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Abstract

The purpose of this quasi-experimental, pre-posttest nonequivalent control group study was to compare two types of reading instruction (English Language Arts vs. English Language Arts with pleasure reading) on 9th and 10th-grade students’ reading motivation. Much of the research on reading motivation is focused on elementary and middle school students, even though the decrease in reading motivation is detrimental at the high school level. Therefore, this study was guided by research questions that examined if there were differences in 9th and 10th-grade high school students’ 1) reading motivation, 2) self-concept as a reader, and/or 3) value of reading after participating in traditional English Language Arts instruction as compared to the intervention of English Language Arts instruction with pleasure reading. In this four-week study involving 216 students, the control group (N = 94) received traditional English Language Arts instruction while the experimental group (N = 122) received the same instruction enhanced with ten minutes of daily classroom pleasure or choice reading. Pre- and post-survey data were collected with the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) to gauge self-reported attitudes toward reading before and after four weeks of study implementation. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed to compare the AMRP mean scores of the two groups to determine if there were statistically significant changes over time to students reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and/or value of reading. Results revealed that student’s in the experimental group did show a significant increase in reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading. Thus, daily involvement in pleasure reading appears to be beneficial in increasing the reading motivation of high school students. Future research can examine implementation of various interventions to determine ways to further enhance various aspects of reading motivation for high school students.
Keywords: Pleasure reading, reading motivation, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, high school students, secondary students, self-determination theory
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides insight into the purpose of this research study. This study explored if the inclusion of pleasure reading every school day would increase the self-reported reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading of ninth and tenth grade high school students. This chapter discusses background information regarding reading motivation with an emphasis on high school students’ low levels of reading motivation and the use of pleasure reading to address these concerns. Further, this chapter proposes a problem of practice regarding reading for pleasure and presents the research problem statement, purpose and significance of the study as well as the specific research questions. The chapter ends with definitions of key terms used in the study.

Introduction and Background

While research on reading motivation customarily focuses on elementary school students, it is still important for teachers to motivate high school students to read. There has been a decline in pleasure reading in the traditional school day at the secondary level (Cuevas, Russell, & Irving, 2012; Morgan & Wagner, 2013). As a result, the national average of the number of students who were at the readiness level in English and reading has declined as evidenced from ACT scores 2015, which was (64%) and (46%), respectively (ACT, 2015). In addition, Melekoglu and Wilkerson (2013) found an association between struggling high school students with below grade level reading, negative attitudes, and low motivation to read.

As students transition from elementary school to middle school, their motivation to read declines. During this transition, students are forced to shift from the pleasure of reading to academic reading to learn new information (Kelley & Decker, 2009). Motivating students at the high school level has proven to be difficult for educators (Jang, Conradi, McKenna, & Jones,
Reluctant high school students are unmotivated to read because classroom reading instruction focuses on assigned reading that students find boring and too complex to comprehend (Beck, 2014; Hughes-Hassell, 2008; Ivey & Johnson, 2013). Excessive academic reading may produce high school students with unsuccessful reading experiences and a lack of motivation to read (Hughes-Hassell, 2008).

When students lack the motivation to read, it begins to impede their willingness to read for pleasure or educational purposes and may severely impact their academic achievement (Howard, 2011). Students with low reading skills struggle reading any text and exhibit negative attitudes toward reading tasks (Hughes-Hassell, 2008; Melekolu & Wilkerson, 2013). Those who have not mastered the necessary reading skills are not able to comprehend what they have read, therefore, decreasing their motivation to read significantly (Pitcher et al., 2007).

Regular pleasure reading improves comprehension and fosters the development of vocabulary, word recognition, and understanding of syntax (Merga & Moon, 2016). Therefore, pleasure reading can increase motivation to read and play a greater role in reading performance, and pleasure reading on a daily basis can increase a student’s ability to read above their age level at better averages than their non-reading peers (Merga & Moon, 2016). A decline in pleasure reading at the secondary level is a result of inconsistent approaches in curriculum at elementary and secondary education (Hanewald, 2013) and disparities between elementary and high school pedagogical teaching methods (Hopwood, Hay, & Dyment, 2014). Secondary schools failing to enhance reading skills in their curriculum will continue to have students struggling with complex academic reading tasks such as understanding vocabulary, reading comprehension, and critical thinking; tasks that become more difficult for secondary students who lack the motivation to read (Melekolu & Wilkerson, 2013).
It is clear that schools must respond to unmotivated readers. Creating a time for pleasure reading in the high school curriculum may provide the vital link that increases motivation to read in high school students as it has for elementary-aged students. Providing a time in the curriculum for ungraded pleasure reading in secondary schools may help improve reading motivation in the lives of high school students (Francois, 2013; Lenters, 2006).

