another attitude because, for example, I can be more serious in English when I feel like it.

Alberto’s description reflects his perception of English, which can help explain why my participants feel a deeper emotional connection with narratives in this language. Ramirez-Esparza et al. (2006) suggest, ‘bilinguals tend to be bicultural’ (p. 2); this can explain Alberto’s passion for English as this provides a new perspective of the world and a new culture. Among the researchers who have investigated the personality in bilinguals, Lightbown and Spada for example, point out that developing a linguistic ability does not only add information to an existing language system, but also changes the way learners think (2013). Hence, Alberto’s fascination for English might relate to the pleasure it arises when expressing himself and understanding in this language. Additionally, construal of events that are not equally or similarly conceptualised across languages work as ‘bridges’ of association,
as what learners are acquiring in their TL are based on their cultural and linguistic knowledge from their L1 (Wray, 2002).

Embodiment is a key aspect in language perception among bilinguals. Embodiment refers to the connection between the body and the mind (Evans, 2012), and its connection to language. Alberto describes his affective connection with English through the semantics of English:

There are very specific and beautiful words (in English). The other day I was watching a video of people reading love letters and some used adjectives, and there was this one that called my attention [he writes the word wholeheartedly in the Zoom chat]. I found this one so cool, such a beautiful word and it’s not in Spanish. So, she said I love you wholeheartedly, and it was like… wow! what a pretty word! How wonderful what this word conveys, I find that there’re words like these I like better in English than Spanish, and I think it’s because of the emotions that English evokes in me.

His affective response to words that are not available in Spanish demonstrate how embodiment relates to engagement in (E)FL. Despite the complexity in explaining Alberto’s emotional response, I hypothesise that his understanding of ‘wholeheartedly’ is based on conceptual differences when referring to love in Spanish and English. The closest synonyms in Spanish are con entusiasmo or con todo el corazón, however these are not semantically equal. Semantics of love in English, as seen in Alberto’s example, reflect a physical relation to the experience of love, enhancing embodied experiences in the acquisition process. Consequently, new events or concepts that are closely connected to physical relations seem to be meaningful to Spanish learners of English.

Maria also describes a similar experience when reading in English:

**Maria:** I cringe when I read a novel in Spanish. There is an extract of this book that I like a lot and it’s very romantic, but it’s in English and I feel it doesn’t have the same effect in Spanish, and I’ll read it now, so pay attention. It goes… This is from *Norwegian Wood, Tokyo Blues* by Murakami. *I felt sorry for Nahoko whenever I heard that sound, my arm was not the one that she needed, but the arm of someone*

---

26 This last expression would be literally translated in English as *with all the heart.*
else. My warmth was not the one she needed, but the warmth of someone else. I felt almost guilty being me. So Deep.

**Alberto:** Ah! I loved it!

**Maria:** I felt almost guilty being me!

**Valeria:** Can you tell us what was it that made you feel this?

**Maria:** exactly where it says my arm was not the one she needed, but the arm of someone else. When the narrator says the arm of someone else. In Spanish would be something like ‘she needed the arm of another person’. It’s not the same! Then it says… my warmth was not the one she needed, but the warmth of someone else. I don’t know; it’s just so deep!

Maria states that English triggers deeper emotional responses in her, even though is unable to explain what syntactic or semantic elements of Spanish kindle her rejection to read in this language. Investigations on bilingual’s emotional connection towards their L1 and L2 suggest that generally bilinguals feel closer to their L1 (Harris et al., 2006), although as observed, this is not always be the case.

Research in cognitive linguistics suggests that the significance of the social environment in language learning, as these have cultural implications in learners’ perception of the world. Boroditsky (2010) says ‘if people learn another language, they inadvertently also learn a new way of looking at the world. When bilingual people switch from one language to another, they start thinking differently, too’ (p.2). Maria’s emotional reaction to Murakami’s excerpt does not seem to be related to specific concepts or words in connection to feelings per se, as it was seen in the previous example of wholeheartedly. Nevertheless, her emotional response seems to relate to syntactic constructions in English, and which Alberto seems to agree with, as he also responds positively to the utterance, I felt almost guilty being me. It is important to note that Maria’s reading experience comes from a translated version of a Japanese novel, and surprisingly enough, when analysing the syntactic construction of this sentence, there are no salient differences between its Spanish translation27, just as my arm was not the one she

---

27 *I felt almost guilty being me* could be translated in Spanish as *me sentí casi culpable de ser yo*. The syntactic structures of both utterances agree: S + V +Av + Adj + CL [ V + O]
needed, but the arm of someone else\textsuperscript{28} (also the possessive construction of this sentence is less commonly used in English).

Reading in English for Maria feels natural and meaningful, potentially because of her desire to become an English speaker, and because of the social and cultural implications it entails to learn this language in Chile. This point is reflected in Carolina’s report who adds: ‘as we already know Spanish, for us sounds cheesy and basic. It’s not that I want to look down on Spanish, but for me, English sounds more sophisticated’. Desire and passion for learning a language has been investigated by scholars in the field of sociolinguistics, especially Bakhtin (1981) who proposes the concept of heteroglossia. This has been proposed to explain the relationship between ‘macro-level of ideologies and the micro-level of conversation’ (Piller & Takahashi, 2006, p. 61), which might as well explain Maria’s response to English narratives. Piller (2002) also expands on this by suggesting that learner’s desires to learn a language are influenced by the beliefs and values in a particular context. Participants’ responses to reading in English reveal the influence of the social and ideological discourse about English in the Chilean context that are powerful enough for EFL learners to reject reading their mother tongue and find pleasure in a FL.

Research has paid vast attention to cognition and emotions of bilinguals. Nevertheless, there is still a need to investigate emotional correlates between learners’ L1 and L2. Carolina reports a salient aspect that is the feeling of ‘otherness’ when switching to L2:

I feel like having another personality. It happens to me that when I want to express things, the most accurate words are only in English! I like writing and sometimes when I feel fully emotional and I want to write my feelings down, I don’t write in Spanish, I do it in English instead! That’s what naturally comes out because the words I find in English are not in Spanish.

\textsuperscript{28}This utterance could be translated as mi brazo no era el que ella necesitaba, si no el brazo de otra persona, which can be literally translated as my arm was not the one she needed, but the arm of another person.
She reports to have a dual identity. Her construal processes might allow her to expand her experiences of events, as when some words in Spanish are not found in English when expressing emotions, she prefers to conceptualise and experience them from and within the perspective of English.

The feeling of otherness is also explained by Alberto and Maria in focus group I:

**Alberto:** I feel English is a language that helps you to be impersonal. It’s the same when someone prefers using the *one* instead of *I*, so if we break something, and instead of accepting a mistake, we say ‘*one* is like this’, instead of ‘*I* am like this’. I feel the same with English, it’s a language that is still alien to me, but at the same time it feels very personal.

**Maria:** Yes, definitely! I feel what Alberto has just said is the reason why when we feel the urge to express ourselves, we do it in English, because we don’t want to accept the nature of the language… Spanish is so real to us, but we prefer to use English instead.

Undoubtedly, their reports seem to contradict what Pavlenko (1998) and other scholars have documented in relation to bilinguals’ emotional connection to their L1. These reports convey a contradiction, as their emotional connection to English resides in their emotional connection to Spanish. For Alberto, English feels personal but alien (potentially because he is not fully immersed in an English-speaking environment) at the same time, conveying a detachment and rejection of their L1 identity. Similarly, for Maria, feeling impersonal comes from their dislike of feeling ‘too close’ to their mother tongue. The feeling of otherness reinforces the previous argument concerning the enjoyment that is experienced when understanding of the outside world is novel since the FL offers new conceptualisations of reality, resulting in a surprising and fascinating experience.

Luz from focus group VI was the only participant reporting to feel closer to Spanish:

I don’t connect emotionally with English. If I read something fully emotional, it feels like ‘ah, how pretty’, but I won’t feel it as deep as if I read it in Spanish. I mean, I have cried with some books in English, but when I read in Spanish, I have that feeling of ‘how wonderful’; it fills you up; English wouldn’t touch all those places a book in Spanish would, and I guess it’s because Spanish is my mother tongue. The fact that
when we write in English we become so cold-hearted, but when we write in Spanish, we give flavour and colour to our writing.

Luz’s connection to Spanish is due to her ability to express deep emotions, as opposed to English, which feels more impersonal. Luz’s perception of English as a cold and serious language agrees with one participant who took part in Dewaele’s study (2006) on expression of anger in different languages. She says: ‘I see English as my stronger ‘more serious’ language in terms of expressing anger or ‘serious matters’. However, Spanish is more valuable to me when expressing endearment or feelings of love or affection’ (p. 136). Altarriba et al. (1999) suggest that when it comes to emotions, Spanish offers a more extensive vocabulary, associated to a wider range of contextual possibilities, which in turn are more easily accessed than English. Quite possibly though, Luz’s connection to Spanish can be related to the fact that emotions are firstly conceptualised and acquired in a L1.

From another angle, José explains the effect of translation on his affective engagement:

I like reading in English because the majority of authors I read are English native speakers and I like reading their original words and not the translation. Even if it’s a good translation, these are not words from the author, because a translation is the translator’s words; it changes the meaning of the text at some point to adjust it to the target language. This is what happens when I read in German. For instance, my favourite example is *Trainspotting*, because the author uses a dialects and accents in the book and in the German version, the translator uses German dialects to keep the original idea, but that changes the characters completely. In the original version, the protagonist comes from Glasgow or somewhere in Scotland, and in the German version, it comes from Bavaria, and that changes the main character hugely.

Translations seem to be highly influential when it comes to reading motivation in L1 reading. One key aspect José points out is the concept of faithfulness of translations. Jakobsons’ idea of ‘equivalence in difference’ suggests that interlingual translations cannot bring full equivalence between codes (1959). This is to say, José’s response of reading translated versions is negative due to an unfaithful transfer of linguistic and cultural elements in the TL, German, José’s L1. Therefore, José’s main motivation to read for pleasure can be due to his love for English and for his interest to access the source culture, which in turn
influences his engagement, as L1 reading does not bring the possibility to access new experiences shaped by his perception of events from the perspective of English.

III. Participants’ motivations to read and their experiences of reading engagement in English

After a systematic analysis of my data, I here summarise my answer to RQ2. On the one hand, there is a need to bring consensus concerning the definition to motivation and its variables, such engagement. This can help qualitative researchers to conceptualise participants’ experiences of reading motivation deeper. Furthermore, due to the limited investigations conducted on voluntary reading in FL, it was particularly challenging to guide my analysis on the relation between language ideology and reading motivation.

Concerning my participants’ motivations to read in English, they generally read to comply with their academic commitments and personal linguistic interests. At the time of this study, participants were taking some practical modules to TEFL, and they still needed to take some other modules related to methodologies and approaches to TEFL. Consequently, their purposes to read at that point were mostly linked to their academic commitments.

Their goals for reading in their leisure time also related to their personal interests in becoming fluent English speakers. The role of English in their lives is essential, as they use it in their everyday activities, from reading for browsing information online to learn about their hobbies. Their interest to read in English relates to the powerful influence of the ideology around English in Chile; mostly perceived as a language that ‘opens doors’ to better possibilities concerning availability and accessibility of information or access to cultural contents outside the Latin American context. It is worth mentioning the strong influence of governmental policies in Chile in participants’ ideologies that influence their motivations to read in the language.
Participants’ language ideologies also influence their passion or fascination to learn English. Their motivations for learning English (and comply with academic responsibilities) are also paradoxical, since their motivations for reading do not necessarily relate to their responsibilities as pre-service, and their awareness of their social role as future EFL teachers in Chile, but to their willingness to become English speakers. Hence, it seems likely that those who read for enjoyment do it for a personal and linguistic interest and not for becoming a EFL reading model for their current and future students. Even though many of them respond positively when reading in English, they did not show interest in sharing their reading habits or reading tastes with their students. I conclude that my participants do not have a strong connection to their teaching personae as they do not show awareness of the importance of their roles for developing and enhancing literacy skills in EFL learners.

Concerning their motivations to read for enjoyment, some regarded reading as escapism or a way to keep an intimate space. Participants suggested they enjoy reading in English as this enables them to disconnect from their daily concerns. Additionally, English was reported to be still an exclusive language for them, as their family or friend circles are not English speakers, hence, the effect of reading in English lies in their willingness to engage with ideas on topics that are only private for them.

Concerning reading engagement, participants experience both cognitive and affective engagement. Those who referred to their cognitive engagement did so from an IR perspective, when reading academically. They apply an interactionist approach, i.e., writing annotations or using colours to process ideas; strategies that are effortful and time consuming. Also, some reported to have the need to interrupt their reading to digest ideas better. In brief a) participants make a significant effort to read in English; nevertheless, they decide to persist in the activity and b) participants’ affective engagement relate to their deeper emotional connection to English and neglect of their L1 identity, this seems to be rooted in their
ideologies about English, reinforced by governmental policies in Chile. However, even though participants feel closer to English, this still feels alien to them, potentially for not being immersed in an English-speaking environment. c) participants’ affective engage also relate to construal as English seems to offer new understanding of emotions and the outside world. Their construal becomes an engagement trigger and results an enjoyable experience. d) reading engagement seems to be enhanced by environments that participants have control over, for instance, the use of music or laptop. Their emotional or internal states were mentioned as a key factor, as this seems to enable them to focus on their reading and enjoy their reading experience. e) time influences their engagement to read. Either for academic or personal purposes, time seems to be crucial in FL reading engagement, as reading in a FL requires a great amount of attention and cognitive effort. f) cognitive engagement can be related to their perception of characters when reading translated texts. The effect of interlingual—or in between languages—translation is negative, as the originality of the text is lost. It was discussed that their responses to texts can be related to their expectations of fidelity, and to the perceived inability to access the source culture through this translated text.

From my findings, language ideology, motivations for language learning and emotional responses to L2 seem to be highly correlated. Additionally, considering the striking findings that oppose some of the reported literature, there is need to investigate reading affective reading engagement between L1 and L2 further.

IV. Summary of the chapter

In this chapter, I analysed my participants’ general purposes to read, as well as their reading engagement in English. I started by examining their general goals for reading in English, though my analysis was not mainly guided by the intrinsic or extrinsic approach to
motivation. Here, I aimed to discover why my participants read for, and examine how their experiences of engagement are like when reading in English.

I also delved into their experiences of reading engagement. They spontaneously referred to their cognitive engagement when reading academic texts, and to their affective engagement when reading for pleasure. I discussed the influence of language ideology in the context of my study in their reading motivation and engagement. I finished this chapter answering my RQ2. I proposed the need to investigate the relationship between affective engagement in L1 and L2/FL reading, especially in connection to identity and language ideology.
Chapter VII: Outcomes of the Intervention: EFL Reading Identity, Literature-to-Film Adaptations and Reading Interest in Class

This chapter focuses on the outcomes of the intervention. I answer RQs 3 and 4 by, firstly, giving a detailed account of participants’ self-reported descriptions of their experiences of reading looking at their behaviour in connection to their interest to read ‘The Father Thing’ and/or ‘Zima Blue’. Secondly, I discuss the interconnection between participants’ EFL reading identities and their reading behaviour during the intervention. Lastly, I analyse the reported triggering factors to their interest and lack of interest to read the short stories in class by examining the influence of the use of literature-to-film adaptations, and lack thereof, as a pedagogical tool to enhance EFL reading in class.

