

Text Interestingness: Approaches to Study and Methods of Assessment in Psychological and Educational Research

Yulia A. Tyumeneva¹ , Ekaterina S. Kashchenko^{2*} , Maria Y. Lebedeva³ 

^{1,2}National Research University "Higher School of Economics", Moscow, Russia

³Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Moscow, Russia

*Corresponding author: eskaschenko@hse.ru

Abstract

Introduction. Text interestingness is often considered a standalone motivational factor in education, making it a popular subject in psychological and educational research. The purpose of this review is to structure the information on the methodology for assessing text interestingness, identify the limitations, and highlight the intersections of various methods. **Theoretical justification.** Existing studies on text interestingness mainly stem from the linguistic approach, appraisal theory of interest, and individual interest theory. Using grounded theory as a method of literature analysis allowed us to identify three approaches to interestingness in research: (1) interestingness based on text characteristics, (2) interestingness based on reader characteristics, and (3) interestingness as a perceived characteristic of the text by the reader. Analysis of assessment methods revealed that each approach prioritizes its specific methods. The text-based approach describes the most objective linguistic (formal and discourse-content) assessments. In the reader-based approach, knowledge tests and self-reported assessments of individual and subject-specific interests are common. The approach to interestingness as a perceived characteristic of the text mainly utilizes subjective scaling and rating methods. **Discussion.** Each approach has advantages and disadvantages, and although their methods differ, they are sometimes interconnected. There is an increasing number of constructs related to interestingness. It is not so much

the variety of methods, but the proliferation of synonymous constructs that may hinder the integration of research results on text interestingness.

Keywords

text interestingness, interest assessment, reader characteristics, text characteristics, perceived interestingness

Funding

This work was supported by the state assignment project FZNM-2024-0003 "Comprehensive Study of Cognitive-Emotional and Linguistic Factors in Human Communicative Activity in the Modern Educational Context."

For citation

Tyumeneva, Y. A., Kashchenko, E. S., & Lebedeva, M. Y. (2024). Text Interestingness: Approaches to Study and Methods of Assessment in Psychological and Educational Research. *Russian Psychological Journal*, 21(3), 190-210, <https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2024.3.11>

Introduction

The interestingness of a text, like any other stimulus or object, is its ability to attract or hold someone's attention. The interestingness of educational texts is generally understood as their ability to retain a student's attention, motivate further reading, and potentially encourage reading texts on similar topics. The study of text interestingness in the literature on educational psychology has a long history (Asher, Hymel & Wigfield, 1978; Asher, 1980; Hidi, Baird & Hildyard, 1982; Hidi & Baird, 1986; Renninger, 1989; Alexander & Jetton, 1996). However, there are relatively few reviews on the topic of text interestingness, and they unfortunately do not provide guidance on existing methods for assessing interestingness, their interconnections, and limitations. For example, a relatively recent review (Su, 2020) summarizes empirical data on the effects of interest and other motivational constructs on learning outcomes but does not provide an analysis of research methodologies. The review by Schraw & Lehman (2001), focused on situational interest, also does not offer insights into methods of assessing text interestingness. Another review by Schriver (1989) is dedicated to text quality assessment in general. While this review contains many useful insights into

text assessment approaches, the author primarily considers them in the broader context of text comprehension as a whole.

Research Aim

The aim of this study is to systematize the methodological approaches to studying text interestingness, their interconnections, and limitations. Additionally, we clarify that the terms "interest in a text" and "text interestingness" in this article refer to the same phenomenon, though from different perspectives. In the first case, interest is attributed to the reader, while in the second, it is attributed to the text itself. However, it is clear that one cannot imagine text interestingness without the reader's interest in it, and conversely, interest in a text cannot exist if the text does not seem interesting. Therefore, we will use both terms interchangeably unless otherwise specified.

Theoretical Justification

Theories of Interest

Early theories of interest primarily focused on textual characteristics that elicit interest. Berlyne (1960) was one of the first to compile a list of characteristics that evoke interest: novelty, surprise, incongruity, complexity, variability, and ambiguity. Later theories suggested that these characteristics alone are insufficient to generate interest due to the intra-individual and inter-individual variability of interest. Intra-individual variability implies that what interests a person today may not interest them tomorrow or next month. Inter-individual variability indicates that what is interesting to one person may be uninteresting to another (Silvia, 2008). Schraw & Lehman (2001) expanded the list of determinants of text interest by distinguishing between personal interests (i.e., long-term interests) and situational interest (i.e., short-term interest), where the latter results from the interaction between text characteristics, task context, and the reader's knowledge. A good summary of such "list-based" approaches is the linguistic theory of emotions by Shakhovskiy (Shakhovskiy, 2008). According to this theory, language has an emotiveness—an ability to convey emotional states, which makes the text a complete communication tool. Emotiveness is expressed through specific speech means, including all of the aforementioned textual characteristics.

According to appraisal theory (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Silvia, 2008), experiencing interest depends on several evaluations that a person makes concerning the text (stimulus), the task at hand (context), and themselves. The importance of the stimulus, its attractiveness, and predictability are related to the assessment of one's ability to handle the task and understand the text. The balance between "predictability" and "complexity" determines the emergence of interest: if the text is perceived as new but too difficult or too predictable and insufficiently complex, interest does not arise.