**Problem of Practice**

The importance of pleasure reading in the lives of young teens lies in its ability to enhance their success in school (Howard, 2011). A lack of reading motivation and reading for pleasure or in academia is a detrimental risk to the development of general literacy skills including reading comprehension, vocabulary, and verbal fluency (Howard, 2011). If students are forced to read books they view as boring or having little relevance to their lives, it leads to students who do not enjoy reading as they did when they were in elementary school (Hughes-Hassell, 2008) and students unwilling to read unless a teacher requires it. Providing time during the school day for pleasure reading can be an effective strategy to better support high school students’ literacy development (Hughes-Hassell, 2008).

Every subject in a school curriculum requires students who can read proficiently (Logan, Medford, & Hughes, 2011). Motivation plays a role in reading performance, especially for those students who read poorly and have low cognitive abilities. Logan, Medford, and Hughes (2011) found that for a student who is unable to read at grade level, tasks as simple as reading a paragraph or completing standardized assessments become challenging. Their study further revealed that intrinsic reading motivation could lead to improvement in reading comprehension skills as intrinsic motivation explained significant variance in children’s growth in reading skills over the period of one school year (p. 127). According to self-determination theory, a student’s
intrinsic reading motivation can be facilitated by a teacher (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Elementary school teachers who provide structured, pleasure reading activities for their students positively impact reading motivation (De Naeghel et al., 2014). Because intrinsic reading motivation declines as students make the transition from elementary to secondary school, a teacher-supported and structured reading intervention could have a positive impact on student’s reading motivation.

**Students are not Reading for Pleasure**

The research on secondary reading motivation suggests that elementary students read daily and experience daily, quality, pleasure-reading experiences, but by the time they reach high school, they lose their motivation to read due to instructional practices (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Morgan & Wagner, 2013; Oldfather & Dahl, 1994).

Though some high school students have acquired the skills to read, they do not reading for pleasure (Merga & Moon, 2016). According to the National Endowment for the Arts (2007), “less than one third of 13 year olds are daily readers” and “the percentage of 17 year olds who read nothing at all for pleasure has doubled over a 20-year period” (p. 7). In addition, because of the demands on their free time (e.g., employment, taking care of younger siblings, homework, extracurricular activities, helping parents), students choose and are in some instances that require them to spend their leisure time doing other things. In Merga’s (2014) mixed-methods study about infrequent engagement in pleasure reading of eighth-grade and 10th-grade students, one student explained, “I would rather do other things with my free time” (p. 63), which suggests a student would prefer to pursue other recreational pursuits. Another student stated they only have time to read books “that we have to do for school,” (p. 64), which suggests students find pleasure reading a waste of time.
Students are spending a portion of their time focused on technology. Cell phones with advanced technology have dramatically increased the amount and types of activities in which students can engage in online activities. This activity can include social media (e.g., Facebook and Twitter), taking and sharing pictures (Instagram and Snapchat), browsing websites, and reading online news (Chen & Yan, 2016). In the present world of technology (social media and smartphones), even active readers are distracted (Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015), so it is an even more arduous task to increase their “willingness to allocate time to pleasure reading” (Merga & Moon, 2016, p. 132).