To answer my RQs, I decided to guide my analysis following Renninger and Hidi’s work about interest and curiosity (2015, 2019, 2020), Guthrie et al.’s (2012) and Green et al.’s (2008) about engagement. Renninger and Hidi posit a distinction between the constructs of curiosity and interest (2015, 2020), even though some scholars regard these as conceptually identical (Kashdan & Silvia, 2009; Silvia, 2006). The perspective proposed by Renninger and Hidi agrees with my participants’ reports, as my findings suggest their interest to read is also connected to their curiosity and engagement.

I have structured my chapter into 3 main sections. Firstly, I delve into my participants’ experiences of reading interest in the intervention, including their individual trajectories. I hence focus on their reading behaviour, reading identity, and I explore the triggering factors of their reading interest, and lack of, to read the source texts in class. In section II, I examine the factors participants reported to have influenced their reading engagement and disengagement. Lastly in section III, I present my concluding thoughts in connection to the
interconnection between EFL reading identity and reading behaviour, my intervention, and its implications for educational practice.

I. Curiosity triggers interest to read in (E)FL

As my study was designed to be set up in a classroom context, my participants described their experiences of interest not only in relation to their appraisal of texts concerning topics and genres, but also to other external factors, i.e., classroom environment. I observed their experiences of interest in the intervention come from internal and external sources, and agree with Renninger and Hidi’s view of interest, who define interest from a dynamic and developmental approach.

Interest is defined as a psychological state that involves a ‘cognitive and motivational disposition to reengage with specific content’ (Renninger & Hidi, 2020, p. 99), which means interest can persist over time if maintained and developed. It is also the result of the ‘interaction between a person and a particular content’, i.e., ‘the potential for interest is in the person, but the content and the environment define the direction of interest and contribute to its development’ (2015, p. 112). From my participants’ reports, I identified that interest to read was connected to, firstly, their predisposition to engage with each text, and secondly, to their interaction with the classroom environment, which incited their disposition to read in class.

Curiosity became a key point in most of my participants’ reports. Renninger and Hidi suggest that, even though interest and curiosity share similarities, one of their fundamental differences is that ‘curiosity is typically short-lived’ (2020, p. 100), and it can eventually ‘lead to interest development’ (2020, p. 99). I observed that most participants in both groups felt curious about the reading sessions and short stories, however, curiosity was not always maintained while reading in all of them, as some decided not to finish the texts.
Generally, the intervention (both groups) enhanced participants’ curiosity, which for most of them led to situational interest (Renninger & Hidi, 2015). However, I am unable to determine whether this developed to an individual interest or whether their interest persisted for a longer period (or well-developed interest in Renninger and Hidi’s terms). In relation to the characteristics of the intervention, participants reported literature-to-film adaptations, texts, and classroom activities as sources of curiosity and interest; however, I could not assert or conclude what specific aspects of these triggered their experiences of interest.

In the film group, I observed a correlation between participants’ reading interest and reading behaviour. Most of them reported to have felt interest to read (consequently have read) both short stories. Concerning ‘Zima Blue’, all participants felt interested to read it and have read it in class. Nevertheless, there were exceptions concerning ‘The Father Thing’. Generally, this short story had a positive reception, as 90% of participants reported to have been interested to read it, however, only one participant — Alejandra— reported to have felt lack of interest. Surprisingly though, she reported to have read this text in class either way. Similarly, two other participants — Teresa and Eva— reported to have felt interested to read ‘The Father Thing’, though reported not to have read it in class.

Reading interest in participants from the no-film group also correlated to their behaviour. All participants reported to have felt interested in reading ‘Zima Blue’ (and consequently have read it in class). Concerning ‘The Father Thing’, three participants— Sofia, Enrique, and Alejandro— reported to have not felt interested in reading and thus not have read this story. From the Reading Interest Log (Guthrie et al., 2005), participants’ reports from both groups agree with evaluating ‘Zima Blue’ as the most interesting story, as 64% (7) of participants from the film group, and 56% (5) from the no-film group reported to have preferred ‘Zima Blue’ over ‘The Father Thing’. I section II below, I examine participants’ justifications for
their preference of this short story, as well as the triggering factors that influenced their interest and lack of interest to read these stories in class.

In tables 15 and 16, I summarise participants’ self-reported experiences of reading interest and engagement from the Reading Interest Log. Participants here reported if they read ‘The Father Thing’, ‘Zima Blue’, or both. They also reported which of the stories they felt most interested in. I present a summary of these findings in figures 8 and 9 below.

**Figure 8**

*Participants’ interests to read the written, source short stories in the intervention*

---

29 In the questionnaire, it was noted that reading the stories meant to have read uninterruptedly for 15 minutes or have read at least 5 pages of each story. This was explicitly stated as each reading session consisted of a limited time which might have not been enough for each participant to finish each story.
Figure 9

Participants’ reports on their most preferred short story

The most preferred short story

- Zima Blue
- The Father Thing

No-film group

Film group
Table 15

Participants’ Responses in Terms of Interest and Engagement to the Short Stories Read in Class: Film Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (Film group)</th>
<th>Did they feel interested to read <em>The Father Thing</em>?</th>
<th>Did they read (or finish) <em>The Father Thing</em>?</th>
<th>Did they feel interested to read <em>Zima Blue</em>?</th>
<th>Did they read (or finish) <em>Zima Blue</em>?</th>
<th>Did they feel engaged when reading <em>The Father Thing</em>?</th>
<th>Did they feel engaged when reading <em>Zima Blue</em>?</th>
<th>Most interesting story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Participants’ Responses in Terms of Interest and Engagement to the Short Stories Read in Class: No-Film Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (No-Film group)</th>
<th>Did they feel interested to read <em>The Father Thing</em>?</th>
<th>Did they read (or finish) <em>The Father Thing</em>?</th>
<th>Did they feel interested to read <em>Zima Blue</em>?</th>
<th>Did they read (or finish) <em>Zima Blue</em>?</th>
<th>Did they feel engaged when reading <em>The Father Thing</em>?</th>
<th>Did they feel engaged when reading <em>Zima Blue</em>?</th>
<th>Most interesting story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héctor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Participants’ reading trajectories: Self-efficacy influences reading interest

Before delving into participants’ reported reasons for why they felt interested, or lack thereof, to read the short stories in class, I will first discuss participants’ reading trajectories, looking at the link between their self-esteem and self-efficacy and their reading behaviour during the intervention. A summary of participants’ individual reading trajectories is presented in tables 17 and 18 (see appendix P, Q), and a summary of participants’ self-concepts as EFL readers is found in table 9 in chapter V.

I identified that participants’ reading behaviour did not always correlate with their self-esteem and reported levels of self-efficacy. On the one hand, all of them reported to have high levels of self-efficacy (IR), but on the other, their reported levels of self-esteem were high or low depending on the approach to reading, i.e., IE and ER. In the case of the film group (see table 17), José, Josefina, Teresa, and Andrés were the only participants who felt interested and showed an incongruent reading behaviour. As Josefina, Teresa and Andrés described their self-esteem as EFL readers only in relation to IR only, it is unclear whether their self-esteem (in both IR and ER), self-efficacy or both have a direct relation to their reading behaviour in the intervention. On the other hand, concerning the no-film group, incongruencies between their reading identity and behaviour were also found, as seen in table 18. Unlike participants from the film group, it is seen that self-esteem in both ER and IR reported by Catalina, Luz and Héctor are negative, though surprisingly, this did not affect their reading behaviour, i.e., it neither affected their experience of interest to read both short stories nor their decision to read the texts in class.

From these findings I hypothesise that, since participants’ self-esteem does not seem to be correlated to their experiences of reading interest and reading behaviour, unlike their reading self-efficacy, not all the aspects of their identities as EFL readers influenced their experience
of interest and decision to engage in reading in class. This point is seen in José, who, even though he reported low self-esteem in ER—as he perceives himself as a bad reader due to the little time he spends for pleasure reading (see chapter V)—is a confident reader with well-developed reading comprehension skills. Consequently, his positive experience of feeling interested to read and deciding to read these stories in class suggests that his confidence in being able to read and understand is what influenced this outcome in the intervention. My findings here correlate with Pirih’s (2015), who investigated EFL reading motivation in Slovenia. Even though her study focuses on a significantly younger age group, the quantifiable results of this study agree with my observation of my data concerning the influence of self-efficacy in reading interest and engagement. Self-perception on capabilities of success in reading determines the decision and maintenance to read due to the confidence in succeeding in the activity.

According to Renninger and Hidi (2016), interest can be triggered, but not necessarily maintained. From the findings, participants reported factors that triggered their curiosity to read, however, their interest to persist reading was not maintained in all of them. From the Reading Interest Log, Eva, Teresa, and Héctor suggested that external factors, such as literary genre, topic, curiosity about how the stories unfolded, and pre-reading activity were the triggering factors to their curiosity to read. Further details on triggering factors to interest are discussed in section II below.

III. Attention triggers interest to read in (E)FL

I administered the Situational Interest Scale (Chen et al., 1999) right after the before-reading activity with each group in both sessions to examine participants’ receptions towards the intervention in both groups. In this questionnaire, participants reported their level of attention during the before-reading activity, their interest in this activity, as well as their
curiosity to read each text (see tables 19, 20, 21 and 22 in appendix R, S, T, U), I summarise the responses from this questionnaire in figures 10 to 21 below.

**Figure 10**

*Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Attention in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention in the before-reading activity</th>
<th>I very much agree</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity called my attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was absorbed by the activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very attentive to the activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very focused during the activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11**
Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Attention in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 2

**Figure 12**

Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Interest in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 1

**Figure 13**
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Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Interest in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 2

![Interest in the before-reading activity chart](image1)

Figure 14

Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Curiosity in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 1

![Curiosity in the before-reading activity chart](image2)

Figure 15
Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Curiosity in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 2

Curiosity in the before-reading activity

The activity invited me to read the story

I want to know how the story unfolds

I want to know more about the characters in the story

I feel intrigued to know more details about the story

Figure 16
Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Attention in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 1

Figure 17

Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Attention in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 2

Figure 18
Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Interest in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 1

**Figure 19**

Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Interest in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 2

**Figure 20**
Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Curiosity in the Before-Reading Activity in Reading Session 1

As seen in the figures above, in the intervention all participants felt generally interested to read both texts in class; thus, no significant differences were found between both groups. The
questionnaires show that there was a similar tenor concerning attention and interest in the before-reading activity, and curiosity in reading the short stories between both groups in reading session 1 and 2. That is, the film group reported high levels of attention, interest, and curiosity in both reading sessions, and so did the no-film group. Nevertheless, the latter reported slightly lower levels in comparison to participants from the film group. Another aspect from both qualitative and quantifiable data is that participants from both groups reported to have felt more interested to read ‘Zima Blue’, than ‘The Father Thing’. Only one participant from both the no-film and film groups reported to have disliked the before-reading activity and have not felt interested to read ‘The Father Thing’.

Concerning participants’ evaluation of their experience of interest and attention in the before-reading activities, the no-film group felt interested in and attentive to the activities. This was also the case for the no-film group, though levels of attention and interest dropped in the reading session 2. This might have been due to participants’ loss of surprise in the designed activities (even though they did not know the titles they were going to read before each session), as these became known, and to an extent, predictable for students due to their engagement in reading session 1.

a) Film and no-film groups had high levels of EFL reading interest

In the focus groups, most participants from the film group reported positively on the use of literature-to-film adaptations before reading the source texts in both reading sessions. Carolina from focus group I describes this in the following extract:

The clips were useful. It was like watching a trailer, like when you go on YouTube and watch a trailer. You watch some scenes, without much context, but they help you know what the story is about. It’s engaging.

From this, literature-to-film adaptations were a triggering factor to reading curiosity. As Carolina describes, the scenes fed her appetite to know more about the storylines, but her
curiosity seems to relate not only the audiovisual stimuli, but mostly to the influence of ellipsis:

They made us want to know more and see how the story unfolded, and to know what happened to the characters. They helped to know what the story was about, because sometimes we go on blind dates with books, so watching some scenes before reading helps to imagine what’s going to happen. It’s a good hook.

Carolina’s curiosity was triggered by the limited information provided by the clips. According to Renninger and Hidi (2020), curiosity is ‘associated with moderate levels of knowledge’ (p. 100), meaning that the clips chosen for the intervention provided sufficient information to trigger Carolina’s curiosity and imagination which led her to predict the storyline. Daniel and José, in focus groups VII and IV respectively, agree with this last point. Nevertheless, the intervention elicited different experiences of curiosity:

Daniel: the clips were very interesting, but I then thought ‘why are they clipping the scenes?’; ‘I want to know what happened in between!’; ‘how did this person end up here!’; but then I realised it was the way the activity was designed. I felt like watching the series and then reading the story. When we were asked to read the story, it was (a) good (feeling because then) I could know what happened in between the scenes!

José: in the case of The Father Thing, I felt very motivated to read the story after watching these few scenes. Though with the other one (Zima Blue), I loved its visuals, the style of the film, and for that reason, I felt more interested in watching the film than reading the story.

As Carolina, Daniel’s experience was characterised by his desire to know more about the storylines. In this case, literature-to-film adaptations were positive in enhancing participants’ interest to read. Nevertheless, in the case of José, the audiovisual material did not enhance his curiosity to read in the first place (as he reported to have read both texts either way) but enhanced his desire to engage with the adaptations instead. This means that, even though there were no other participants who reported a similar experience to José’s, the use of literature-to-film adaptations as a pedagogical tool to enhance reading interest might cause distraction or not sufficient curiosity to engage with written source texts. José’s interest in the literature-to-film adaptation correlates with Torabian and Tajadini’s study (2017) in relation
to the use of film animation in an EFL reading class in Iran. Even though their study investigates the effect film animations in EFL reading comprehension, they found that participants responded positively in the use of animation films, suggesting learners had a positive reception and experienced high levels of attention and interest in the films used in the EFL class.

José also describes the influence of the literature-to-film adaptations in his experience of reading interest:

… as I liked the style of the film (of Zima Blue), I wanted to see this in the text, because I loved the animation and when I read it, I imagined the story following this style. I compared the story with the adaptation the whole time. I think (the adaptation) limited my imagination. I think this is what happens when you watch a film adaptation before reading the source text, I already had the image of the story in my mind. I knew how Zima Blue looked like and I didn’t have the chance to create my own mental image of him, for example.