The theory of individual interest (Hidi & Renninger, 2006; Renninger & Hidi, 2015), which focuses more on the development of interest, distinguishes between situational interest—comparatively immature and based on specific circumstances—and individual interest, which is more stable and characteristic of the person. Situational interest is associated with a positive emotional response that stimulates attention to the material being studied and can potentially lead to the formation of lasting individual interest (Mitchell, 1993; Schiefele & Rheinberg, 1997). Conversely, existing individual interests can shape situational interests. If interest in a text is a form of situational interest triggered by a specific situation, and individual interest is a personality-oriented focus on a particular field of activity, then there is also the category of thematic interest, i.e., interest in the topic covered by the text (Hidi & McLaren, 1991; Schiefele, 1996, 1998; Schiefele & Krapp, 1996).

Literature Review Procedure

To systematize the existing literature where interestingness and interest were measured, we used the grounded theory method (Strauss & Corbin, 2001). The idea behind this method is that theories and hypotheses regarding the data can be derived from the data itself, reflecting the experiences of study participants. The grounded theory method is widely used to study social phenomena, processes, and interactions, especially when investigating a relatively unknown or underexplored area.

We applied this method to published literature concerning the assessment of text interestingness, using publications as data sources instead of respondents. This method also allowed us to stop searching for new publications once the approaches and methods began repeating, and we no longer found novel information.

The analysis of the publications was conducted in line with the stages described by Strauss and Corbin (Strauss & Corbin, 2001; Charmaz, 2006), albeit with some modifications to suit our objectives. Instead of coding sections of respondents' answer protocols and grouping similar codes into subcategories and categories, we recorded researchers' approaches to interestingness and assessment methods and then grouped similar approaches into larger components. For example, groups of methods emerged that were focused on quantitative and qualitative text characteristics associated with generating interest. These methods were primarily used in linguistic research. Instead of hypotheses, which grounded theory traditionally aims to generate, we sought to structure the research field, ensuring that structural elements did not overlap but remained interconnected. At the same time, we were able to systematize the limitations of each approach and its associated methods. The publication analysis continued until each category was saturated, and no new data appeared that required new categories.

Search Query

The process began with a search query that consisted of the following steps:

Step 1:

All publications that mentioned "Individual interest" or "Text interestingness" in their titles, abstracts, or keywords were gathered. The search period was 2003 to 2023.

Step 2:

Next, we narrowed down the number of publications related to interest by focusing on those indexed in the Web of Science (WoS) database under research categories associated with psychology, including "Psychology," "Psychology Multidisciplinary," "Psychology Experimental," "Psychology Social," "Psychology Applied," and "Education & Educational Research."

Step 3:

The search queries from steps 1 and 2 were merged into one query as follows: TS= "(Individual interest) OR TS = (Text interestingness)." It was further refined by the following Web of Science categories: "Psychology OR Psychology Multidisciplinary OR Psychology Experimental OR Psychology Social OR Psychology Applied AND Education AND Education & Educational Research."

Step 4:

All collected data were analyzed based on the following characteristics: year of publication, the main journal in the field, h-index, impact factor (IF), and citation count.

In total, we analyzed 83 articles.

Text Interestingness: Approaches to Assessment

In fact, text interestingness is assessed according to the theoretical positions we outlined above, even if authors do not explicitly refer to a particular theory. Ultimately, the methodology for assessing text interestingness and interest in a text was structured as follows:

First, interestingness is considered a characteristic of the text itself, so formal quantitative text parameters or discourse-content methods are used to assess it. These methods classify the text by certain parameters (genre, type of information, etc.) that presumably contribute to generating interest.

Second, interestingness is considered dependent on reader characteristics, so individual predispositions are assessed, which (potentially) influence the emergence of interest in the text. In this approach, interestingness is viewed as a direct result of the text aligning with the reader's knowledge and interests (Renninger, Hidi & Krapp, 1992; Sansone & Thoman, 2005; Draijer, Bronkhorst & Akkerman, 2022).

Finally, in the third approach, interestingness is seen as a perceived characteristic of the text, and subjective self-reports or behavioral indicators are used to assess it. This approach includes dynamic assessment methods.

It should be noted that we do not aim to cover all the methods for assessing text characteristics, reader characteristics, and interest in a text presented in the literature. Similarly, we did not set out to describe empirically established determinants of interest or the consequences of its emergence. Our goal is to structurally present the entire methodology of this field, pointing out the advantages and disadvantages of different methods discussed in the literature.

Evaluation of Textual Characteristics Related to Text Interest

Formal Characteristics of Text and Methods of Evaluation

In linguistics and natural language processing (NLP), a text is considered an independent reality that contributes to a reader's impression of it, including its interest level. Over more than half a century of text evaluation, there has been a proliferation of "interest formulas" (Hilderman & Hamilton, 1999; McGarry, 2005) as well as various textual characteristics associated with interest. Interest indices can either be directly based on textual characteristics or derived from other indices. In the former case, interest is determined based on the frequency of specific words, their combinations, patterns, etc., in the assessed text compared to these same parameters in thematically similar text corpora. In the latter case, interest is considered a function of other textual parameters. For example, psycholinguistic theories of information processing conceptualize interest as a function of complexity and comprehensibility (Van der Sluis et al., 2014).

Complex models of evaluation now enable the creation of numerous indices potentially related to text interest: readability (Benjamin, 2012; O'Sullivan et al., 2020), coherence (Boscolo & Mason, 2003; Boscolo et al., 2011; Xia, Kochmar & Briscoe, 2016), comprehensibility (Baur & Prue, 2014; Friedrich & Heise, 2022), informativeness (González-Gallardo et al., 2020), difficulty (Fulmer et al., 2015), semantic noise (Lee et al., 2021), and others. All these methods are formal in that they do not require qualitative assessment of the text's content and are objective in that the index value depends only on the text or the text corpus.