**Teachers are not Devoting Class Time to Pleasure Reading**

Teachers can play a powerful role in the active facilitation of student access to materials for pleasure reading (Merga & Moon, 2016). Despite the competing demands of curricular changes and high-stakes testing on teachers’ time, they still can focus on activities such as pleasure reading, which can yield positive results over the long term (Merga & Moon, 2016). These activities include traditional English language arts instruction with the infusion of pleasure reading, which benefits include: reading attainment, writing ability, text comprehension, improved grammar skills, and positive reading attitudes (Clark & Rumbold, 2006). Elementary school teachers are often considered the driving force behind helping students learn how to read, but as students transition from elementary to secondary school, teaching them to enjoy reading is frequently neglected (Merga & Moon, 2016; Nieuwenhuizen, 2001). Through normal classroom practices, secondary teachers can often unintentionally discourage students from becoming lifelong readers (Lee, 2011) because pleasure reading is not incorporated into the curriculum. Also, much of the reading done in the English language arts classroom is assigned reading of privileged, canonical texts that drastically limit the choices students are given as readers (Hale &
Crowe, 2001; Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Morgan & Wagner, 2013; Pitcher et al., 2007; Sewell, 2008; Yagleski, 2005). The students in Merga and Moon’s (2016) study revealed that although a greater volume of books was available in the English teacher’s high school classroom, these teachers did less to encourage pleasure reading than their elementary counterpart. Because pleasure reading is not a focus, this suggests a disconnection in the transition from elementary to secondary school and may lead some students to misinterpret this lack of encouragement and believe that reading for pleasure is not an essential activity (Merga & Moon, 2016).

Among the best instructional practices that should occur in a high school English language arts classroom are modeling reading strategies, close reading, comprehension strategies, vocabulary, fluency, shared reading, and reading conferences. Although the center of these instructional activities is reading, the focus is not pleasure reading. The pressure of high stakes testing (ACT Aspire, ACT, and the SAT) requires secondary teachers to be responsive to the immediate demands of their curriculum. These requirements leave little time for pleasure reading during a limited, 60-minute class period (Merga & Moon, 2016) even though research has shown that reading for pleasure can improve literacy comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, and motivation (De Naeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenksite, & Rosseel, 2012; Ercegovac, 2012; Goctu, 2016; Hopwood et al., 2014; Howard, 2011; Merga & Moon, 2016). Fielding, Wilson, and Anderson (1986) found that reading as little as 10 minutes per day had a positive influence on reading test scores. Although the specific purpose of pleasure reading is not to add grades to a teacher’s grade book, it can assist with the overall literacy development of students in the classroom. Krashen’s (2004) meta-analysis of in-school pleasure reading found that reading increased standardized reading comprehension, writing style, vocabulary, spelling, and grammatical development. In 51 out of the 54 studies of elementary and high school students
Krashen (2004) analyzed, findings emerged that students who participated in pleasure reading (in school free reading programs) do as well as or better than students who were engaged in traditional programs. Regular, uninterrupted pleasure reading can offer secondary educators an opportunity to create an enthusiastic culture of reading in the classroom and improve student literacy.

**Choice in reading.** Many researchers have argued that offering students a choice in what they read fosters motivation and engagement (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001), supports readers who find reading difficult (Allington, 2012; Gallagher, 2009; Ivey & Johnston, 2013), and improves performance on standardized reading tests (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Ivey & Johnston, 2013). Choice is a positive force in engagement with adolescent readers (Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015; Morgan & Wagner, 2013). However, choice in reading in high school classrooms is not as prevalent as it is in elementary or middle school classrooms, which has led to a decrease in high school students reading for pleasure. This was corroborated with data from the National Center for Education Statistics (2013) that suggested 45% of 17-year-olds rarely or never read for pleasure. But when choice is at the forefront of literacy instructional strategies, it contributes greatly to the development of motivated and engaged readers (Daniels & Steres, 2011). A reading intervention conducted by Ercegovac (2012) was created for students in an urban, secondary school library that provided expert guidance and allowed students to choose what they wanted to read. This revealed that “when self-selecting reading materials, students often seek similarities with their own issue, family conditions, sexual orientation, self-esteem, health, specific problems, racial, language, or cultural characteristics” (p. 37). This is not the case when students are required to read novels selected by their teachers who select books based on their curriculum. Merga and Moon’s (2016) social influence study on high school students’
recreational reading revealed several emerging themes. Students stated that in order for them to invest more recreational time in reading books, they needed “strategies for choice, time availability, time allocation, concentration, and encouragement” (p. 135) from teachers. They also wanted “in-class library time to choose books to read,” “in-class silent reading opportunities,” and for “teachers to provide ongoing encouragement, motivation, and support,” (p. 135).

In order for high school teachers to create literacy environments where students are enthusiastic and motivated to read, students must be allowed ownership in the selection process (Lapp & Fisher, 2009). Because choice is a significant component of reading for pleasure, the opportunity to participate in 10 minutes of pleasure reading, choosing what they want to read as part of a daily classroom instructional strategy, could be the missing factor that ninth and 10th grade students need in high school to engage them in pleasure reading activities.