According to Green et al. (2008), transportation, or individuals’ ‘response to narratives’ (p. 513), is ‘psychologically similar to flow’ (p. 513). In comparison to reading narratives, films reduce transportation, as they limit viewers’ imagination; nevertheless, these do not necessarily limit viewers’ curiosity and engagement to read the source texts. Green et al. (2008) found out that ‘reading followed by watching provided the greatest transportation’ (p. 512). José’s experience might come from his preference to invest in his imagination when it comes to reading written source texts, though, the employed literature-to-film adaptations in the intervention triggered his curiosity regardless.

Participants from the no-film reported positively on the intervention. This means most of them found that reading short introductions before reading the short stories were engaging. Isabel and Catalina suggest:

**Catalina:** it was engaging that it put us into context. (These descriptions) were like 2 lines long, they were engaging. I felt like reading the stories, like ‘why did this happen? how strange!’, kind of thing.
Isabel: I felt curious too. I feel like the title of the stories and short descriptions were very accurate and gave us suspense, like… ‘what’s going to happen?’

Similarly, Catalina and Isabel suggest that the short descriptions of the short stories enhanced their reading curiosity. From these reports, it is apparent that, just as participants from the film group, Catalina’s and Isabel’s experiences of reading curiosity were triggered by ellipsis. As also stated by Green et al. (2008), written texts allow readers to create their mental image or representation of narratives, hence their ‘active engagement may encourage transportation’ (p. 517). Similar to Carolina’s report, Héctor says that the given predictions in the intervention enhanced their own prediction of the stories: ‘in my case, predicting caused curiosity. In my case, I could understand the context a bit, and it helped me predict the storyline’.

Consequently, participants’ experiences (from both groups) were no different in terms of their experiences of reading curiosity and interest. It seems, though, that their sensorial and cognitive experiences were somewhat dissimilar. Unfortunately, in the focus groups, participants from the film group did not disclose further on what factors or elements in the films triggered their curiosity to read, mainly because this was not part of the aims of my study), however, participants from the film group provided further details in relation to their reading experience, specially while engaging with each narrative (see subsection c below). Unfortunately, due to scarcity of empirical studies focusing on the use of literature-to-film adaptations in relation to EFL reading interest, my findings cannot be compared to other similar studies. To the best of my knowledge, most of the current studies conducted on the use of films, animations or literature-to-film adaptations, delve into the influence of or interconnection between these multimodal materials and learners’ FL reading comprehension and EFL learning.

b) Experiences of reading in an online classroom setting
Due to the restriction of COVID-19, my intervention took place online; hence participants were asked to read the short stories from a laptop. During the focus group interviews, most of them did not refer to the experience engaging in online sessions, although only one—José—described how his online reading experience affected his engagement to read Zima Blue in class:

Reading from the screen tired my eyes. It was a bit demotivating because I felt like ‘oh, my eyes hurt’, ‘I can’t read anymore- I’d love to, but I can’t’. I’m not that used to reading from a laptop.

Chu et al. (2011) conducted a study to examine the differences in ocular symptoms between reading from a printed text and a computer monitor. In their study, they reported that negative eye symptoms are higher when reading from a screen. Examining José’s experience, some avenues for further research might be needed to look at the influence of reading from digital devices in readers’ engagement, especially in classroom settings, where there is an increased use of digital reading (Van der Weel & Mangen, 2022). Even though José was the only participant who reported to have interrupted his reading of ‘Zima Blue’, this still suggests engagement can be affected by external elements. Hence, digital reading might posit another challenge to (E)FL readers.

Participants from both groups agreed with suggesting that both the activities, as well as the classroom environment were engaging. Maria and Eva, from the film group (focus groups VII and IV respectively), say:

**Eva:** I really liked both texts. I was looking forward to watching the films fully and finishing reading both texts as well.

**Maria:** I liked the selection of the texts a lot, and the film adaptations as well. Also the fact that you showed us some parts of the films before reading; I was so intrigued about the storylines.
Text selection, the activities designed for each session, as well as the sequence of these were key in triggering their curiosity for the main reading activity. Their curiosity, in turn, boosted their interest by the integration of these external elements (see section iii below).

José agrees with Maria and Eva when describing the influence of the intervention in their curiosity:

I was very open. In the first session, I found it great to have watched the films and then read the story. In the second session, I knew the structure of the class already, but I didn’t know what we were going to read, and that was exciting; neither knowing the short story, nor the film we were going to watch.

Carolina, on the other hand, describes the intervention as surprising. She says:

The activities motivated me. (The experience) was different because we usually read in class, but to watch scenes…? (never). The scenes invited me to get immersed in the stories, to know who the characters were, their motifs, their personal stories. The scenes helped me imagine the events while I was reading. It was something different! Sometimes reading sessions are very monotonous because everything is academic. I also felt very comfortable to participate in the discussions; I was able to give my opinion and think about other stories I have read or watched…

Curiosity to read was propelled by the novelty of this reading experience at university. As participants’ reading experiences have been mostly from IR perspective, ER was novel and hence became an interest trigger to read (Renninger & Hidi, 2015). The classroom environment also enhanced classroom discussion, meaning that they also felt comfortable participating in the activities and engaging with the texts.

Even though novelty and/or surprise (as the source of curiosity) was higher in the first session, their curiosity and interest were maintained in the second session despite of them knowing the classroom and activity dynamics. This can be explained by the influence of not having shared the short stories and literature-to-film adaptations with participants before the sessions, as I wanted to prevent boredom (Renninger & Hidi, 2020).

Andrea, from the no-film group (focus group II), also agrees with these appraisals:
I think the activities played a lot with our imagination. I liked the fact that everyone had different thoughts about the storylines, of what could these be about. I liked the fact that there was active participation, so the tutor didn’t have to push us; that was good. I could see everyone was interested in each activity and in reading as well.

Reading a short description before the main reading activity still enhanced curiosity to read. It seems likely that their volition to engage in each activity and their curiosity to read was enhanced by the classroom environment and, most importantly, by the limited information about the stories given to participants before the main reading task. The brief descriptions of the storylines helped participants to predict the sequence of events, enhancing suspense and curiosity.

The intervention followed Day and Bamford’s (1998) approach to ER, meaning that participants were not obliged to read in class and/or engage with activities. Despite of this, participants were willing to engage in the sessions eitherway. Catalina, from the no-film group, explains how the classroom environment led her to engage with the activities:

We were relaxed. We knew it was important to participate, but we engaged because the sessions were amusing. It was amusing to imagine, and then realise that our predictions had nothing to do with the stories. It was amusing, and we didn’t have the pressure of assessment. The fact of just doing the activities for the sake of enjoyment.

Similarly, Josefina (film group) explains that the non-academic context of the intervention was joyful:

I was very invested in both sessions. I was very absorbed by the activities because I found them amusing. We generally read for our lessons (at university), but to read in the class and the fact that the activities prepared us to read helped us create a mood for reading. I found this very positive, as it helped to feel interested in reading. I also think that having participated changed our mood. For example, we were like ‘we’ll enjoy reading because it’s literature’; it’s something we do it for pleasure, so we came with this positive attitude to the sessions; I was curious to see what the sessions were going to be about.

A salient aspect shared by both Catalina and Josefina is the enjoyment of not being assessed. Even though the pressure of assessment can trigger volition to engage with tasks, the lack of it can enhance their intrinsic and free voluntary choice to engage with an activity, as suggested by Day and Bamford (2002) and Renninger and Hidi (2016). Their volition to
engage, in turn, suggests the activities were meaningful and inviting. On the other hand, despite neither Catalina nor Josefina mention the role of comprehension in their discourse, their reading enjoyment and amusement also seem to relate to the easiness of language.

c) Storylines and writing style in ‘The Father Thing’ and ‘Zima Blue’ were influential in reading interest and engagement

Participants from both groups frequently referred to plot and writing style (both texts) and their influence in their interest and engagement to read. ‘Zima Blue’ was the most preferred story, suggesting that aspects such as easiness of vocabulary, writing style and story line were key factors in appraising this story positively. Generally, participants’ reports look contradictory when establishing a connection between such appraisals and their experiences of reading ‘Zima Blue’ and ‘The Father Thing’.

As observed in tables 15 and 16, most reported to have felt interested to read both texts, and to have read the stories in class. Nevertheless, 4 participants decided not to read one of the stories, as they did not feel sufficiently interested to read in class. After having examined both internal (reading identities) and external factors of the intervention (see tables 23 and 24 in appendix V, W), I conclude that a) generally, the designed before-reading activity for each group incentivised their curiosity to read and sustained their interest to engage in the second reading session, as a result of the limited information participants had about the texts and literature-to-film adaptations used in the second session b) the storylines or plots triggered their interest to read, and c) the textual features and writing style enhanced their reading engagement. A summary of these findings is presented in figure 22 below.
Figure 22

**Summary of Film and No-Film Group Participants’ Reports on Triggering Factors to Read in Reading Sessions 1 and 2**

![Chart showing summary of participants' reports on triggering factors to read in Reading Sessions 1 and 2. The chart compares Film group and No-film group responses to various factors such as liking to comment with friends, the teacher asking to read the texts, being interested in the genres of the texts, the whole class having to read them, the stories looking easy to read, feeling interested in the plots, feeling curious about the stories, the before-reading activities being interesting, feeling interested to read the texts, and other factors.]

I like commenting what I read with my friends
The teacher asked us to read the texts
I felt interested in the genres of the texts
The whole class had to read them
The stories looked easy to read
I felt interested in the plots
I felt curious about the stories
The before-reading activities were interesting
I felt interested to read the texts
Other
It was striking to find that some participants reported to have enjoyed ‘Zima Blue’ and consequently have read the text, though at the same time found it difficult to understand. Alejandro and Daniel (focus groups VI and VII respectively) explain this further:

**Alejandro:** Zima Blue is dense, I think; complex. I must confess this second reading was more complex than the first one.

**Daniel:** I think Zima Blue was a bit more dense, a bit more complex, but not necessarily less interesting. This doesn’t make it less attractive to me.

From the questionnaires (see tables 15 and 16), Alejandro reported to have felt engaged when reading ‘Zima Blue’, as opposed to ‘The Father Thing’, despite of his difficulty to understand the story. On the other hand, Daniel reported to have felt both interested and engaged to read ‘Zima Blue’ despite of difficulty of the text. As a result of my analysis and evaluation of language levels in both texts, these were linguistically appropriate as dictionaries/translation platforms were not used. Comprehension triggered and helped sustain participants’ reading interest (Day & Bamford, 1998).

From the Reading Interest Log, participants’ interest correlate with their engagement. This means, participants who reported not to have felt interest, also reported disengagement. Larson (2014) posits that interest contributes to engagement; in turn interest, as Renninger and Hidi (2015) suggest, is the ‘psychological state and motivational disposition of a person’ (p. 75) to engage in an activity. This means, interest relates to the general disposition to engage with reading, whereas engagement relates to the environmental factors that help sustain the activity. In the intervention, participants’ interest to read were enhanced by the storylines, their engagement by the textual features/textual qualities, and writing style.

Participants did not go in detail concerning their preference for the topics or genres in the focus groups. Nevertheless, as similarly discussed in chapter VI, topic interest and storylines played a role in participants’ interest to read. Some of them suggested that the topics, and presumably genres as well, incentivised them to read the stories, as Catalina explains: ‘I liked
the first story (‘The Father Thing’) better. The second one didn’t interest me that much, because it was strange, something like *Avatar. No, I don’t like that*. Sofia (focus group II) also shares a similar experience:

The second story (Zima Blue) interested me a lot. I think it was because of my personal interest. Even though it was a bit hard to understand because the descriptions were a bit too long, so I got lost at some points. But I liked the topic; I felt more interested in Zima Blue (than The Father thing).

Topic interest is “characterised by an anticipatory response triggered by the presentation of topics and themes” (Kerger et al., 2011, p. 608). In the case of Sofia, she reported to have felt interested to read ‘Zima Blue’, as opposed to ‘The Father Thing’. This decision could have been triggered by her predisposition for the topic and/ or genre, as Zima Blue aligned with her personal interest. In addition, her topic interest facilitated her cognitive and emotional engagement that helped her persist in her reading, despite the language barrier.

Interest, however, did not always sustain participants’ reading. As Teresa says, ‘The Father Thing’ was interesting, but it didn’t speak to me as much as ‘Zima Blue’ did, and for that reason, I didn’t finish the story’. Interest is dynamic; hence factors are needed to sustain it, as their attention and engagement. I observed that textual features, writing style and narrative were participants’ engagement drivers. For instance, Maria explains why the narrative of ‘The Father Thing’ was more engaging:

The Father Thing started from the climax of the story… we knew immediately what was happening, I mean, I was intrigued from the beginning, but in Zima Blue, the story started with the journalist talking about Zima Blue…so, (the story) started from the end…so, I think that the fact that the story started from the end made it difficult (for me) to hold to it, unlike The Father Thing.

In medias res seems to be a major engagement driver for Maria. As opposed to in extrema res, Maria finds that having been placed immediately at the climax of the story is enthusing. The use of this narrative strategy caused an emotional response, as excitement, which in turn sustained her attention and engagement to read (Berger et al., 2023).
In a similar vein, Alberto and José suggest the importance of writing style in his engagement:

**Alberto:** talking about the structure of the text, the *build up* of it made it more interesting. How the actions were described, the way characters interacted to each other helped to create this tension and suspense that made me feel very interested (in the story).

**José:** I loved the writing style of The Father Thing. It was very easy to get immersed in the story. The language was very accessible, and it showed the point of view of the kids very realistically, very much like how a kid would speak. I liked the style; the short sentences gave the feeling that something was going to happen… (and events were) narrated in a very _straight to the point_ (way).

In ‘The Father Thing’, Philip K. Dick includes short dialogues, short descriptions, short sentences (in some instances), as well as tildes (~) to mark the end and beginning of new scenes. These stylistic devices also triggered excitement in Alberto and José, as these likely conveyed an urgent tone, which agrees with the story’s suspenseful plot. As Berger et al., (2023) suggest, short sentences generally require less effort to cognitively process the content, becoming less engaging. Alberto’s and José’s interest was sustained as a result of the easiness of the story’s writing style, its accessibility, easiness of their experience of arousal, or attentiveness, while reading.

Supporting this very last point, and returning to comprehension, Carolina and Andrea explain how linguistic complexity becomes detrimental in sustaining interest:

**Carolina:** *(Zima Blue)* was difficult for me because of its long descriptions. There were instances where I had to skip some lines to continue. Some descriptions were a bit confusing for me, but I still found the text interesting.

**Andrea:** I like *(Zima Blue)* better because it was more detailed; more descriptive. So, I liked that better; I was more engaged with the text. On the contrary, The Father Thing had these tildes I didn’t know what they meant; I mean, I didn’t know if they meant the beginning of a new chapter or change of scene; I was a bit puzzled. But *(Zima Blue)* was more ‘complete’, so to speak; that kept me more engaged.

Comprehension were Carolina’s and Andrea’s engagement driver. Their lack of comprehension was provoked by different textual aspects from both texts. Carolina’s
engagement was not sustained due to her insufficient vocabulary, whereas Andrea’s lack of punctuation understanding, as well as the fragmented writing style, made it difficult to decipher ambiguity in the storyline. Even though their reports suggest that comprehension was a triggering factor (and although they do not comment on their emotional response such as frustration) it is true that in the case of Andrea, her comprehension seemed to be more related to her literacy skills, rather than her ability to read in a FL. Carolina’s and Andrea’s engagement could have been lost due to their capabilities in EFL reading.