Content-Discursive Characteristics of Text and Methods of Evaluation

In addition to objective measures, the approach to interest from the text's perspective also considers content-related and discursive characteristics. Historically, this approach can be seen as more contemporary, largely displacing formal indices (Bisiada, 2017).

In the approach that considers content-related and discursive characteristics of a text, it is assumed that the type or genre of information itself can determine the interest

level of the text. For instance, types of information such as conceptual (defining a phenomenon and describing its main characteristics), event-based (describing human actions), discursive, and evaluative (comments on certain phenomena) are presumably expected to evoke different levels of interest regardless of reader specifics (Boscolo et al., 2011; Lepper et al., 2022; Mardasari, 2017).

In educational research, the so-called seductive details have received attention. These are parts of a text that are not critical to the key idea but are more interesting compared to the rest of the text due to their vivid or non-trivial aspects. Although researchers have experimented with the "seductive details effect" in relation to memory or comprehension of educational texts (Hidi, Baird & Hildyard, 1982), this characteristic remains poorly defined (Sadoski et al., 1995). Different studies have used various techniques to make texts more attractive, such as adding biographical details, addressing the reader directly, and describing life-critical events (Hidi & Baird, 1988; Wade & Adams, 1990; Garner et al., 1991).

The vividness of descriptions in a text can also be evaluated as a kind of interest (Wade et al., 1993; Wade, Buxton & Kelly, 1999). Vivid segments are those that create uncertainty, tension, or anxious anticipation (Jose & Brewer, 1984; Iran-Nejad, 1987), intensify the narrative (Bergin, 1999; Folling-Albers & Hartinger, 1998; Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000), surprise with unexpected plot twists or little-known facts (Hidi, 1990), or contain humorous elements (Dienstbier, 1995).

In essence, the above-mentioned parameters can be generalized as emotion-evoking. Linguistic theory of emotions (Shakhovsky, 2008) can serve as a good means of generalizing these characteristics. According to it, a text as a communication tool can express and transmit emotions, so an interesting text is primarily an emotional one (Hidi & Baird 1988; Schiefele, 2009; Soemer & Schiefele, 2019). Therefore, the subject of linguistic analysis also includes emotion-evoking rhetorical techniques. In addition to the aforementioned parameters of "attractiveness," emotion-evoking features also include: contextualization, specification, dialogicity, manifestation of emotions, problematization, identification with the reader (e.g., appeals to their experience) (Piotrovskaya & Trushchelev, 2020; Piotrovskaya & Trushchelev, 2021; Ionova, 2023).

Content-discursive characteristics are usually evaluated by experts. We will not delve into the advantages and disadvantages of the expert method but will note that it is useful when preparing a text for a specific group of readers, such as engineers or computer scientists, and where other reader characteristics can be considered more or less uniform (more on reader characteristics below).

In addition to expert evaluation, scaling methods (subjective ratings) of various parameters related to interest are widely used. More details on these methods are provided below.

Evaluation of Reader Interest in a Text

The reader is an active participant in reading, interpreting the text and focusing on qualities that are mainly explored in educational research. A typical approach to evaluation can be described as follows: the reader possesses characteristics independent of the text that contribute to desired educational outcomes such as memorization, comprehension, engagement, and the emergence of interest in the educational text. As our analysis shows, no study on text interest overlooks the reader's prior knowledge, stable individual interests, and situational thematic interest. Whether a text is interesting to a particular reader or not depends on at least three of these characteristics.

Researchers also consider other individual characteristics of the reader: intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, need for new knowledge, attitudes towards the text and expectations, certain cognitive abilities, gender, etc. Here, we focus on three of these, which are most illustrative in terms of the variety of evaluation methods.

Prior Knowledge

Since prior knowledge can influence the perception of a text as interesting, this characteristic is typically assessed in studies of interest. Generally, prior knowledge is evaluated through several pre-reading questions related to the text's topic. The number of correct responses from respondents on the text's topic is considered an indicator of the level of prior knowledge. For instance, Song (2003) used several questions requiring four short answers regarding key terms of the target text. Similarly, prior knowledge was assessed in the study by Boscolo et al. (2011), except that, in addition to knowledge of terms, respondents were also asked about mechanisms or consequences of specific phenomena.

Individual Interest

Individual interest is usually seen as a mediating factor in the emergence of interest in a text. Most commonly, individual interest is assessed through direct open-ended questions where areas of interest are predefined by researchers, such as interests directly related to school subjects (Alexander, Jetton & Kulikowic, 1995; Dawson, 2000; Ainley, Hillman & Hidi, 2002; Häussler & Hoffmann, 2002; Marsh et al., 2005).

Another common method for assessing individual interest is through questionnaires with subscales representing criteria of developed individual interest as defined by Hidi and Renninger's theory (e.g., Dahl & Nierenberg, 2021). These criteria include values associated with the area of individual interest and achieved competence. Numerous individual interest questionnaires have been developed within this approach: The Individual Interest Questionnaire (IIQ) (Rotgans, 2015), task value and competence belief scales (Eccles et al., 1993), the Student Interest Questionnaire (SIQ) and cognitive competence scale (Schiefele

et al., 1988), parts of the Current Motivation Questionnaire (QCM) (Vollmeyer, Rollett & Rheinberg, 1998; Vollmeyer & Rheinberg, 2000), the Affect and Experience scales (Ely, Ainley & Pearce, 2013), and others (Bathgate, Schunn & Correnti, 2014). Many of these scales were specifically developed for particular domains, such as scales for interest in mathematics, physics, biology (Marsh et al., 2005).

