Dear Reviewers,

We would like to thank you for your most constructive suggestions and feedback of our paper. We believe this has helped us further strengthen the discussion of our research. Please see below details of our changes to all your comments. All your suggestions and comments have been incorporated in the paper.

Thank you once again.

Sincerely,

Authors

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer 1** | **Responses to reviewer** |
| This small number of focus groups, and the (implied) small number of student responses causes concern about their generalizability. In addition, the self-reporting by students about their reasoning or justification for reading/not reading is fraught with concerns. These cautions were not sufficiently raised by the author(s) in this paper. | *The limitations and future research section has been enhanced to explicitly recognize these limitations.*  |
| The concept maps presented are very busy and complex. The size of the figures is too small. The author(s) should have considered presenting each figure on a separate page, in landscape orientation. | *We have changed the orientation of pages that have the figures to landscape, and increased the size of these figures. While figures 2-5 are now very clear, figure 1 has improved marginally. Our purpose of showing figure 1 is to present a visual depiction of all concepts together. However, in order to make the concepts more legible we have broken that figure into smaller and more legible figures (2-5). Still, if reviewers would rather this figure be removed we will be willing to remove it. We think that figure still has some value in presenting an overall picture of the concepts.*  |
| The use of yellow and red coloring seems to indicate certain things within the concept maps, but this was not sufficiently explained.  | *We have added an explanation of this yellow highlight and red font coding in the second paragraph of the results section on page 12. In addition, we have marked subsequent result discussions with (2FG) for both focus groups, where concepts coded in yellow highlight and red font appear in the results section.* |
| The first and second concept maps presented seem to be identical, but the text supporting them seems to imply they should be different. | *Clarifications about the nature and content of the various concept maps have been added in the text. Concept Map 1 incorporates all concepts combined, Concept Maps 2-5 focus on individual concepts.* |
| Many of the propositions appear to be self-evident, and their association with the constructs of behavioral economics are not sufficiently explained.  | *We have added supporting theoretical and conceptual arguments to all of the propositions.*  |
| More importantly, the students are self-reporting their motives and reasoning for reading/not reading. For instance, at one point the author(s) raise a proposition based on the students’ seeming assertion that they don’t read if the material is not relevant/referred to during class discussion. However, at another point, the students report that they don’t read if the instructor simply reviews the reading in class. So, the process of developing the propositions seems to have been built on these sorts of conflicting motives and explanations. The students seem to be justifying their behavior to the interviewers, whether it is “correct” behavior or not.  | *Concerns about the focus group process as well as the issue of students’ self-reporting have been addressed (with appropriate references). Relevant passages have been added and rephrased to address this concern.*  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer 2** | **Responses to reviewer** |
| Please add more references to the section about self-rationing inefficiency. The section about construal level theory is well referenced, but not the section prior to it. | *We have added references on pages 7-8 in the self-rationing efficiency section.*  |
| Also, jumping ahead, you need more references in your very last pages of your conclusion (last paragraph of paper). | *References to the appropriate literature have been added in relevant places in the last pages/conclusion.* |
| I think you need to speak directly to the limitations of having only 18 students in terms of generalizability. See below for more comments. | *The limitations and future research section explicitly identifies this limitation.*  |
| I think you need to better explain how having greater availability of library reserve books will impact reading compliance as I am not sure how you came to this conclusion. Also, when I think of accessibility with books, I think of having a book on my cell phone or ipad or kindle, not at the library. Technology changes us, doesn’t it? ☺ | *In terms of library reserves and e-books, we added more data from the focus groups, regarding what students said. We also pulled data from our local university surveys regarding student use of mobile devices to read e-books, yet did not cite the survey because it would inform the reviewers what university this manuscript is coming from.* |
| I think this would be a stronger paper if you listed the long term benefits of reading. I am not sure most professors could list these benefits, let alone students! ☺ | *In terms of long term reading benefits, we added a reference to one of the most recent articles by Cunningham and Stanovich (they have multiple articles on this topic through the 90s and early 2000s), dealing with their findings regarding the benefits of long term reading* |
| You discuss in your Future Research Directions section how the point of this study was not to generalize the findings, but yet you have numerous suggestions/recommendations throughout the paper that basically imply this is what professors “should” do in their classrooms. In other words, the entire paper is generalizing your findings, which I understand. Instead of stating that the point of this paper is not to generalize, I think it would be stronger to take out the section of “the point of this is not to generalize” and change it to “one limitation of the research is the small sample size, so we need to be careful when generalizing. Nevertheless, this is an important study because….” | *We have reworded appropriate parts of this section to ensure that we do not generalize findings of this study.*  |