**IV. Summary of the chapter**

In this chapter, I systematically analysed the outcomes of the intervention to answer my research questions, 3 and 4. My analysis and discussion comprised quantifiable data from both the Situational interest scale and Reading interest log, and qualitative data from focus groups. Participants’ interest to read ‘The Father Thing’ in session 1 and ‘Zima Blue’ in session 2, was triggered by both internal and external sources. A link was found between participants’ reading personae and their reading behaviour during the intervention, however, not all aspects of their reading identities seemed to influence their interest to read in class, only their self-efficacy. In addition, participants’ reading curiosity, interest and engagement seemed to have also been influenced by external factors, such as classroom environment, textual features, and challenge of reading digitally.

Concerning the outcomes of the intervention, it was found that were no significant differences between the 2 groups’ reading behaviour. Participants’ reports (both groups) regarding the before-reading activity suggested that their levels of attention, curiosity and interest were high. Nevertheless, the no-film group reported a slightly lower levels, though still positive in relation to the film group.
Concerning the selection of texts, these were positively appraised; however, most showed preference for ‘Zima Blue’ over ‘The Father Thing’. In addition, I discussed the influences of applying some of the tenets of ER posited by Day and Bamford (1998) in participants’ curiosity to read in class. They generally evaluated the intervention as surprising, as ER was a new and amusing experience, and the activities and materials enhanced their imagination. In connection to the online setting, I discussed the implications of digital reading in EFL reading disengagement.

In summary, the intervention triggered participants’ reading curiosity, that in turn motivated their interest to read. Nevertheless, I hypothesise that the major source of their interest was selection of texts and participants’ preferences for the stories’ topics and/or genres. Even though their interest was mostly enhanced, it not always maintained. Their reading engagement was mostly sustained by writing style, textual features, and narrative, such as the use of in medias res in ‘The Father Thing’. In all, I found that the outcomes of the intervention were exceedingly positive, which do not reflect my initial hypothesis of literature-to-film adaptations as an enhancing tool of EFL reading interest in class.

As there were no substantial differences between the use and not use of literature-to-film adaptations, the main characteristic of the use of this multimodal material was that of triggering of participants’ imagination. This led to their curiosity to know more about the storylines, their characters, and motives. Participants’ imaginations were similarly enhanced only by the descriptions of these stories; hence, I can conclude that to enhance EFL reading interest in a classroom, it is crucial to enhance psychological responses, such as surprise an imagination, as well as cognitive engagement, which can be achieved by selecting suitable texts and narratives to generate suspense and curiosity, and not necessarily by selecting pedagogical tools used as the main channel to enhance interest.
Chapter VIII: Conclusion

In this final chapter I present my conclusion. In section I, I reflect on the qualities of my study, and describe how this developed from my initial and main interest to delve into the use of literature-to-film adaptations in connection to EFL reading interest to my interest in including EFL reading identity as an important component to examine EFL reading behaviour. In section II, I metaphorically illustrate the interconnection between EFL reading identity and behaviour by means of an EFL reading tree and present a reflection of my findings about the relevance of these to the field of literacy in SL/ (E)FL. In section III, I reflect on my findings but from a contextual perspective, giving a closer look to the relation between the status of English and the Chilean context. In section IV, I reflect on what literature-to-film adaptations offer to EFL reading interest, and finally in section V, I refer to my methodological decisions by acknowledging my study’s strengths and limitations and suggesting further avenues for research.

I. My study journey: From literature-to-film adaptations to reading identity

My project was born from my initial interest in examining the potential influences of literature-to-film adaptations in EFL reading interest in an EFL classroom setting. I was interested in how films help— if at all— enhance interest to read in class. Films are frequently used in classrooms, though mostly intuitively; hence I was curious to observe whether multimodality, as in films and adaptations, indeed helped in enhancing learners’ EFL reading interest. My interest also emerged from the necessity to investigate the use of literature-to-film adaptations in connection to EFL as, to the best of my knowledge, most of the existing, and published, studies that focus on the use of films or adaptations in relation to reading comprehension or EFL learning. Also, I was very enthusiastic in focusing on EFL reading
experiences but particularly in a classroom setting to observe what elements in learning and teaching settings helped learners to feel interested and engaged to read.

During the course of my research, I reflected on my own reading experience with English to decide the focus of my study. I looked back at my own biography and experiences as EFL reader, former TEFL undergraduate, and lecturer in TEFL when designing my intervention and when making methodological decisions. I intuitively explored literature on topics related to language and identity, as I felt this aspect was at some point connected to readers’ volition to engage with reading in a FL. I came across with theories of language motivation, suggesting the relevance of self-efficacy in FL learning. My systematic exploration into the topic of language and identity invited me to reflect on my past experiences when initiating my EFL reading journey and became interested in investigating identity as a component in EFL voluntary reading. I found this especially relevant when exploring the identities of TEFL undergraduates who would soon-to-be EFL qualified teachers.

My initial—main—interest in investigating literature-to-film adaptations and EFL voluntary reading, slightly diverted into EFL reading identity, which then took an important focus in my project. This decision led me discover striking findings about EFL literacy which aims to contribute the role of education in EFL voluntary reading, including the role of language ideology and preconceptions of reading in experiences of reading in (E)FL contexts.

II. What my study offers to the fields of SL/ (E)FL literacy and to educational practice

Even though my study does not present generalisable findings, the observable interconnection in relation to EFL reading identity and behaviour still suggests a representative link to interest in FL reading that can be key for enhancing pleasure reading among (E)FL learners. This interconnection was not entirely observed in the intervention;
however, this was noted when participants described their experiences of reading engagement when reading voluntarily outside the classroom in their leisure time. I observed that participants’ general experiences when reading in English in their leisure time were informed by their self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-esteem, since if these were positive, their inclination to read voluntarily in English was higher. However, not all of these identity aspects were linked to their reading behaviour in the intervention; because reading sessions were designed to captivate participants’ attention and curiosity to read, external stimuli and environmental aspects became salient and highly influential in participants’ decision to read or not to read in class, influencing mostly their reading behaviour. To make this link pictorial, and hopefully clearer to readers, I metaphorically illustrated this connection by means of an EFL reading tree (see figure 23).

This EFL reading tree consists of the root, stem and top. Precisely, the roots hold participants’ preconceptions of reading, ideologies concerning English as a LF and past stories and experiences as EFL readers. These are grounded elements that inform their EFL reading identities. The roots feed the stem that represents participants’ reading personae today. The interconnection between the roots and the stem is manifested by the top, where the leaves and branches represent participants’ general EFL reading practices and experiences (curiosity, interest, and engagement) in connection to their voluntary reading.
Figure 23

EFL Reading Tree

**a) The roots: Preconceptions of reading and language ideology**

The root of this tree informs my participants EFL reading identities. Profoundly in participants’ internal landscapes resides past personal events informed by influence of globalisation and popular culture, preconceptions of reading, social discourses, and ideologies about English as a LF. Firstly, their personal history reading in English have been influenced by the role of English as a LF, emphasising a discourse connected to the importance of learning and reading in English in relation to its instrumentality in today’s global world. Secondly, their personal history in connection to the instruction of reading (IR) and ELL at school and university highly influence their EFL reading self-efficacy.

Their self-efficacy, or beliefs on how capable they are at doing reading tasks, or how much they can comprehend, influence their predisposition to engage with EFL reading, as low self-
efficacy levels can cause disengagement or withdrawal from reading. Their self-concepts, or how they feel about themselves as EFL readers are in turn influenced by their understanding of reading, IR and/or ER, and the set of expectations about what it means to be a good reader. Their self-esteem is rooted in their self-evaluations as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ readers. Self-esteem is linked to self-concept as their self-appraisals are interpreted positively and/or negatively giving shape to their self-understanding as an EFL reading persona.

Focusing on their personal history, beliefs concerning the status of English as a LF and as a language of prestige in Chile was a powerful driver to become EFL readers and to immerse themselves in their EFL reading journeys, which started mostly during their teenage years and last until today. The influence of governmental policies in Chile, such as ‘English Opens Doors’ programme, has highly influenced participants’ inclination to learn and read in this language, due to feelings associated to English being a prestigious language, or English being an essential and necessary tool for today’s world. The roots of this EFL reading tree can be representative of other contexts where English is also a FL. That is, even though it is impossible to assert the origins of these preconceptions, ideas about reading seem to be inculcated and perpetuated by TEFL programmes at universities who primarily emphasise the development of language skills.

Lastly, the roots of this tree are also linked to their identity as EFL speakers, rather than soon-to-be TEFL teachers (at the time of my intervention). Findings suggest a close link between EFL reading and language skills development, meaning that, participants overall do not include their role as pre-service TEFL teachers in their construction of their EFL reading identities. This reinforces the idea ‘idealised native speaker’, discussed by Selvi and Campus (2016), widespread in TEFL programmes in Chile. Similarly, participants who reported reading as an enjoyable activity, they also linked their reading practice to their identities as EFL speakers rather than EFL teaching personae, suggesting that reading for them is mostly a
personal experience, as they do not perceive themselves as EFL reading models to their students.

I conclude that there is little awareness of how impactful this is in individuals’ volition or genuine decision to learn and read in this language are determined by perceptions of English as key to opportunities is installed and widespread in the Chilean society. In addition, their emotional connection or highly positive affective response to English talks about a high level of identification with this language, and a substantial rejection of their own L1 identity as well. This is reinforced by their descriptions of reading practices that occur voluntarily, suggesting their internal drive to engage with the TL and positive predisposition to overcome challenges associated with reading in a FL.

I posit the question about the role of teachers in the attempt to enhance (E)FL reading interest in (TE)FL students/pre-service teachers. Teacher’s role in promoting the benefits of pleasure reading in a FL should not be promoted only from the perspective of benefits of reading for the acquisition of the TL, but also, and perhaps most importantly, from the perspective of pedagogy and social justice. Consequently, my study offers opportunities for discussing/ raising awareness of role of (TE)FL teachers in promoting appreciation for the experience of reading in L2/FL, regardless of their predominance or power, as it is the case of English as a LF, such as Japanese or Portuguese, or minority or indigenous languages, as Mapudungun30.

b) The stem: EFL reading personae

The stem of this tree represents participants’ reading personae, precisely their self-concepts, self-efficacy, and self-esteem. Their identities are dynamic, as these are shaped and fed by the roots of this tree. As participants’ reading identities are multifaceted, their reading

---

30 Aboriginal language spoken by Mapuche communities in the south of Chile and Argentina.
personae show the complexity of their internal landscapes and their dynamic relationship with EFL reading.

My participants’ multifaceted identities are also highly influenced by the integration of both IR and ER perspectives to reading. Even though their self-efficacy is reported from an IR perspective—suggesting their beliefs about how capable they are at reading relate to how capable they think they are at comprehending or at executing reading tasks—, their self-concepts and self-esteem are described from both IR and ER perspectives. The integration of these IR and ER perspectives resulted in, to some degree, contradictions in their description of their selves, conveying the complexity of their reading identities.

Their self-concepts are described from ER and IR perspectives, i.e., the context and purpose of reading shape their identity. For example, when reading is voluntary, their self-concepts are described as ‘curious’, but when reading is academic, their self-concepts change to ‘professional’, conveying different foci of, or even objectives for, reading. Self-esteem is described binarily, i.e., as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ readers. This means that when their self-appraisals are informed by IR, being a ‘good’ reader entails to be proficient, whereas by ER, ‘good’ readers are those who enjoy what they read and those who are faithful to their interests.

My study reveals the complex relationship between (E)FL reading identity and reading behaviour. I conclude that self-concept, self-efficacy, and self-esteem are influential when it comes to responses to (E)FL reading and promoting pleasure reading. Great attention should be then given to affective aspects of ELL in the EFL classroom, as these can positively and/or negatively influence both cognitive and affective engagement. For example, feeling efficacious can enhance the voluntary inclination to read in (E)FL as students can overcome challenges of reading in foreign language positively (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000).

Additionally, I highlight the important role of (TE)FL teachers in promoting a positive,
affective, relationship with reading (Guthrie & Coddington, 2009) which includes selection of texts in relation to students’ interest and language levels. Also, focusing on stimulating students’ imagination and/or surprise can enhance reading interest as well as appreciation for language and culture in relation to their L1, as well as the differences and similarities when experiencing the reading in L1 and/or L2/FL.

c) The top: EFL reading behaviour

The stem, fed by the roots, is manifested in the branches, and leaves of this tree. These overall represent the interconnection between their reading selves/ personae and their relationship with EFL reading, manifested by their affective and cognitive engagement experiences. The influence of roots and the stem in reading responses is, for example, evidenced when preconceptions about reading, such as reading as a ‘moral act’, dictate decisions as engaging with and/or persevering when reading. Practices such as not finishing a book can generate negative feelings or responses, as guilt for example, which can explain participants’ decision to read and persist even though having reported difficulties in understanding. This might be particularly influential when it comes to early stages of EFL reading.

The roots of this tree are also influential when referring to participants’ cognitive and affective engagement. Findings related to their affective engagement are striking as they described having a high emotional connection to English as opposed to their L1, Spanish. I hypothesise that their emotional connection is rooted in their set of believes about English as a language of prestige and access, as they give a higher value to this language in comparison to Spanish or other languages, such as Japanese. Their affective responses to English reading showed contradictions. For example, they paradoxically described English as ‘neutral’ or even ‘alien’ language, simultaneously evoking positive affective responses. This experience
can be explained by cognitive processes such as embodiment and construal that are experienced differently in Spanish and English. English is cognitively more accessible than Spanish, as nouns, for example are rather construed physically than abstractly.

In the intervention, participants’ experiences of reading interest do not fully correlate with their three aspects of their reading personae. My study showed that literature-to-film adaptations did not elicit significant differences in relation to levels of reading interest in comparison to the written descriptions of the stories, however the film group reported to have felt slightly more curious to read than the no-film group. Reading interest can have both internal and external sources; in the intervention external elements, mostly classroom environment, activities, and dynamics, were psychologically stimulating, precisely in their reading attention and imagination that directed participants’ curiosity and interest to read in class.

Participants’ reading interest and engagement were also related to their interest in the topics and genres and textual style and characteristics. Interest can be captivated in an early stage, however, engagement to read will be maintained depending on their comprehension level. My study reinforces the importance of probing and diagnosing students’ topic interests and language level when selecting texts in (E)FL reading sessions. It is necessary to systematically evaluate language level, and make suitable decisions concerning writing style, textual cues, and narratives from the teacher’s diagnosis of students’ interests and skills when it comes to encouraging (E)FL reading interest in class.