A more flexible method for assessing individual interest is to use open-ended questions. In the simplest case, participants can indicate their interests by selecting from a broad list. Sometimes options are provided related to school subjects (e.g., Bathgate, Schunn & Correnti, 2014), or even specific subtopics like "robots" or "black holes," which brings the method closer to evaluating thematic interests (see also Ainley, Hillman & Hidi, 2002).

An even more flexible approach was implemented in Ely et al.'s (Ely, Ainley & Pearce, 2013) work, where respondents used an interactive program to select their areas of interest from a wide list of topics (60 different interests), not directly related to school subjects, including areas such as fitness and gaming consoles. Respondents could then add specific features of their interests using text comments and rating scales. These scales included assessments of emotions associated with each chosen area of interest: happiness, hope, frustration, anxiety, and so on. As a result, individual interest profiles were constructed for the respondents.

Additionally, behavioral indicators of individual interest have been developed (Renninger, 1990, 1992; Tyumenova, Obukhov & Finogenova, 2020), such as repeated engagement in an activity, the ability to engage in an activity without coercion and supervision, or willingness to spend leisure time or other resources for access to interesting activities.

Thematic Interest

Conceptually, thematic interest is poorly defined and remains more of a working concept that has empirically proven to be a possible mediator between individual interest and interest in the text. As Bergin (1999) argues, it is meaningless to claim that a factor is purely personal or purely situational, as individual factors always interact with situational ones, generating either interest or lack of interest. A similar viewpoint has been presented by other researchers (Wade et al., 1999; Renninger, 2000).

Thematic interest is assessed through ratings of various topics, sometimes exclusively those that will be covered in the target text, and sometimes several, including the topic of the target text (Boscolo et al., 2011). This assessment is usually done using Likert scales such as "Indicate how interested you are in globalization" (Ainley et al., 2002; Carrell & Wise, 1998), or respondents are asked to rate headlines or the general essence of texts, for example, "How interesting do you think a text on [topic] will be to you?" (Graham et al., 2008). Another method involves evaluating respondents' prior knowledge of a particular topic, assuming that thematic interest should be accompanied by deeper knowledge

in the relevant area compared to areas where interest is not expressed. Although this method seems more objective, its use complicates the interpretation of many empirical data, as assessments of thematic interest and prior knowledge are often mixed (Bügel & Buunk, 1996; Uher, 2023).

Perceived Interest in the Text

By perceived interest, we mean the subjective impression of the text that arises in the reader during or immediately after reading, and is directly related to the assessment of the text as interesting or not.

Researchers often attempt to isolate components of interest from the range of impressions, considering interest as a secondary phenomenon, for example, as a function of novelty, narrative vividness, and a certain level of text complexity. In such an approach, researchers might consider each of these components as autonomous "independent" variables. However, the boundaries between all perceived characteristics of the text, if they exist at all, are semantically or phenomenologically permeable. Therefore, it is difficult to seriously consider the autonomy of such emergent impressions from the text, such as "narrative vividness," "engagement," or "interest."

In any case, given that these are subjective impressions of the text, it is quite natural to apply subjective assessment methods. Typically, a rating scale is used to indicate the level of interest the text evokes. This rating can be a global assessment or based on specific aspects of interest (emotional response, usefulness), which are determined by the researchers either arbitrarily or based on previous work (Schraw, Flowerday & Reisetter, 1998; Boscolo et al., 2011). Sometimes, instead of a simple rating scale, questionnaires are used, such as the Perceived Interest Questionnaire, which includes statements like "I find this story very interesting; I would read it again if I had the chance" (Schraw, 1997) (see also Abu-Rabia & Salim, 1996).

One problem frequently discussed in relation to perceived interest in the text is the influence of subsequent reading on the evaluation of the preceding text. Even if participants are instructed to respond based on what they felt at a specific moment, such as when they first started reading the text, subsequent reading experiences may affect their judgments. Thus, perceived interest in the text after reading does not necessarily reflect what happens during the reading process (Schraw, 1997; Schraw & Lehman, 2001).

To assess interest dynamics during reading, researchers often use ratings of individual text segments. For example, in a study conducted by Schiefele (1996), students were asked to rate their activity, emotional state, and concentration at four points in time during reading. These ratings were included in the text between its sections. A similar approach was used in an online reading motivation questionnaire, where participants rated their emotional response to the text and their intention to continue reading (Boekaerts, 1997).

In an effort to make interest assessment during reading more immediate and avoid

distracting respondents with text-based questions, pictograms are sometimes used. For example, during reading, a set of pictograms depicting faces with negative or positive emotions is shown multiple times. Respondents are asked to select the emotion that the read text segment evoked (Ainley, Hillman & Hidi, 2002). Additionally, researchers add behavioral indicators of interest in the text, such as continuing to read when given the option to stop (see also Graham et al., 2008).

Overall, dynamic assessment of interest using behavioral indicators reveals its potential when employing interactive computerized tasks. In this case, real-time tracking of behavioral reactions indicating student engagement with the text is possible. For instance, a special program called "Between the Lines" (Ainley, Hillman & Hidi, 2002) was developed, which, in addition to capturing emotional reactions to the text segments, allowed students to choose which text to read next.