Pleasure reading time outside of the school has diminished due to technology distractions, increased responsibilities (academic and personal), and other leisure activities. However, motivation and desire for pleasure reading can be cultivated in school, given the right conditions, support, and incentives (Merga & Moon, 2016). When teachers fail to include choice in reading as part of their English language arts curriculum, they deny their students a literacy rich educational setting that can impact a student’s attitude and the frequency in which they engage in pleasure reading (Morgan & Wagner, 2013).

**Problem Statement**

Adolescent literacy achievement has been and continues to be a major concern in the educational community. In fact, concerns about students’ literacy capabilities consistently dominates the educational landscape (Hopwood, Hay, & Dyment, 2017). The high school in
where this study was conducted had a student population of approximately 2,500 students for 2016-2017. The standardized test scores in reading and literacy on the ACT Aspire, the state required test for ninth- and 10th-grade high school students, was lower than the national average and continued to fall below the college and career readiness level. Nationally, the average number of students at the readiness level in English and Reading after taking the ACT in 2015 was (64%) and (46%), respectively (ACT, 2015). Table 1 shows the “readiness” level of ninth and 10th-grade students in reading who took the ACT Aspire test three times during the 2016-2017 school year. Over 57% of students in ninth grade and 55% of students in the 10th grade did not perform at the “readiness” level.

Table 1

*Participating High School’s College Readiness in Reading 2016-2017*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Oct 2016 ACT Aspire</th>
<th>Dec 2016 ACT Aspire</th>
<th>March 2017 ACT Aspire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Grade</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Adapted from participating high school’s ninth and 10th grade ACT Aspire Summative Assessments*

There are some reasons why student literacy has declined over the years. The one thing I have noticed as a library media specialist is that students no longer find it useful or necessary to read for pleasure even though research has shown that reading for pleasure can increase literacy and comprehension skills (Mol & Jolles, 2014). However, if the process of reading instruction becomes difficult and frustrating and a student is unable to read and comprehend age appropriate reading material, it produces a student unmotivated to read. Motivation linked to reading achievement is a significant and fundamental part of providing effective reading instruction (Beck, 2014; Reutzel & Cooter, 2013).
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quasi-experimental, pre-posttest nonequivalent control group study was to compare two types of reading instruction (English language arts instruction vs. English language arts instruction with pleasure reading) on ninth and 10th-grade students’ reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading, controlling for pretest scores. One of the variables of interest, traditional English language arts instruction, was generally defined as teaching reading as a holistic activity where the materials are expected to be real and relevant and integrates reading and writing instruction with content area subjects (Morrison & Mosser, 1993). The second variable of interest, traditional English language arts instruction with the inclusion of pleasure reading, was generally defined as teaching reading as a holistic activity where the materials are expected to be real and relevant and integrates reading and writing instruction with content area subjects (Morrison & Mosser, 1993) with the inclusion of pleasure reading, which was defined as reading books by choice in contrast to reading assigned by a teacher (Merga & Moon, 2016). The dependent and control variables are generally defined below.

**Reading motivation.** Reading motivation is the drive to read resulting from a comprehensive set of an individual’s beliefs about, attitudes towards, and goals for reading (Conradi, Jang, & McKenna, 2014).

**Self-Concept as a Reader.** Self-concept as a reader is a student’s belief about his or her competence in reading and performance in reading compared to their peers (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996).

**Value of Reading.** The value of reading is the value a student places on reading-related activities and engagement in those activities (Gambrell et al., 1996).
Motivation for the pretest and posttest were measured using the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007).

**Significance of the Study**

Students who are unmotivated to read are an epidemic that affects all academic areas from basic to advanced levels (Gallagher, 2009). Even students who score at the advanced level on standardized exams can be alliterate. It is important to recognize and understand alliterate readers who like to read but are unable to make time in their schedule to engage in reading, readers who do not independently engage in pleasure reading, and readers who have negative attitudes toward reading and connecting with text (Beers, 2003), so that schools can help counteract and find ways to motivate these students who are unmotivated to read.