III. English in Chile: Widespread beliefs about English negatively affect experiences of pleasure in (E)FL reading

Language ideology in the context of my study is a salient aspect that has previously been pointed out by some researchers in Chile. The governmental programme ‘English opens
Doors’, created in 2003, reflects the underlying perception of English as a key to opportunities which is a deep-rooted and widespread cultural discourse in the Chilean society that is not openly questioned. My study offers opportunities to reflect the influence of public speeches in education that informs people’s personal spheres. For example, ideas such as learning is key ‘to become somebody’ are highly influential in the Chilean society. In the context of my study, TEFL programmes seem to reinforce beliefs concerning the idealised, native speaker among TEFL undergraduates. These are harmful beliefs that can negatively impact their self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-esteem when it comes to pleasure reading in (E)FL. In turn their set of beliefs about EFL reading as mostly an instrument for accessing information can be detrimental to future EFL students in primary or secondary school contexts, as TEFL teachers will not perceive themselves as EFL reading models, promoting appreciation of reading experiences in FL through the contact of foreign cultures and events.

IV. Literature-to-film adaptations can be beneficial and/or detrimental in enhancing EFL reading interest in the (E)FL classroom

It is worth discussing the benefits and drawbacks about the use of literature-to-film adaptations for educational practice. Concerning benefits, literature-to-film adaptations were influential in participants’ enjoyment during both sessions; they captivated participants’ attention, and positively boosted a pleasurable reading experience. From my study, I conclude that multimodality was beneficial for triggering psychological responses such as curiosity and imagination, especially if only extracts are used before reading source, written texts. Literature-to-film adaptations were indeed influential in participants’ enjoyment during both sessions; they were receptive to engaging with multimodality as films are usually associated to leisure time. Additionally, literature-to-film adaptations helped creating a positive, safe, and relaxing classroom environment which became beneficial in participants’ reading experience. Concerning comprehension, these also helped participants to engage
easily with written, source texts as the extracts of literature-to-film adaptations provided some key contextual information about plot and characters. In this regard, literature-to-film adaptations are beneficial for prevent demotivation and/or frustration while reading in (E)FL.

Nevertheless, my study also suggested that literature-to-film adaptations were not significantly influential in stimulating high levels of reading interest. Unexpectedly, they did not show significant differences in stimulating curiosity and imagination in comparison to the written short descriptions. I concluded that the integration of varied contextual factors, such as classroom environment and activities, for example, were also beneficial in enhancing reading interest. Consequently, the feasibility of employing literature-to-film adaptations can be questioned. The process of text selection can be time consuming, and if done successfully, reading interest can still be enhanced without the use of literature-to-film adaptations. I argue that proposing this as a pedagogical tool can be to some extent detrimental if the focus is disproportionately given on finding and selecting literature-to-film adaptations instead of written, source texts in the first place. Availability of adaptations can be limited if language level, plot, genre, or topics do not agree with participants’ needs. Teachers, thus, might feel tempted to disregard these key aspects due to time, and choose written, source texts based on the availability of literature-to-film adaptations.

Literature-to-film adaptations can also be logically hard to include in (E)FL classrooms. Length of texts is a fundamental aspect to enhance engagement, as interruption of reading due to (class) time constraints can be detrimental to students’ interest as they can find difficulty in retaining information about narratives to then be able to reengage with the same text. Consequently, applying literature-to-film adaptations with the primary objective of enhancing reading in class can take substantial time from students’ reading time and can negatively affect the reading experience. Nevertheless, it can bring benefits if these are used to enhance reading interest outside the classroom.
V. Limitations and strengths of my study and avenues for further research

My study has both strengths and limitations. Despite my attempt to minimise problematic issues in my intervention, I acknowledge some limitations, necessary to address in future studies. Firstly, the 2 reading sessions occurred in, possibly, undesirable times for participants. This affected the total number of volunteers taking part. Classroom-based studies usually take part in routine classes, meaning that time slots are arranged by host institutions. The lack of flexibility in conducting the sessions can bring difficulties in gathering a wider range of experiences from a bigger number of participants, and in conducting a longer intervention. Even though my study offers insightful findings, a longer intervention would have brought a deeper understanding of the developmental phrases of EFL reading interest in a classroom setting.

Concerning investigating reading experiences in (E)FL classrooms, my study failed to capture participants’ responses to reading from an observational perspective. This means, as my study was conducted online, I could not observe participants’ non-verbal reactions, and expressions, which could have contributed to analysing their experiences of absorption and/or (lack of) interest to read in class. Additionally, my study reflects a relatively limited range of experiences of EFL reading interest. Participants who volunteered were highly motivated students and showed great disposition to engage with the activities and peers in the sessions. This is due to the nature of the sample; TEFL undergraduates who were almost qualified TEFL teachers at the time of the study, suggesting they share a love for English, and generally a love for reading. My study, thus, does not examine reading experiences of demotivated students, who might reflect the reality of a big group of learners in (E)FL classroom contexts in Chile and worldwide. From this point, I acknowledge that my findings concerning the effects of the use of literature-to-film adaptations might be dissimilar in a wider and heterogeneous sample. Thus, I suggest the need to investigate experiences of
(E)FL reading among demotivated students or learners who choose not to read voluntarily in (E)FL and/or are reluctant readers in their L1. I also suggest the design of longitudinal studies to examine the influence of literature-to-film adaptations in the development of EFL reading interest among readers who do not read voluntarily in English or who have not developed interest to read in (E)FL to examine the potential long-term effects of these in reading motivation.

My study has distinctive strengths. First and foremost, it significantly contributes to the research of literary in (E)FL and EFL reading for pleasure, precisely to EFL reading motivation, interest, and engagement. My study offers a new perspective to reading for pleasure. My systematic review of the existing, published, literature (including empirical studies) mostly showed a predominant focus on L1 and on young learners. Hence, my study contributes to the examination of EFL reading motivation, including interest and engagement among young adults and TEFL pre-service teachers. Additionally, even though my study focuses on English, it still provides insightful understanding of motivation in other FLs.

From a systematic examination of the current body of published empirical studies, my study is novel. To the best of my knowledge, there are no published empirical studies that focus on the use of literature-to-film adaptations as a pedagogical tool employed before a main reading task in ER in EFL reading sessions. Consequently, my study significantly contributes to the existing body of literature in the field. Lastly, my findings posit the need for raising awareness among (E)FL teachers and pre-service teachers in Chile and worldwide concerning the role of reading identity, including self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-esteem as EFL readers, in their reading behaviour and practice in the (E)FL classroom.

I carefully designed my study by anticipating potential unexpected situations that could have negatively affected my intervention. For example, technology failure, participants’,
teachers’ unattendance— especially in the second reading session—, and session and material preparation. The design of my intervention was distinctive. I successfully diagnosed and targeted my participants’ needs and interests by carefully designing and creating 2 ER following key principles of ER in EFL. I succeeded in selecting the short stories with their corresponding literature-to-film adaptations by systematically looking for materials in accordance with participants’ interests and levels of proficiency in English. I also anticipated any potential queries and/or confusion from teachers while running the sessions by carefully planning each reading session and maintaining a fluid communication with them.

My study offers a multilayered approach to data analysis to investigate EFL reading identity. The integration of thematic, narrative and discourse analyses was beneficial for understanding different perspectives of their identities, including their personal history and EFL journeys, as well as their rooted discourses concerning deeper psychological aspects of their selves as their self-efficacies and self-esteem. Another strength of my study was identifying and exploring different aspects of reading motivation and interest, including attention, curiosity, and engagement. The latter was deeply examined by looking at the differences of construal in both Spanish and English and its link to affective engagement, as well as the influence of widespread social discourses about English as a LF. My study offers striking findings concerning the high positive, emotional connection when reading in English. As these are counterintuitive findings, I suggest further research concerning construal when reading in L1 and L2/FL and affective engagement when reading in L2/FL.

I employed a codebook method for thoroughly analysing data. This method was useful to systematically analyse data and apply the different analysis approaches. My data processing was detailed, rich and systematic, and hence beneficial for a thorough understanding of my participants’ identities and experience of reading interest in their general practices and in the
intervention. My study offers a codebook proposal (appendix X) for future qualitative studies in the field.

Concerning the methods for data collection employed, these were appropriately selected for answering my RQs. My study offers new versions of the employed questionnaires focusing on EFL reading in Spanish, which can contribute to qualitative studies focusing on reading interest in other FLs. Additionally, my questionnaires were carefully translated into Spanish with the support of other qualified TEFL teachers, suggesting a very rigorous methodological procedure. Lastly, my decision of conducting focus groups was appropriate for answering my RQs. My participants had the space to share their personal and shared (group) experiences concerning their general reading practices, personal histories with ELL, as well as in the intervention, i.e., the data I collected was detailed and rich. My study also proposes a focus group protocol (Appendix E) for future, cognate studies.
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Appendix A

Data analysis plan

Objectives of the study: this doctoral research comprises two studies. For study 1, the main objectives are as follows: a) to explore TEFL undergraduates’ perceptions of themselves as readers of English, b) to explore TEFL undergraduates’ motivations to read in English. On the other hand, study 2 aims at: a) to explore TEFL undergraduates’ engagements with the two short stories during two extensive reading sessions, b) to explore the influence - if at all- of the study intervention (the use of literature-to-film adaptations vs. the use of written text only) on TEFL undergraduates’ interest to read the short stories during the reading sessions, and c) to explore how similar or different self-reports on interest to read the short stories are between participants from film and no film groups.

Research design: This is a cross-sectional descriptive study, which will employ mixed data to achieve the research objectives and to answer the following research questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of study</th>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Type of data to be employed</th>
<th>Approach to data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFL reading identity</td>
<td>RQ.1. How do TEFL undergraduates construct their identities as EFL readers?</td>
<td>Quantitative data from questionnaire&lt;br&gt;Focus group transcripts</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics&lt;br&gt;Thematic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ.2. What are their motivations to read in English, including their EFL reading engagement and interest?</td>
<td>Quantitative data from questionnaire&lt;br&gt;Focus group transcripts</td>
<td>Narrative analysis&lt;br&gt;Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Descriptive data will be analysed inductively.
32 Reading self-efficacy questionnaire (Burrows, 2012).
33 Data will be explored inductively and deductively; the latter will follow Mishler’s (1995) and Richmond’s (2022) approaches to the study of narratives.
34 Motivations for reading questionnaire (Guthrie & Wigfield, 1997).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of study</th>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>Approach to data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFL reading interest (intervention)</td>
<td>RQ.3. What do these students self-report in relation to their experiences of reading interest in the intervention?</td>
<td>Focus group transcripts</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, Thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ.4. What is the connection, if at all, between participants’ EFL reading identities and their EFL reading behaviour in the intervention?</td>
<td>Quantitative data from questionnaires, Focus group transcripts</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, Thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 *The situational interest scale* (Chen et al., 1999) and *Reading interest log* (Guthrie et al., 2005).
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Lesson plan for class 1 and 2: no-film group

Class objectives (per class):
- To read for the overall meaning of a short story.
- To respond affectively to the short story.
- To discuss students’ main ideas and responses from text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-section stage</th>
<th>Strategies/ activities/ instructions</th>
<th>Materials and considerations for special cases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>1. Teacher greets students and introduces the session’s learning objectives. &lt;br&gt; 2. Teacher activates students’ previous knowledge by working on unknown vocabulary retrieved from the short stories students will read during the while-stage of the class. &lt;br&gt; 3. Students work on predicting vocabulary by using dictionaries and visual aids (PPT). &lt;br&gt; 4. Teacher checks vocabulary with the students.</td>
<td>Images to display meaning of unknown words through PPT &lt;br&gt; Dictionaries &lt;br&gt; Short story (PDF) &lt;br&gt; Take time to observe who is/who is not participating. Try to encourage those who do not seem too involved in the class to participate by asking their opinions, or thoughts on possible topics students will read in the following stage of the class. What makes you think of this/these topic(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While-section stage</td>
<td>5. Teacher provides a brief description of the short story (The Father Thing in session 1/ Zima Blue in session 2). He/ she reads it out loud and projects it for students for them to read. Teacher asks students to briefly predict details about the short story by creating a timeline of relevant events they think they will find in the text.</td>
<td>Short story (PDF) &lt;br&gt; Take time to observe who is/who is not participating. Try to encourage students to read for enjoyment and to focus on their affective responses while they read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Students openly share their predictions with the whole class (link Gdocs).

7. **Students respond to during intervention questionnaire** (Situational Interest Scale).

8. Students are asked to read the short story extensively (individually, in silence, and at their own pace) Short story is shared via Zoom chat. Teacher provides guiding questions for students to focus on their responses to both adaptations and short stories. They are invited to write their reflections, reactions, general responses to the short stories in their notebooks/ Google docs as they read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-section stage</th>
<th>Meanings-focused output.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Teacher starts by exploring the questions given. Students discuss questions and share their responses. (Teacher can help guide this discussion if it is needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher reflects on session’s learning objectives (metacognition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td><strong>ONLY AT THE END OF CLASS 2: Students respond to post intervention questionnaire</strong> (Reading Interest Log).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short story Questions**

- Take time to observe who is/who is not participating. Try to encourage those who do not seem too involved in the class to participate by asking them their opinions. Did you like the story? Why or why not? What do you think of the story/characters/ plot/ end?
Lesson plan for class 1 and 2: film group

Class objectives (per class):
- To read for the overall meaning of a short story.
- To respond affectively to the short story.
- To discuss students’ main ideas and responses from text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies/activities/instructions</th>
<th>Materials and considerations for special cases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-section stage</strong></td>
<td>Images to display meaning of unknown words through PPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown vocabulary</td>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher greets students and introduces the session’s learning objectives.</td>
<td>Short story (PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher activates students’ previous knowledge by working on unknown vocabulary, retrieved from the short story to be read in the while-stage of the class.</td>
<td>Take time to observe who is/who is not participating. Try to encourage those who do not seem too involved in the class to participate by asking their opinions, or thoughts on possible topics students will read in the following stage of the class. What makes you think of this/these topic(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students work on predicting vocabulary by using dictionaries and visual aids (PPT).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher checks vocabulary with students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While-section stage</strong></td>
<td>Short story (PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning-focused input.</td>
<td>Scenes from the adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students are invited to watch some scenes of the short story’s adaptation. Teacher asks students to briefly predict details about the short story by creating a timeline of relevant events they think they will find in the text.</td>
<td>Take time to observe who is/who is not participating. Try to encourage those who do not seem too involved in the class to participate by asking their opinions, or thoughts on possible topics students will read in the following stage of the class. What makes you think of this/these topic(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students openly share their predictions with the whole class (Gdocs link).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Students respond to during intervention questionnaire (Situational Interest Scale).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Students are invited to read the short stories extensively (individually, in silence, and at their own pace). Short story is shared via Zoom chat. Teacher provides guiding questions for students to focus on their responses to both adaptations and short stories. Students are asked to write their responses in their notebooks or Google docs (reflection of topics in the film and short story, their reactions to them, thoughts or their general experiences watching and reading these input).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-section stage</th>
<th>Meaning-focused output.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Students are invited to get involved in a whole-class book circle. Teacher gives instructions of whole-class discussion.</td>
<td>Short story Questions PPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teacher starts by exploring the questions given. Students discuss questions and share their responses. (Teacher can help guide this discussion if it is needed)</td>
<td>Take time to observe who is/who is not participating. Try to encourage those who do not seem too involved in the class to participate by asking them their opinions. Did you like the story? Why or why not? What do you think of the story/characters/plot/end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher reflects on session’s learning objectives (metacognition).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (ONLY AT THE END OF CLASS 2: Students respond to post intervention questionnaire (Reading Interest Log).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

A Qualitative Study of TEFL Undergraduates’ Experiences of Reading in EFL in Chile

Dear EFL teacher,

You have been invited to take part in this study. Please take time to carefully read the following information and then decide whether you would like to take part by completing the consent form at the end of this document. In case there is anything that is not clear to you, or if you would like more information, please contact the researcher Valeria Riveros Fuentes on valeria.riveros@york.ac.uk

The focus of this project is on the exploration of the use of literature-to-film adaptations on TEFL undergraduates’ reading interest in English during extensive reading sessions. Consequently, this project has the following broad aims: a) to examine the impact of literature-to-film adaptations on learners’ reading situational interest and engagement in an extensive reading session at a university setting, b) to open the discussion of the use of literature-to-film adaptations as potential tool for L2/FL teaching; the impact of these in language learners’ and TEFL undergraduates’ motivation and L2/FL reading behaviour, c) to examine the TEFL undergraduates’ reading self-efficacy, self-conception of readers and motivations to read in English. This is to understand the relation between intrinsic motivation, identity and reading behaviour with the use of literature-to-film adaptations, and d) to contribute to the existing evidence and discussion of the use of multimodality in FL reading.