Discussion

The analysis of publications through the lens of grounded theory revealed three approaches to evaluating interest: from the perspective of textual characteristics, from the perspective of reader characteristics (interest in the text), and from the perspective of the reader's perception of the text. The first approach predominantly employs objective or expert evaluation methods; the second uses questionnaires and rating scales; and the third involves rating scales and behavioral indicators (see Table 1).

Overall, when discussing methods for assessing interest as a text characteristic, it is important to emphasize their objectivity, relative independence from the evaluator (with the exception of expert-based methods), and the technical feasibility of creating complex indices. Methods for processing formal text characteristics, especially automatic ones, are quick to use and can handle a large number of texts. They allow for the selection of models (indices) based on the composition and "weight" of each characteristic for the best prediction of reader behavior. This, by the way, explains the predominant focus on these methods by e-commerce and marketing.

The drawbacks of methods for processing formal text characteristics, and the approach in general, include their strong focus on computational strategies at the expense of theoretical grounding. This, in our opinion, hampers the use of these methods in education, where it is difficult to find simple predictive criteria for "interest," especially at the level of individual student behavior.

Methods for assessing interest in the text are primarily subjective self-reports and ratings. Unlike objective methods, they are highly "personalized" and theoretically grounded, although they suffer from issues typical of all survey methods: lower reliability, poor reproducibility, susceptibility to social desirability, etc.

Finally, methods for assessing perceived interest in the text include subjective self-reports and behavioral observation. Despite the drawbacks inherent to self-reports, this approach allows for the most accurate assessment of text interest as a characteristic.

After all, self-reports on personal impressions are the most appropriate way to understand what respondents truly think and feel.

Our analysis of the methodology revealed that the range of constructs related to interest is, on the one hand, very broad, and on the other, largely duplicated across different approaches.

Table 1

Constructs Related to Interest and Methods of Evaluation

Constructs *	Text Metrics	Questionnaires	Subjective Ratings	Methods Expert Evaluation	Knowledge Tests	Behavioral**
Interest	+	+	+			
Readability	+					
Emotionality	+		+	+		
Individual Interest		+	+			
Thematic Interest		+	+		+	
Prior Knowledge			+		+	
Perceived Interest			+			+

Note. * – List is not exhaustive, ** – Excluding eye-tracking reactions.

As seen in Table 1, the same constructs can be assessed using different methods. For example, "readability" as a formal characteristic can be evaluated using the LIX formula, which relates the number of words in a text, the number of sentences, and the number of words containing more than six letters (Björnsson, 1968; see also Klare, 1984). However, "readability" is also assessed as a perceived characteristic of the text through expert evaluation or readability questionnaires (Friedrich & Heise, 2022).

Moreover, the validity of many linguistic indices is ensured by their comparison with ratings from real readers (Benzahra & Yvon, 2019; Gkikas et al., 2022). Direct questions are typically used for this verification: "How well is this article written?", "How well do the parts of the text fit together?", "How easy was it to understand the text?", "How interesting is this article?", etc. (Crossley, Allen & McNamara, 2011). Without such verification, the use of objectively calculated indices can be misleading, leading to a deterioration rather than an improvement of texts (Swaney et al., 1981). In other words, the interpretation of objective text indicators depends on whether there is a corresponding characteristic in the reader's semantic field and their ability to assess this characteristic.

This dependence of objective measures of interest on subjective ones is inevitable, but it essentially revives one of the main problems in psychology of individual differences—the issue of proliferation of psychological constructs or the "jingle-jangle fallacy," where identical phenomena are given different names or new constructs are invented from descriptions of behavior (Boag, 2011; Cooper, 2024; Hodson, 2021). The fact is, text interest can be described in many ways, leading to numerous text characteristics that can be assessed. Indeed, we see that (both objectively and subjectively) almost synonymous characteristics are assessed: interest, engagement, vividness, ease of understanding, involvement, emotionality (see, e.g., Schraw, Bruning & Svoboda, 1995; Schraw, 2000; Dai & Wang, 2007; Friedrich & Heise, 2022).

A fundamental solution to this problem seems to be the exclusion of synonyms from the studied constructs (the "bottom-up" approach proposed by Raymond Cattell) and a more meaningful minimization of the studied text characteristics, evaluating only the most specific parameters that make the explication of other evaluative values irrelevant (Zadvornaia, 2022).

Conclusion

The presented review and analysis of the literature provide a structured overview of the methodology for studying text interest, the constructs related to "interest," and the intersections and limitations of various evaluation methods. Three approaches to text interest have been identified: from the perspective of text characteristics, from the perspective of reader characteristics, and from the perspective of the reader's perception of the text. Each approach predominantly uses its specific methods, although there is significant overlap among them.

We have noted the wide range of synonymous constructs related to interest, which contributes to the proliferation and fragmentation of this field of research. This issue appears to merit greater attention, as without addressing it, integrating new knowledge about text interest will remain challenging, no matter how much we improve the methods of its evaluation.