To accomplish the study aims outlined above, your help and work in this study will be essential, as your participation will involve your teaching experience in TEFL programme in the host institution. Your main role will be conducting two reading sessions with second year students from the module IEL (Integrated English Language) III in a pilot study and conduct two reading sessions with fourth year students from IEL VIII in the main study. Consequently, if you accept to take part, these are tasks you will be asked to do:

a) Conduct two online reading sessions via Zoom in both the pilot and main study. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to teach the sessions in both studies.

b) You will be asked to start and finish the sessions on time.

c) Read the short stories and watch their film adaptations before each session.
d) Class materials will be prepared by the researcher (lesson plan and class materials). You will be asked to get familiarised with the learning objectives of each class and each activity students will be asked to do.

e) Follow the intervention procedure which will be given to you two weeks before the pilot and main study, which will involve asking participants to complete questionnaire and participate in focus groups (the latter will be conducted by the researcher).

f) Report the researcher any problem regarding lesson plan, intervention materials, intervention procedure either before or during the pilot and main study.

g) Be contacted by the researcher whenever necessary.

I am committed to carry out this study according to code of ethics from the University of York. Additionally, I commit to comply with all the points outlined above to respect our agreement in case you accept to take part. Your participation is voluntary; however, if you decide to participate, you will be asked to respect each of the points described above. Additionally, if you decide to withdraw, you can do so at any time without giving any reason, but not before three weeks before the start of the pilot study.

Finally, and in spirit of reciprocity, the researcher will give you £30 Amazon voucher after each study.
Consent Form

Title of Project: An Exploration on The Use of The Literature-To-Film Adaptations on Chilean TEFL Undergraduates’ Reading Motivation and Interest: A Classroom-Based with Quasi-Experimental Features Study.

Name of Researcher: Valeria Riveros Fuentes

1. I confirm that I have read the information in this informed consent for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions to the researcher and have had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw without giving any reason at any time until three weeks before the start of the pilot study.

3. I agree to participate in this study by committing to respect each of the points outlined in this informed consent.

Name of Participant:

Date:

Signature:
La influencia de adaptaciones cinematográficas de textos literarios en la motivación e interés lector de estudiantes de pedagogía en inglés en Chile

Estimado estudiante:
Con mucho agrado te invito a participar en este estudio titulado *A Qualitative Study of TEFL Undergraduates’ Experiences of Reading in EFL in Chile*. Este estudio busca investigar las identidades y las motivaciones lectoras de estudiantes de pedagogía en inglés en Chile. Además, busca averiguar las influencias de adaptaciones cinematográficas de textos literarios en el interés lector durante dos clases de lengua inglesa. Antes de que decidas participar, te invito a que atentamente leas la siguiente información. En caso de cualquier duda, por favor contáctame a valeria.riveros@york.ac.uk.

**Propósito del estudio**
Este estudio busca investigar los efectos que tienen extractos de adaptaciones cinematográficas de cuentos cortos en tu interés por leer los cuentos fuentes en tu clase de lengua. Para esto, esta investigación buscará primero conocer sobre tu identidad como lector del idioma inglés, tus motivaciones para leer en inglés y luego conocer tu experiencia lectora durante la investigación.

¿Qué implicaría este estudio para ti?
Tu participación en este proyecto es voluntaria y quienes participen se les invitará tomar parte en dos sesiones de IEL VIII. **Quienes deseen participar, al final del estudio recibirán $12.000 chilenos como muestra de agradecimiento.** El estudio implicará contestar 3 cuestionarios muy breves antes, durante y después de la intervención y participar en una entrevista grupal después del estudio. Los tres cuestionarios te tomarán entre 5 a 10 minutos en total en contestar y la entrevista grupal entre 60 a 90 minutos aproximadamente. Además, tu participación implicará participar de las clases; es decir, leer dos cuentos cortos y/o ver algunas escenas de sus adaptaciones cinematográficas y participar en las discusiones en clase.
Los participantes serán divididos entre dos secciones (la investigadora de este proyecto distribuirá los participantes en cada grupo). **Los dos grupos** serán invitados a leer un cuento corto por sesión; sin embargo, solo **un grupo** será invitado a ver extractos de adaptaciones cinematográficas del cuento estudiado.
Para este estudio es necesario que asistas a ambas sesiones y ser puntual. Este estudio no implicará ningún tipo de evaluación, pero se considerará como parte de tu módulo de lengua VIII. Por último, durante tu participación, será necesario que mantengas tu cámara prendida en todo momento y cumplir con los requisitos descritos para poder recibir tu incentivo.

**Tu participación**

Recuerda que tu participación es opcional. Puedes **retirarte del proyecto en cualquier momento durante el estudio hasta 4 semanas luego de que el estudio haya terminado** sin necesidad de dar ninguna justificación. Si deseas retirarte, por favor contáctame a valeria.riveros@york.ac.uk

*Si deseas participar y eres de cuarto año de carrera y perteneces a la sección 1 de IEL VIII, pertenecerás al grupo NO-FILM.
*Si deseas participar y eres de cuarto año de carrera y perteneces a la sección 2 de IEL VIII, pertenecerás al grupo FILM.
*Si deseas participar y eres de quinto año de carrera, pertenecerás al grupo FILM.

**Anonimidad y confidencialidad**

Toda información que entregues será tratada confidencialmente y tu información personal será anonimizada. Este es un proyecto doctoral respaldado por la universidad de York. Para obtener más información sobre la regulación de protección de información, te invito visitar el siguiente link https://www.york.ac.uk/education/research/gdpr_information/

¿A quién dirigirse en caso de preguntas, sugerencias o quejas?

**Investigadora:** Valeria Riveros

**Email:** valeria.riveros@york.ac.uk

**Comité de ética de la universidad de York:** education-research-admin@york.ac.uk

Por favor, una vez firmado este consentimiento, descarga y guarda una copia de referencia de este consentimiento.

¡Muchas gracias!
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Cuestionario de auto-eficiencia (Reading self-efficacy questionnaire, edited version of Burrows, 2012)

El siguiente cuestionario busca averiguar tus percepciones acerca de tus capacidades lectoras en inglés (cuando lees [ara tus estudios universitarios y cuando lees por placer). Por favor, contesta cada item según las categorías presentadas a continuación. Recuerda que debes contestar según tu percepción sobre tus habilidades lectoras; es decir, como describes, degun la escala (1 al 6), tus propias habilidades lectoras cuando lees en inglés. No existen respuestas correctas o incorrectas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Leo y entiendo detalles específicos de historias en libros de ficción escritas en inglés
2. Leo y entiendo las ideas generales de historias en libros de ficción escritas en inglés
3. Leo y entiendo letras de canciones en inglés
4. Leo y entiendo un poema escrito en inglés
5. Leo y entiendo los subtítulos de películas internacionales
6. Leo y entiendo detalles específicos de un artículo en una revista escrita en inglés, relacionado con uno de mis pasatiempos
7. Leo y entiendo las ideas principales de un artículo en un periódico de un país de habla inglesa
8. Leo y entiendo ideas específicas de un artículo en un periódico de un país de habla inglesa el cual trate de un tema relacionado con mis estudios universitarios
9. Leo y entiendo las ideas principales de un artículo en un periodo de un país de habla inglesa que trate cerca de un tema relacionado con mis estudios universitarios
10. Leo y entiendo blogs escritos en inglés
Cuestionario de motivaciones para leer (Motivations for reading questionnaire, edited version of Guthrie and Wigfield, 1997)

El siguiente cuestionario busca averiguar tus motivaciones para leer en inglés (ya sea cuando lees para tus estudios universitarios o cuando lees por placer). Lee cada uno de los ítems y decide si describen a alguien similar o diferente a ti. Para esto debes utilizar la siguiente escala (1 al 4). Recuerda que tus respuestas son en base a tus motivaciones para leer en inglés, por lo tanto, no existen respuestas correctas o incorrectas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muy diferente a mí</th>
<th>Un poco diferente a mí</th>
<th>Un tanto parecido a mí</th>
<th>Muy parecido a mí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Cómo describes tu curiosidad por leer en inglés?
1. Si alguien habla sobre un tema interesante, podría leer más sobre el tema 1 2 3 4
2. Tengo temas favoritos de los cuales me gusta leer 1 2 3 4
3. Leo para aprender información nueva sobre temas que me interesan 1 2 3 4
4. Leo sobre mis pasatiempos para aprender más sobre ellos 1 2 3 4
5. Me gusta leer nuevas cosas o sobre nuevos temas 1 2 3 4
6. Disfruto leer sobre diferentes culturas 1 2 3 4

¿Cómo describes tu involucramiento por leer?
7. Me gusta leer en inglés 1 2 3 4
8. Leo mucho en inglés 1 2 3 4
9. Disfruto mucho cuando leo en inglés 1 2 3 4
10. Cuando leo en inglés, me imagino imágenes de lo que estoy leyendo 1 2 3 4
11. Cuando leo, me identifico con algunas ideas o hay ideas que me 'hablan' 1 2 3 4
12. Cuando leo historias, siento que me identifico con (algunos) personajes 1 2 3 4

¿Cuál es tu principal motivación por leer?
12. Leo para mejorar mis habilidades lectoras en inglés 1 2 3 4
13. Leo para mejorar mis habilidades de escritura en inglés 1 2 3 4
14. Leo para aprender vocabulario 1 2 3 4
15. Leo para mejorar mis notas en las asignaturas 1 2 3 4
16. Leo por gusto o por placer 1 2 3 4
17. Leo para cumplir con mis evaluaciones en las asignaturas 1 2 3 4
18. Leo para participar de mis clases 1 2 3 4
19. Leo para aprender de otras culturas o temas que no conozco 1 2 3 4
20. OTRO
Escala de interés situacional (The Situational Interest Scale, edited version of Cheng, et al., 1999)

Este cuestionario busca averiguar sobre **tu nivel interés en la actividad** recién realizada en clase y sobre **el nivel de interés que sientes ahora por leer el cuento corto**. Lee los siguientes ítems y decide la opción que más te represente. Para esto, utiliza la escala (1 al 4). Recuerda que este cuestionario busca conocer **tu experiencia**, por lo que **no existen respuestas correctas o incorrectas**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Cómo describirías tu nivel de atención en la actividad?

1. Estuve muy concentrada durante la actividad  1  2  3  4
2. Estaba muy atenta a la actividad  1  2  3  4
3. Estaba absorbida por la actividad  1  2  3  4
4. Me llamo mucho la atención la actividad  1  2  3  4

¿Cómo describirías la actividad?

6. La actividad fue muy entretenida  1  2  3  4
7. La actividad me llamo mucho la atención  1  2  3  4
8. La actividad fue fascinante  1  2  3  4
9. Me sentí a gusto con la actividad  1  2  3  4

¿Cómo describirías la actividad?

10. La actividad fue muy entretenida  1  2  3  4
11. La actividad me llamo mucho la atención  1  2  3  4
12. La actividad fue fascinante  1  2  3  4
13. Me sentí a gusto con la actividad  1  2  3  4
14. Me sentí entusiasmada con la actividad  1  2  3  4
15. La actividad fue muy placentera  1  2  3  4

¿Cómo describirías tu interés por leer el cuento corto ahora?

16. Me siento intrigado por conocer más detalles de la historia  1  2  3  4
17. Quiero conocer más sobre los personajes de la historia  1  2  3  4
18. Quiero saber cómo la historia se desarrolla y termina  1  2  3  4
19. La actividad me invito a leer y a disfrutar de ella  1  2  3  4
Cuestionario de interés lector (Reading Interest log, edited version of Guthrie at al., 2005)

Este cuestionario busca averiguar sobre tu interés lector por los cuentos leídos en clase. Para esto, me gustaría saber si leíste los cuentos cortos en clase. Para el propósito de este estudio, leer cada cuento significa haber leído durante 15 minutos o haber leído por lo menos 5 páginas de cada historia. Si leíste uno o ambos cuentos, por favor marca la alternativa SI. Si no leíste uno o ninguno, marca la alternativa NO. Además, en caso de haber leído los textos, ¿Qué tan interesado/a te sentiste? Para responder a esta pregunta, por favor marca la alternativa que más te represente utilizando la siguiente escala (1 al 4). Recuerda que no existen respuestas correctas o incorrectas.

- Lei ‘The Father Thing’ Si …………… No ……………
- Lei ‘Zima Blue’ Si …………… No ……………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Me pareció para nada interesante</th>
<th>No me pareció interesante</th>
<th>Me pareció interesante</th>
<th>Me pareció muy interesante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The Father Thing’

‘Zima Blue’

De las dos historias, ¿Cuál te pareció más interesante, o con cual de los dos cuentos te sentiste más interesado por leer?

- The Father Thing
- Zima Blue

¿Cuáles fueron los motivos que fomentaron tu lectura de los cuentos en clase?

Por favor, marca todas las alternativas que te representen (puedes marcar más de una opción). Recuerda que no existen respuestas correctas o incorrectas.