References

- Abu-Rabia, S. (1996). Druze Minority Students Learning Hebrew in Israel: The Relationship of Attitudes, Cultural Background, and Interest of Material to Reading Comprehension in a Second Language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17(6), 415–426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639608666293>
- Ainley, M., Hillman, K., & Hidi, S. (2002). Gender and interest processes in response to literary texts: Situational and individual interest. *Learning and Instruction*, 12(4), 411–428. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(01\)00008-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(01)00008-1)
- Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (1996). The Role of Importance and Interest in the Processing of Text. *Educational Psychology Review*, 8(1), 89–121.
- Alexander, P. A., Jetton, T. L., & Kulikowich, J. M. (1995). Interrelationship of knowledge, interest, and recall: Assessing a model of domain learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(4), 559–575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.87.4.559>
- Asher, S. R. (1980). Topic interest and children's reading comprehension. In R. Spiro, B. Bruce, & W. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 525–534). Erlbaum.
- Asher, S. R., Hymel, S., & Wigfield, A. (1978). Influence of topic interest on children's reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 10, 3–47.
- Bathgate, M. E., Schunn, C.D., & Correnti, R. (2014). Children's motivation toward science across contexts, manner of interaction, and topic. *Science Education*, 98(2), 189–215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21095>
- Baur, C., & Prue, C. (2014). The CDC Clear Communication Index is a new evidence-based tool to prepare and review health information. *Health Promotion Practice*, 15(5), 629–637. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839914538969>
- Benjamin, R. G. (2012). Reconstructing readability: Recent developments and recommendations in the analysis of text difficulty. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24, 63–88.
- Benzahra, M., & Yvon, F. (2019, August). Measuring text readability with machine comprehension: a pilot study. In *Workshop on Building Educational Applications Using NLP* (pp. 412–422). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-4443>
- Bergin, D. A. (1999). Influences on classroom interest. *Educational Psychologist*, 34(2), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3402_2
- Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity*. McGraw-Hill Book Company. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11164-000>
- Bisiada, M. (2017). Review of the book *Readability: Text and Context*, by Alan Bailin and Ann Grafstein. *Style*, 51(2), 257–263. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sty.2017.0019>

- Björnsson, C. H. (1968). Läsbarhet. Liber.
- Boag, S. (2011). Explanation in personality psychology: "Verbal magic" and the five-factor model. *Philosophical Psychology*, 24(2), 223–243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2010.548319>
- Boekaerts, M. (1997). Self-regulated learning: A new concept embraced by researchers, policy makers, educators, teachers, and students. *Learning and Instruction*, 7(2), 161–186. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(96\)00015-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(96)00015-1)
- Boscolo, P., & Mason, L. (2003) Topic Knowledge, Text Coherence, and Interest: How They Interact in Learning from Instructional Texts. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 71(2), 126–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220970309602060>
- Boscolo, P., Ariasi, N., Del Favero, L., & Ballarin, C. (2011). Interest in an expository text: How does it flow from reading to writing? *Learning and Instruction*, 21(3), 467–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2010.07.009>
- Bügel, K., & Buunk, A. (1996). Sex differences in foreign language text comprehension: The role of interests and prior knowledge. *Modern Language Journal*, 80(1), 15–31.
- Carrell, P. L., & Wise, T. E. (1998). The relationship between prior knowledge and topic interest in second language reading. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 20(3), 285–309. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198003015>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Cooper, C. (2024). What is wrong with individual differences research? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 221, 112550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2024.112550>
- Crossley, S. A., Allen, D. B., & McNamara, D. S. (2011). Text readability and intuitive simplification: A comparison of readability formulas. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 23(1), 84–101.
- Dahl, T. I., & Nierenberg, E. (2021). Here's the TRIQ: The Tromsø Interest Development Questionnaire based on the four-phase model of interest development. *Frontiers in Education*, 6(402), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.716543>
- Dai, D. Y., & Wang, X. (2007). The role of need for cognition and reader beliefs in text comprehension and interest development. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32(3), 332–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CEDPSYCH.2006.05.002>
- Dawson, C. (2000). Upper primary boys' and girls' interests in science: have they changed since 1980? *International Journal of Science Education*, 22(6), 557–570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095006900289660>
- Dienstbier, R. A. (1995). The impact of humor on energy, tension, task choices, and attributions: Exploring hypotheses from toughness theory. *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*, 111.
- Draijer, J., Bronkhorst, L., & Akkerman, S. (2022). Manifestations of non-interest: Exploring the situated nature of students' interest. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 113, 101971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101971>
- Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C. M., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., & Mac Iver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage–environment fit on young

- adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist*, 48(2), 90–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.2.90>
- Ellsworth, P.C., & Scherer, K.R. (2003). Appraisal processes in emotion. In R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, & H.H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 572–595). Oxford University Press.
- Ely, R., Ainley, M., & Pearce, J. (2013). More than enjoyment: Identifying the positive affect component of interest that supports student engagement and achievement. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 8(1), 13–32.
- Folling-Albers, M., & Hartinger, A. (1998). Interest in boys and girls in elementary school. *Interest and Learning*. Kiel, Germany: Institute for Science Education (pp. 175–183)
- Friedrich, M. C., & Heise, E. (2022). The Influence of Comprehensibility on Interest and Comprehension. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*. <https://doi.org/10.1024/1010-0652/a000349>
- Fulmer, S. M., D'Mello, S. K., Strain, A., & Graesser, A. C. (2015). Interest-based text preference moderates the effect of text difficulty on engagement and learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 41, 98–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.12.005>
- Garner, R., Alexander, P. A., Gillingham, M. G., Kulikowich, J. M., & Brown, R. (1991). Interest and learning from text. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 643–659. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1163152>
- Gkikas, D. C., Tzafilkou, K., Theodoridis, P. K., Garpis, A., & Gkikas, M. C. (2022). How do text characteristics impact user engagement in social media posts: Modeling content readability, length, and hashtags number in Facebook. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 2(1), 100067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjime.2022.100067>
- González-Gallardo, C. E., SanJuan, E., & Torres-Moreno, J. M. (2020). Extending Text Informativeness Measures to Passage Interestingness Evaluation (Language Model vs. Word Embedding). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2004.06747>
- Graham, J., Tisher, R., Ainley, M., & Kennedy, G. (2008). Staying with the text: The contribution of gender, achievement orientations, and interest to students' performance on a literacy task. *Educational Psychology*, 28(7), 757–776.
- Häussler, P., & Hoffmann, L. (2002). An intervention study to enhance girls' interest, self concept, and achievement in physics classes. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 39(9), 870–888. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.10048>
- Hidi, S. (1990). Interest and its contribution as a mental resource for learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 60(4), 549–571.
- Hidi, S. E., & McLaren, J. A. (1991). Motivational factors and writing: The role of topic interestingness. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 6, 187–197.
- Hidi, S., & Baird, W. (1986). Interestingness — A neglected variable in discourse processing. *Cognitive Science*, 10(2), 179–194.
- Hidi, S., & Baird, W. (1988). Strategies for increasing text-based interest and students' recall of expository texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 465–483. <https://doi.org/10.2307/747644>
- Hidi, S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Motivating the academically unmotivated: A critical issue for the 21st century. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(2), 151–179.

- Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four-phase model of interest development. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 111–127.
- Hidi, S., Baird, W., & Hildyard, A. (1982). That's important but is it interesting? Two factors in text processing. In *Advances in psychology*. (Vol. 8, pp. 63–75). North-Holland. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(08\)62681-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62681-3)
- Hilderman, R. J., & Hamilton, H. J. (1999). Heuristic measures of interestingness. In *Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery: Third European Conference, PKDD'99, Prague, Czech Republic, September 15-18, 1999. Proceedings 3* (pp. 232–241). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Hodson, G. (2021). Construct jangle or construct mangle? Thinking straight about (nonredundant) psychological constructs. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, 5(4), 576–590.
- Ionova, S. V. (2023). The emotional dominant of the text: Some linguistic aspects of the study. *Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Series 2: Linguistics*, 22(1), 13–27.
- Iran-Nejad, A. (1987). Cognitive and affective causes of interest and liking. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(2), 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.79.2.120>
- Jose, P. E., & Brewer, W. F. (1984). Development of story liking: Character identification, suspense, and outcome resolution. *Developmental Psychology*, 20(5), 911–924.
- Klare, G. R. (1984). Readability. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 681–744). Longman.
- Lee, B.W., Jang, Y., & Lee, J.H. (2021). Pushing on Text Readability Assessment: A Transformer Meets Handcrafted Linguistic Features. *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.834>
- Lepper, C., Stang, J., & McElvany, N. (2022). Gender differences in text based interest: Text characteristics as underlying variables. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(2), 537–554. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.420>
- Mardasari, D. (2017). Reading Interest, Text types and reading Comprehension of English Education Study Program Students of FKIP Sriwijaya University. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, 4(1), 44–58.
- Marsh, H. W., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Köller, O., & Baumert, J. (2005). Academic self concept, interest, grades, and standardized test scores: Reciprocal effects models of causal ordering. *Child Development*, 76(2), 397–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00853.x>
- McGarry, K. (2005). A survey of interestingness measures for knowledge discovery. *The knowledge engineering review*, 20(1), 39–61.
- Mitchell, M. (1993). Situational interest: Its multifaceted structure in the secondary school mathematics classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(3), 424.
- O'Sullivan, L., Sukumar, P., Crowley, R., McAuliffe, E., & Doran, P. (2020). Readability and understandability of clinical research patient information leaflets and consent forms in Ireland and the UK: a retrospective quantitative analysis. *BMJ open*, 10(9), e037994.

- Piotrovskaya, L. A., & Trushchelev, P. N. (2020). What makes text interesting? Linguistic ways to increase the emotionality of educational texts. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(4), 991–1016.
- Piotrovskaya, L., & Trushchelev, P. (2021). Linguistic Approach to Study of Strategies for Increasing Text-Based Interest. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*.
- Renninger, K. A. (1989). Interests and noninterests as context in reading. In annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Renninger, K. A. (1990). Children's play interests, representation, and activity. In Fivush, R., & Hudson, J. (eds.), *Knowing and Remembering in Young Children*, Memory Cognition.
- Renninger, K. A. (1992). Individual interest and development: Implications for theory and practice. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 361–395). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Renninger, K. A. (2000). Individual interest and its implications for understanding intrinsic motivation. In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 373–404). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012619070-0/50035-0>
- Renninger, K. A., & Hidi, S. (2017). *The Power of Interest for Motivation and Engagement*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315771045>
- Rotgans, J. I. (2015). Validation study of a general subject-matter interest measure: The Individual Interest Questionnaire (IIQ). *Health Professions Education*, 1(1), 67–75.
- Sadoski, M., Goetz, E. T., & Avila, E. (1995). Concreteness effects in text recall: Dual coding or context availability. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(2), 278–288. <https://doi.org/10.2307/748038>
- Sansone, C., & Thoman, D. B. (2005). Interest as the missing motivator in self-regulation. *European Psychologist*, 10(3), 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.10.3.175>
- Schiefele U. (1998). Individual interest and learning, what we know and what we don't know. In Hoffman L., Krapp A., Renninger K. A., Baumert J. (Eds.), *Interest and learning: Proceedings of the Seeon Conference on Interest and Gender* (pp. 91–104). Kiel, Germany: IPN.
- Schiefele, U. (1996). Topic interest, text representation, and quality of experience. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21(1), 3–18.
- Schiefele, U., & Krapp, A. (1996). Topic interest and free recall of expository text. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8(2), 141–160.
- Schiefele, U., & Rheinberg, F. (1997). Motivation and knowledge acquisition: Searching for mediating processes. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 10, pp. 251-301). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Schraw, G. (1997). Situational interest in literary text. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22(4), 436–456. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0944>
- Schraw, G. (2000). Reader beliefs and meaning construction in narrative text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 96. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.1.96>
- Schraw, G., & Lehman, S. (2001). Situational interest: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13, 23–52. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009004801455>