1. Me gusta comentar lo que leo con mis amigos
2. El profesor nos dijo que lo leyéramos
3. Me sentí interesado por el género literario
4. Toda la clase tuvo que leerlos
5. Se veían fáciles de leer
6. Me sentí interesado por el tema del cuento
7. Me sentí muy curioso por saber más de la historia
8. La actividad antes de la lectura me pareció interesante
9. No me sentí interesado por leer los cuentos
10. OTRO
Appendix E

Protocolo de entrevista grupal

Información de la sesión:
• Fecha:
• Hora de comienzo y termino:
• Grupo:
• Número de entrevista:
• Nombre de los participantes

Comenzar la grabación*

I. **Bienvenida: 3 minutos.**
   a) Saludar a los participantes y agradecerles por su participación en el estudio.
   b) Registrar sus nombres.
   c) Presentarme (investigadora).
   d) Resumir el propósito y los objetivos del estudio y mencionar que esta entrevista será grabada y tendrá una duración de aproximadamente 80 minutos.
   e) Explicar el por qué han sido escogidos para participar en este estudio. Preguntar si existen preguntas con respecto a la entrevista, ética, incentivos, etc.

   *Recordar a los participantes que no existen respuestas correctas o incorrectas a cada pregunta que se hará durante esta entrevista. Además, la información entregada aquí será tratada confidencialmente. Es por esto, que se agradecerá que los participantes respondan lo más honesta y abiertamente posible. Es importante agregar que esta entrevista no tendrá ninguna implicancia en los estudios universitarios de los participantes.*

   Además, invitar a los participantes a utilizar el Padlet creado para esta entrevista libremente (deben ingresar a la página para poder hacer uso de esta o deben ingresar sus nombres cada vez que comenten algo), para comentar, compartir apreciaciones, pensamientos, anécdotas, entre otros durante la entrevista.

II. **Preguntas: 70 a 80 minutos.**

Para comenzar, mostrar las ilustraciones creadas por Quentin Blake de *The Rights of the Reader* del escritor francés Daniel Pennac en el Padlet. Invitar a los participantes a reflexionar sobre cada enunciado y a comentar sus reacciones, pensamientos, opiniones, etc. Para comenzar, preguntar: ¿qué significa para ti ser lector? ¿Qué se siente ser un lector en la lengua inglesa? ¿Qué lugar tiene la lectura en tu vida? ¿Cómo te describirías como lector de la lengua inglesa?

   **A. Tema 1: identidad lectora (en inglés) – 30 minutos aproximadamente.**
   Durante este tema, hablaremos sobre tus experiencias como lector de la lengua inglesa. Te invito a compartir como vives el ser lector en inglés, como se siente (poder) leer en inglés, como te describes/percibes como lector en este idioma (quizás tomar algunas ideas generadas de la imagen publicada en el Padlet).

   1. ¿Me podrían contar que nivel de inglés tienen?
B. Tema 2: tu motivación por leer en inglés (20 minutos).
En este tema, los invito a hablar sobre tus objetivos/motivaciones personales con respecto a la lectura en inglés. Por ejemplo, ¿Cuál es tu primordial motivación por leer en inglés?

1. ¿Me puedes contar por qué leen en inglés?
   Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿qué lugar tiene la lectura en inglés en tu vida? ¿lees por avanzar en tu adquisición de la lengua, por mejorar tus notas en la universidad, por disfrute, por curiosidad, para alimentar tu imaginación, para acceder información, porque el inglés te abrirá puertas?

2. ¿Cómo te hace sentir el leer en inglés?
   Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿...el leer para la universidad, por elección propia?
3. ¿Cómo describirías tu experiencia en general cuando lees en inglés?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿es valiosa, te es indiferente, no te gusta, te entrega placer, distracción, conexión con lo que lees...? ¿Cuáles son los principales obstáculos, si existen, que se te presentan? ¿tu experiencia lectora en inglés es generalmente la misma o depende del texto, del momento, del contexto, de tu ánimo, tu motivación? ¿Qué ha generado tu desinterés por la lectura? (basado en los cuestionarios).

4. ¿Me puedes contar si experimentan gusto por leer o placer por leer?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿para ti que es leer por placer? ¿Cómo traducirías ese placer? ¿Qué genera ese placer por leer (los temas, el género)?

5. ¿Te sientes interesado por leer cosas nuevas en inglés?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿cómo tu interés por leer en inglés ha cambiado durante el tiempo? ¿Qué ha contribuido en esto?

6. ¿Podrías contarme si la lectura en inglés te ha traído algo a tu vida? Si es así, ¿qué cosa?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿el aprender inglés, aprender sobre otras culturas, concerté a ti mismo...?

C. Tema 3: tu experiencia/ experiencia lectora durante este estudio (35 minutos).

En este tema, me gustaría que compartieras tu experiencia en general/ experiencia lectora durante las sesiones de lectura. En esta ocasión, te invito a compartir tus apreciaciones de los cuentos que exploraste en cada sesión, las actividades realizadas, las escenas de las adaptaciones (en el caso del grupo FILM), entre otros elementos que consideres importante destacar.

1. ¿Cómo te sentiste participar en este estudio?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Por qué decidiste participar? ¿Cómo describirías tu predisposición, motivación por participar?

2. ¿Me podrías contar como fue tu predisposición/ motivación por leer los cuentos en clase?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Cómo te sentiste cuando supiste que leerías literatura en clases?

3. ¿Cómo te sentiste durante la intervención?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿cómo describirías tu experiencia en general durante las dos sesiones? ¿Qué tal las sesiones en sí, con respecto quizás al ambiente en clases? ¿te sentiste relajado, estresado, abrumado?

4. ¿Cómo describirías tu experiencia lectora durante la intervención?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿sentiste interés/curiousidad por leer los cuentos en las clases? ¿te sentiste entusiasmado o no? ¿cómo describirías tu interés, esta surgió, fue mantenida o perdida en algunos momentos?

5. Considerando tu experiencia con respecto a tu interés lector, ¿me podrías contar qué partes del texto te parecieron interesantes y por qué?
Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Qué tal aquellas partes del texto que encontraste difíciles de entender (ya sea por el nivel de inglés o por la temática, estilo narrativo, etc.)? ¿En estas partes de tu lectura, persististe, dejaste la lectura o adelantaste la lectura? ¿En qué momentos del texto comenzaste a sentirte interesado o desinteresado por leer o seguir leyendo? (¿Tuvo el género narrativo, el estilo narrativo que ver en esto?)

6. ¿Me podrías decir que aspectos de la intervención, ya sea en la clase u otros aspectos, causaron o influyeron en esta experiencia lectoras (interés lector)?

Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Qué tal las actividades, los textos, los géneros o los temas de estos?

7. ¿Cómo describirías tu nivel de comprensión de los textos que leíste?

Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Cómo tu comprensión afectó/ influyó tu interés lector? ¿Cómo tu nivel de inglés influyó tu comprensión de los textos?

8. ¿Leiste los textos en clase?

Posibles preguntas adicionales: en caso de no haberlos leído completamente (poner atención a lo que menciona el cuestionario sobre ‘leer’ o ‘no leer’ un texto), ¿sentiste interés por seguir leyendo después de haber terminada la sesión? ¿Por qué crees que esto sucedió?

9. ¿Qué piensas sobre los textos que exploraste/leíste en las sesiones?

Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Cómo los describirías? ¿Hubo alguno que te encanto, te gusto o desagrado?

10. PARA EL GRUPO NO-FILM SOLAMENTE: ¿Cómo experimentaste la actividad de predicción antes de leer el/los cuento/s en clase?

Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Cómo influyó, ya sea positiva o negativamente, tu interés lector/ experiencia lectora?

11. PARA EL GRUPO FILM SOLAMENTE: ¿Cómo te sentiste al ver las escenas de las adaptaciones de los cuentos vistos en clase antes de leerlos?

Posibles preguntas adicionales: ¿Cómo estas influencieron, ya sea positiva o negativamente, en tu interés lector en caso de que sea así? ¿Qué partes (o cuál de las dos adaptaciones) de las adaptaciones influyeron en tu experiencia de interés lector? ¿Qué características de las escenas mostradas influyeron en tu experiencia lectora?

III. Cierre: 2 a 3 minutos.

Terminar la grabación*
## Appendix F

### Table 3

**Summary of Instruments Employed and their Adaptations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Original items</th>
<th>Adapted items</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading self-efficacy questionnaire</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Burrows, 2012)</td>
<td>Items 3, 5, 9, 10, 11 and 14 have been removed for not complying with the research aims.</td>
<td>a) Items 4 and 10 have been included and taken from the English reading self-efficacy scale developed by Zare and Davoudi Mobarakhe (2011).&lt;br&gt;b) Items 1, 2, 6, 7 and 8 have been slightly adapted to fit the research context.</td>
<td>a) The adapted items have been included as they refer to reading activities which are recurrent in students’ their academic contexts.&lt;br&gt;b) The original items refer to very specific reading tasks; thus, these have been adapted to less specific activities, as the aim to apply this questionnaire concerns students’ general perceptions of their reading abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivations for reading questionnaire</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Guthrie &amp; Wigfield, 1997)</td>
<td>In my study, solely the constructs of reading curiosity and involvement were used. Constructs pertaining to reading efficacy, challenge, importance, recognition, grades, social, competition, compliance and work avoidance were not included as these do not agree with my research aims.</td>
<td>a) Items 7, 9, 10 and 11 have been slightly modified to meet the research aims.</td>
<td>a) The original instrument was developed to investigate motivations for reading in primary school children. Therefore, the items have been adapted to suit the research context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The situational interest scale</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Chen et al., 1999)</td>
<td>In my study, only the constructs of attention demand, sense of delight and exploration intention were used. Constructs pertaining to total interest, novelty, challenge, desire arousal, time alteration were not included, to not comply with the aims of my project.</td>
<td>d) Items 2 and 6 from the construct of attention demand have been removed. e) The 5 items in the construct of exploration intention.</td>
<td>a) The activities described in these items are not relevant with the experience that the intervention is expected to elicit.&lt;br&gt;b) The original questionnaire was developed to explore SI in Physical Education classes; therefore, new items created by the researcher have been included to meet the research aims and context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading interest log</strong></td>
<td>Items 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were removed as these were relevant to examine participants’ interest in each of the chosen texts.</td>
<td>No items were adapted, as all of these were relevant to examine participants’ interest in each of the chosen texts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Guthrie, et al., 2005) did not agree with my study’s research context. However, included two questions which were relevant to explore students’ interest in the chosen scenes from the cinematic adaptation and their effects on their interest to read the source texts.
### Appendix G

#### Table 7

*Summary of Participants' Stories Following Richmond's Story Map*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>Main theme(s)</th>
<th>Key story(ies)</th>
<th>Character(s)</th>
<th>World</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>a. Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>b. Her classmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Himself</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>b. himself, his uncle</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to knowledge</td>
<td>a. Interest to find and read new things</td>
<td>a. Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>b. herself, friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to knowledge</td>
<td>a. Topics of her interest</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Herself, Spanish teacher</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Reading at university</td>
<td>b. Herself, university teachers</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself, friend</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at university</td>
<td>a. Himself, university teachers</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Himself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Himself, teacher</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Himself, parents</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to knowledge</td>
<td>a. Interest to read on topics of her interest</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to knowledge</td>
<td>a. Topics of her interest</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Reading at school</td>
<td>a. Herself, teacher</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Himself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Herself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Himself, grandmother</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héctor</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Himself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Influences of agencies in reading</td>
<td>a. Cultural and linguistic domination</td>
<td>a. Himself</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix H

### Table 8

*Summary of Participants’ Visions of EFL Reading in Accordance with their Discourse Patterns*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Language use</th>
<th>Communication of beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>- Vocabulary denotes an important focus on their abilities as a reader ('a capable/ trained reader').</td>
<td>EFL reading connected to IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>- Vocabulary revolves around his curiosity in reading</td>
<td>Reading occurs when motivation emerges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>- Vocabulary denotes a positive predisposition in reading or feels motivated to read in English</td>
<td>Reading is pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>- Vocabulary describes reading in EFL as a ‘war’</td>
<td>- EFL reading connected to IR: reading is difficult and requires perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language denotes relevance of topics in reading</td>
<td>- There are ‘rules’ in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>- Language structure denotes obligation in reading.</td>
<td>- EFL reading connected to IR: reading is conceptualised as a duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary denotes importance of topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>- Metaphors: ‘heavy’ vs. ‘light’ reading</td>
<td>- EFL reading connected to IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of conditionals denote that voluntary reading is hypothetical</td>
<td>- Reading requires motivation and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reading is described as a mental process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>- Vocabulary denotes a judgement of her own practice</td>
<td>- Reading is instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary use denotes relevance of topics in reading</td>
<td>- Reading is a duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language use denotes reflection on her visions of what is reading</td>
<td>- Leisure reading depends on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Structures denote reading is an obligation or duty</td>
<td>- To read means to read a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>- Use of hyperboles denotes excitement when referring to reading voluntarily</td>
<td>- Reading is instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Metaphors: reading is a tool to fill in our brains with information</td>
<td>- Reading is a source for knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Structures denote a duty</td>
<td>- EFL reading is connected to IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives for reading are fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There are ‘rules’ in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>- Use of hyperboles describes curiosity as powerful</td>
<td>- There are ‘rules’ in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language denotes a disconformity with his moral practices</td>
<td>- There are moral ‘rules’ in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>- Use adverbs denotes reading is a frequent practice</td>
<td>- EFL reading is connected to IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Structures suggest a commitment to progress in her level of English</td>
<td>- Reading is instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary denotes guilt when she does not read</td>
<td>- Reading requires motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>- Metaphorical language when referring to comprehension; ideas ‘get in’ the mind of the reader.</td>
<td>- Reading requires motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Metaphorical language when refers to reading for pleasure; reading when is pleasurable becomes ‘a part’ of herself.</td>
<td>- Reading is pleasant when it meets own expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language use denotes relevance of topics in reading interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>- Vocabulary denotes reading is a solitary act</td>
<td>- Reading implies criticality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary describes curiosity as powerful</td>
<td>- Reading is a private space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Metaphorical language when referring to reading for pleasure; reading ‘becomes’ closer to her
- Reading is personified; she ‘talks’ to characters
- Metaphorical language when referring to interest; the reader is a container, interest ‘gets in’ her

Andrés
- Language denotes relevance of leisure reading
- Curiosity is described as powerful
- Reading is described metaphorically; it ‘opens’ one’s mind, reading is a journey
- Reading interest should be cultivated
- Reading requires work and discipline

Eva
- Language denotes importance of topics
- Structures (ergative) denote hard work in reading
- Use of verbs denotes discipline in reading
- Reading means to read a book
- Reading is a private space
- Reading implies discipline

Luz
- Language denotes relevance of topic in reading interest
- Metaphorical language concerning reading; it is described as an object that one ‘consumes’
- Use of onomatopoeic language denotes weak predisposition to reading
- Reading for pleasure is metaphorically described as ‘hunger’
- Reading for pleasure means to read fiction
- Reading requires motivation
- Reading for pleasure is spontaneous and it requires interest

Alejandro
- Use of hyperboles denotes emphasis in reading vastly
- Language use suggests relevance of topics in reading interest
- Curiosity is conceived in terms of quantity; how many reading ones look for, and metaphorically as a powerful force that incites looking for new texts
- Descriptions denote strict characteristics a reader should have
- Reading is instrumental
- Reading requires motivation
- There are moral ‘rules’ in reading