- Schraw, G., Bruning, R., & Svoboda, C. (1995). Sources of situational interest. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27(1), 1–17.
- Schraw, G., Flowerday, T., & Reisetter, M. F. (1998). The role of choice in reader engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(4), 705. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.4.705>
- Schriner, K. A. (1989). Evaluating text quality: The continuum from text-focused to reader-focused methods. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 32(4), 238–255.
- Shakhovskiy, V. I. (2008). *Linguistic Theory of Emotions*. Gnosis.
- Silvia, P. J. (2008). Interest — The curious emotion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(1), 57–60.
- Soemer, A., & Schiefele, U. (2019). Text difficulty, topic interest, and mind wandering during reading. *Learning and Instruction*, 61, 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.12.006>
- Song, S. H. (2003). The effect of interesting text on the reading comprehension of Korean college EFL students: a comparison of seductive details and interesting elaborations. Doctoral dissertation. Austin.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2001). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. URSS.
- Su, R. (2020). The three faces of interests: An integrative review of interest research in vocational, organizational, and educational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 116, 103240.
- Swaney, J. H., Janik, C. J., Bond, S. J., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). *Editing for comprehension: Improving the process through reading protocols* (DDC Tech. Rep. No. 14). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University, Communications Design Center.
- Tumenyeva, Y. A., Obukhov, A. S., & Finogenova, O. N. (2020). Development and validation of a behavioral indicators scale for assessing interest in mathematics. *Pedagogy and Psychology of Education*, (3), 128–146. <https://doi.org/10.31862/2500-297X-2020-3-128-146>
- Uher, J. (2023). What's wrong with rating scales? Psychology's replication and confidence crisis cannot be solved without transparency in data generation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 17(5), e12740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12740>
- Van der Sluis, F., Van den Broek, E. L., Glassey, R. J., van Dijk, E. M., & de Jong, F. M. (2014). When complexity becomes interesting. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(7), 1478–1500.
- Vollmeyer, R., & Rheinberg, F. (2000). Does motivation affect performance via persistence? *Learning and Instruction*, 10(4), 293–309. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(99\)00031-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(99)00031-6)
- Vollmeyer, R., Rollett, W., & Rheinberg, F. (1998). Motivation and learning in a complex system. *Advances in Motivation*, 53–67.
- Wade, S. E., & Adams, R. B. (1990). Effects of importance and interest on recall of biographical text. *Journal of Reading behavior*, 22(4), 331–353.
- Wade, S. E., Buxton, W. M., & Kelly, M. (1999). Using think alouds to examine reader text interest. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(2), 194–216.

- Wade, S. E., Schraw, G., Buxton, W. M., & Hayes, M. T. (1993). Seduction of the strategic reader: Effects of interest on strategies and recall. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 93–114.
- Xia, M., Kochmar, E., & Briscoe, T. (2016). Text readability assessment for second language learners. In *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications* (pp. 12–22). San Diego, California: Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W16-0502>
- Zadvornaia, E. G. (2022, March). Simply interesting: On certain aspects of information evaluation. *Linguistics, Linguodidactics, Linguoculturology: Current Issues and Development Perspectives: Proceedings of the VI International Scientific and Practical Conference*. Belarusian State University.

Received: March 12, 2024

Revised: May 15, 2024

Accepted: August 15, 2024

Author Contributions

Yulia A. Tyumeneva – working with sources, writing the article text, content analysis.

Ekaterina S. Kashchenko – working with sources, writing the article text, content analysis.

Maria Yu. Lebedeva – writing the article text, content analysis.

Author Details

Yulia A. Tyumeneva – Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Senior Researcher, Associate Professor of the Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education “National Research University Higher School of Economics”, Moscow, Russian Federation; Web of Science ResearcherID: H-7317-2015, Scopus Author ID: 12790872300, SPIN-code RSCI: 7451-2225, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2381-917X>; email: jutu@yandex.ru

Ekaterina S. Kashchenko – Postgraduate student of the Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education “National Research University Higher School of Economics”, Moscow, Russian Federation; Web of Science ResearcherID: GZK-6625-2022, SPIN-code RSCI: 4682-2750, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1273-6600>; email: eskachenko@hse.ru

Maria Yu. Lebedeva – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Head of the Laboratory of Cognitive and Linguistic Studies, Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education “State Institute of the Russian Language named after A.S. Pushkin”, Moscow, Russian Federation; Web of Science ResearcherID: G-2557-2016, SPIN-code RSCI: 8526-1522, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9893-9846>; email: m.u.lebedeva@gmail.com

Conflict of Interest Information

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.