Héctor
- Descriptions revolve around IR, strategic in reading
- Vocabulary denotes reading is only useful when the information is important
- Use of adverbs and nouns denotes interest in new information about a topic of his interest
- Reading interest is described metaphorically by use of colloquial expressions, interest in the new
- Reading is instrumental
- Reading is difficult
- Reading is a source of knowledge
- EFL reading is connected to IR
- Reading becomes valuable when topic is relevant
- Reading depends on its objectives

Daniel
- Metaphorical language through colloquial expressions; reading is hard
- Use of language denotes an enjoyment in challenge
- Vocabulary use denotes positive predisposition to reading and structures denotes agency and volition in reading
- Curiosity is described as a spontaneous; it is described metaphorically by the use of colloquial expressions
- Reading is difficult
- Reading requires discipline
- Reading is pleasurable when is understood

Sara
- Use of verbs denotes that reading is cultivated for progressing in language acquisition
- Use of verbs denotes fear of ‘losing’ her reading skills
- Use of language denotes agency and volition to look for texts to read
- Language use suggests relevance of topic in reading interest
- Reading flow is described as a mental process when aiming to comprehend
- Her description as a reader is described in terms of her comprehension abilities
- Reading is instrumental
- Leisure reading depends on time
- Reading is pleasant when shared and discussed with others
Appendix I

The Rights of the Reader
by Daniel Pennac
illustrated by Quentin Blake

1 The right not to read.

2 The right to skip.

3 The right not to finish a book.

4 The right to read it again.

5 The right to read anything.

6 The right to mistake a book for real life.

7 The right to read anywhere.

8 The right to dip in.

9 The right to read out loud.

10 The right to be quiet.

10 rights — 1 warning. Don’t make fun of people who don’t read—or they will strike back.
### Appendix J

**Table 9**

*Summary of Participants’ Self-Reported Self-Concepts as EFL Readers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>A trained reader</td>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>A reader who does not finish what they read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who likes re-reading texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who enjoys reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>A constant reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A seasonal reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who reads more in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who lends texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who enjoys reading out loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A critical reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who does not finish reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A committed reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who immerses in reading easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>A consistent reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A critical reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>A trained reader</td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A committed reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who tries to read in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A juvenile reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who reads for personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who immerses in reading easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who inspires (others to read)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>A seasonal reader</td>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>A reader who enjoys reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A committed reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who needs motivation to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who comments on what they</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who does not push themselves to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read (with others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A seasonal reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A committed reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who does not prefer to read</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who needs motivation to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who enjoys reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
<td>Héctor</td>
<td>A reader who enjoys reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A consistent reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who needs motivation to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A strategic reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who does not read too much</td>
<td></td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who tries to read in English</td>
<td></td>
<td>A motivated reader (to finish texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who knows the origins/ backgrounds of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>A reader who does not read too much</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who does not push themselves to read</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who enjoys reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A selective reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who immerses in reading easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A strategic reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who tried to read in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A practical reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who comments on what they read (with others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>A reader who reads a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A curious reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>A motivated reader (to finish texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A reader who does not finish what they read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix K

### Table 10

*Summary of Participants’ General Scores and Results from the adapted version of Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (Burrows, 2012)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Total Score (60)</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Film</td>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix L

**Table 11**

*Summary Participants’ Responses*[^36] to *Adapted Version of Reading Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (Burrows, 2012).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>I cannot do it (1.00)</th>
<th>I probably cannot (2.00)</th>
<th>Maybe I cannot (3.00)</th>
<th>Maybe I can (4.00)</th>
<th>I probably can (5.00)</th>
<th>I definitely can (6.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the specific details of fiction books written in English.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>9 (45.00)</td>
<td>8 (40.00)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the main ideas of fiction books written in English.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>15 (75.00)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the lyrics of a song written in English.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>7 (35.00)</td>
<td>12 (60.00)</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand a poem written in English</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>8 (40.00)</td>
<td>6 (30.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the English subtitles in an international movie.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>15 (75.00)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the specific details of a magazine article written in English and related to one of my hobbies (i.e., fashion, sports, music, movies).</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>16 (80.00)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the main ideas of an article in a newspaper published in an English-speaking country.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>6 (30.00)</td>
<td>12 (60.00)</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^36]: This table summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the <strong>specific details</strong> of an article in a newspaper published in an English-speaking country that is written about a topic related to your major (i.e., economics, law) at university.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand the <strong>main ideas</strong> of an article in a newspaper published in an English-speaking country that is written about a topic related to your major (i.e., economics, law) at university.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and understand online blogs written in English.</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 12

*Summary of Participants’ Self-Appraisals and Self-Efficacy as EFL Readers from Focus Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Perspective of reading</th>
<th>Self-efficacy in EFL reading</th>
<th>Description of an EFL reading model</th>
<th>Self-appraisal as EFL reader (Self-esteem)</th>
<th>Inferred self-appraisal (Self-esteem)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Faithful to their reading interest.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Good reader: she is faithful to her reading interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Good reader: she can comprehend texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Respectful reader towards the author of an oeuvre. Curious reader.</td>
<td>No explicit reference</td>
<td>Good reader, as he is curious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curious. Faithful to own interest. Values all genres and topics.</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curious.</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Able to understand.</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reads for pleasure.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Able to understand.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reads for pleasure.</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Able to understand.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Bad reader: she feels insecure of what she understands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Feel interest to read. Perseverant.</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Good reader: she understands, she is fluent in reading (vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Feel interest to read. Shares ideas from reading with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héctor</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>No reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recommends books</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehends and summarises information</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 13

Summary Participants’ Responses\(^{37}\) to Adapted Version of Motivations for Reading Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes for reading in English</th>
<th>Very different to me (1.00)</th>
<th>A bit different to me (2.00)</th>
<th>A bit like me (3.00)</th>
<th>A lot like me (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I read to improve my reading skills in English</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>6 (30.00)</td>
<td>10 (50.00)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to improve my writing skills in English</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>6 (30.00)</td>
<td>9 (45.00)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to learn vocabulary</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>12 (60.00)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to improve my grades</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>11 (55.00)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read for pleasure/ enjoyment</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>13 (65.00)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to comply with my assignments at university</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>16 (80.00)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to participate in class</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>15 (75.00)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to learn about other cultures or topics I do not know about</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>6 (30.00)</td>
<td>13 (65.00)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No other purposes were mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\) This table summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.
Table 14

Summary Participants’ Responses\textsuperscript{38} to Adapted Version of Motivations for Reading Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in EFL reading</th>
<th>Very different to me (1.00)</th>
<th>A bit different to me (2.00)</th>
<th>A bit like me (3.00)</th>
<th>A lot like me (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If someone discusses something interesting, I might read more about it</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>7 (35.00)</td>
<td>13 (65.00)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have favourite topics that I like to read about</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>19 (95.00)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read to learn new information about topics that interest me</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>16 (80.00)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read about my hobbies to learn more about them</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>13 (65.00)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to read about new things</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>12 (60.00)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy reading books about different cultures</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
<td>8 (40.00)</td>
<td>10 (50.00)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading engagement in EFL reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very different to me (1.00)</th>
<th>A bit different to me (2.00)</th>
<th>A bit like me (3.00)</th>
<th>A lot like me (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to read in English</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>7 (35.00)</td>
<td>13 (65.00)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read in English a lot</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>8 (40.00)</td>
<td>11 (55.00)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy reading in English</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>7 (35.00)</td>
<td>13 (65.00)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I read, I make images in my mind</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (10.00)</td>
<td>18 (90.00)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I read, I identify myself with some ideas</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (15.00)</td>
<td>5 (25.00)</td>
<td>12 (60.00)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I read, I identify myself with some characters</td>
<td>1 (5.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>4 (20.00)</td>
<td>11 (55.00)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{38} This table summarises the responses from participants from both Film and No-film groups.
## Table 17

**Film Group: Summary of Participants’ Individual Trajectories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Perspective of reading</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Short story</th>
<th>Reading interest</th>
<th>Reading behaviour in intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18

**No-film group: Summary of Participants’ Individual Trajectories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Perspective of reading</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Self-esteem</th>
<th>Short story</th>
<th>Reading interest</th>
<th>Reading behaviour in intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No reference</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good reader</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héctor</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>The Father Thing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Bad reader</td>
<td>Zima Blue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix R

### Table 19

**Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to the Intervention in Reading Session 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention in the before-reading activity</th>
<th>I very much disagree (1.00)</th>
<th>I disagree (2.00)</th>
<th>I agree (3.00)</th>
<th>I very much agree (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was very focused during the activity</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very attentive to the activity</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was absorbed by the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity called my attention</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>9 (82.00)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in the before-reading activity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity was amusing</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was fascinating</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the activity</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>8 (72.00)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt enthusiastic in the activity</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>9 (82.00)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was pleasant</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curiosity to read The Father Thing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel intrigued to know more details about the story</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>10 (91.00)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know more about the characters in the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know how the story unfolds</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>10 (91.00)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity invited me to read the story</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>8 (72.00)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 20

Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to the Intervention in Reading Session 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention in the before-reading activity</th>
<th>I very much disagree (1.00)</th>
<th>I disagree (2.00)</th>
<th>I agree (3.00)</th>
<th>I very much agree (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was very focused during the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>8 (72.00)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very attentive to the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>8 (72.00)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was absorbed by the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity called my attention</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>8 (72.00)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the before-reading activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was amusing</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was fascinating</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt enthusiastic in the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was pleasant</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity to read Zima Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel intrigued to know more details about the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>11 (100.00)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know more about the characters in the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>11 (100.00)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know how the story unfolds</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>11 (100.00)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity invited me to read the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>11 (100.00)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 21

Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to the Intervention in Reading Session 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention in the before-reading activity</th>
<th>I very much disagree (1.00)</th>
<th>I disagree (2.00)</th>
<th>I agree (3.00)</th>
<th>I very much agree (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was very focused during the activity</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very attentive to the activity</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was absorbed by the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity called my attention</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest in the before-reading activity

| The activity was amusing                | 1 (9.00)                    | 1 (9.00)          | 4 (36.00)      | 3 (27.00)                | 3.00 | 1   |
| The activity was fascinating           | 1 (9.00)                    | 1 (9.00)          | 7 (64.00)      | 0 (0.00)                 | 2.66 | 0.71|
| I liked the activity                   | 1 (9.00)                    | 0 (0.00)          | 4 (36.00)      | 4 (36.00)                | 3.22 | 0.97|
| I felt enthusiastic in the activity     | 1 (9.00)                    | 1 (9.00)          | 6 (55.00)      | 1 (9.00)                 | 2.77 | 0.83|
| The activity was pleasant              | 0 (0.00)                    | 2 (18.00)         | 5 (45.00)      | 2 (18.00)                | 3.00 | 0.71|

Curiosity to read The Father Thing

| I feel intrigued to know more details about the story | 0 (0.00)                    | 1 (9.00)          | 2 (18.00)      | 6 (55.00)                | 3.55 | 0.73|
| I want to know more about the characters in the story | 1 (9.00)                    | 0 (0.00)          | 3 (27.00)      | 5 (45.00)                | 3.33 | 1   |
| I want to know how the story unfolds     | 1 (9.00)                    | 0 (0.00)          | 2 (18.00)      | 6 (55.00)                | 3.44 | 1   |
| The activity invited me to read the story | 0 (0.00)                    | 3 (27.00)         | 2 (18.00)      | 4 (36.00)                | 3.11 | 0.93|
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### Table 22

Summary of No-Film Group Participants’ Responses to the Intervention in Reading Session 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attention in the before-reading activity</th>
<th>I very much disagree (1.00)</th>
<th>I disagree (2.00)</th>
<th>I agree (3.00)</th>
<th>I very much agree (4.00)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was very focused during the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very attentive to the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was absorbed by the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity called my attention</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in the before-reading activity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity was amusing</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was fascinating</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt enthusiastic in the activity</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>7 (64.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity was pleasant</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (18.00)</td>
<td>6 (55.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curiosity to read Zima Blue</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel intrigued to know more details about the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know more about the characters in the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know how the story unfolds</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>4 (36.00)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity invited me to read the story</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (9.00)</td>
<td>5 (45.00)</td>
<td>3 (27.00)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix V

### Table 23

*Summary of Film Group Participants’ Responses to their Triggering Factors to Read in Reading Sessions (Reading Interest Log)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Alberto</th>
<th>Carolina</th>
<th>José</th>
<th>Josefin</th>
<th>Alejandra</th>
<th>Teresa</th>
<th>Andrés</th>
<th>Eva</th>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Sara</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like commenting what I read with my friends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher asked us to read the texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt interested in the genres of the texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole class had to read them</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stories looked easy to read</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt interested in the plots</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt curious about the stories</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The before-reading activities were interesting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>81.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt interested to read the texts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix W

### Table 24

*Summary of No-Film Participants' Responses to their Triggering Factors to Read in Reading Sessions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Catalina</th>
<th>Sofia</th>
<th>Andrea</th>
<th>Isabel</th>
<th>Marcela</th>
<th>Enrique</th>
<th>Luz</th>
<th>Alejandro</th>
<th>Héctor</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like commenting what I read with my friends</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher asked us to read the texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>88.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt interested in the genres of the texts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>55.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole class had to read them</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stories looked easy to read</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt interested in the plots</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt curious about the stories</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The before-reading activities were interesting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt interested to read the texts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix X

Topic 1 codebook: EFL reading identity

The following table describes and summarises the codes developed from an inductive examination of participants’ reports during the 7 focus groups concerning topic 1: participants’ construction of identities as readers of English. The process of coding was done in Spanish, the participants’, and researcher’s L1, to ensure the maintenance of the essence of participants’ reports. Lastly, the process of coding was guided by RQ 1:

**RQ.1.** How do TEFL undergraduates construct their identities as EFL readers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description of code within the research context</th>
<th>Data extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>concepto de lector</strong></td>
<td>Un buen lector es quien</td>
<td>Código para describir a un lector quien no se exige leer temas o textos que no le interesan/ gustan. Lector quien lee por placer. Código para describir a un lector que siente la motivación de leer por los temas o por autores de su interés Palabras claves: fidelidad, leer por gusto.</td>
<td>Maria: yo creo que, según lo que yo creo... de mis pensamientos, que un buen lector es una persona que es fiel como a las cosas que le gustan en cuanto a la lectura y que no se está como... exigiendo leer cosas que a lo mejor no le interesan, solo por el hecho de ‘¡oh, tengo qué leer!’ ... que, no falta la persona que te critica ‘¡oh, es que no has leído a Heidegger, o no sé qué!’ (se ríe). Eh... entonces, si te gusta leer lo que sea, eh... y te gusta leer solo eso, está bien. Entonces yo creo que una persona que es un buen lector es una persona que le es fiel como a las cosas que le gustan y lee por gusto y no por exigencia como de... afuera, algo así.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>