If the inclusion of 10 minutes of pleasure reading every school day is successful in motivating students to read, it could improve literacy achievement and raise student test scores on the ACT Aspire in reading for ninth and 10th-grade students. Research has shown that reading motivation is a key factor in successful reading (Taboada, Tonks, Wigfield, & Guthrie, 2009), and pleasure reading has been shown to improve reading motivation, attainment, writing ability, text comprehension, and grammar (Clark & Rumbold, 2006). The outcomes of this study provide teachers information about the effectiveness of integrating pleasure reading into their classrooms each day to motivate students to read more than the required classroom texts and novels. For the research field, the outcomes encourage researchers to focus their reading research on high school students. Much of the research on reading motivation is focused on elementary and middle school students (De Naeghel et al., 2014), even though the decrease in reading motivation is detrimental at the high school level (Hughes-Hassell, 2008). Students who find reading difficult are unable to read at grade level and score below the proficient level or career
readiness level on standardized tests. If more research begins to focus at the high school level, perhaps solutions can be found to increase reading motivation for high school students. This is reason enough to examine a cohort of ninth- and 10th-grade students to see how their self-concept as readers and value of reading may change over an eight-week period.

**Research Questions**

The study was guided by three research questions:

**Research Question 1**

While controlling for previous reading motivation, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference in ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ reading motivation after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

**Research Question 2**

While controlling for previous self-concept as a reader, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference between ninth- and 10th-grade students’ self-concept as a reader after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

**Research Question 3**

While controlling for previous value of reading, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference between ninth- and 10th-grade students’ value of reading after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

**Null Hypotheses**

The null hypotheses for this study were:
Null Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ reading motivation, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), based on the type of reading instruction they receive (e.g. traditional English language arts instruction vs. traditional English language arts instruction with pleasure reading).

Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant a difference between ninth- and 10th-grade students’ self-concept as a reader, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), based on the type of reading instruction they receive (e.g. traditional English language arts instruction vs. traditional English language arts instruction with pleasure reading).

Null Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference ninth- and 10th-grade students’ value of reading, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), based on the type of reading instruction they receive (e.g., traditional English language arts instruction vs. traditional English language arts instruction with pleasure reading).

Definitions

Definitions for the following key terms provide a context for their meaning within this study.

Pleasure reading. Pleasure reading is leisure reading, recreational reading, independent reading, or a reading of books by choice in contrast to reading assigned by a teacher (Merga & Moon, 2016).
**Reading motivation.** Reading motivation is the drive to read resulting from a comprehensive set of an individual’s beliefs about, attitudes toward, and goals for reading (Conradi, Jang, & McKenna, 2014).

**Intrinsic motivation.** Intrinsic motivation is the drive to read for internal purposes, such as deriving pleasure, attaining personal goals, or satisfying curiosity. Intrinsic motivation is the engagement in an activity based on personal interest in the activity itself (Wang & Guthrie, 2004) and doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

**Extrinsic motivation.** Extrinsic motivation is the drive to read for external purposes, such as rewards or recognition. Extrinsic motivation is the participation in an activity based on external values and demands or doing something because it leads to a separable outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

**Self-concept as a reader.** Self-concept as a reader is students’ belief about their competence in reading and their performance in reading compared to their peers (Gambrell et al., 1996).

**Value of reading.** The value of reading is the value the student places on reading-related activities and engagement in those activities (Gambrell et al., 1996).
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The body of research investigating reading motivation in elementary students is extensive (Conradi, Jang & McKenna, 2014; Logan et al., 2011; Louick, Leider, Daley, Proctor, & Gardner, 2016; Retelsdorf, Koller, & Miller, 2011). However, there is considerably less research focused on high school students’ reading motivation (McGeown, Duncan, Griffiths, & Stothard, 2015) or reading for pleasure. In fact, a conceptual review conducted by Conradi et al. (2014) revealed only eight percent of existing reading research conducted was with high school students. The following review of literature will look at the educational research that explores the lack of reading motivation strategies geared toward high school students, reading motivation strategies that have shown to be successful with elementary students, and how an instructional strategy that includes pleasure reading as an integral part of an English language arts program can be a possible solution to increase reading motivation in high school students.

In addition, the theoretical framework section discusses self-determination theory and the theory’s application to the current study in terms of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations for reading. Finally, related literature about reading motivation, assessing reading motivation, and pleasure reading is examined.

Introduction

Reading for pleasure has been called many things: independent reading, recreational reading, voluntary reading, and leisure reading. It has also been defined in different ways. The Clark and Rumbold (2006) defined it as “reading that we do of our own free will, anticipating the satisfaction that we will get from the act of reading” (p. 6). The following are also definitions of reading for pleasure.
Independent Reading

Independent reading is the opportunity for students to be given choices in a variety of areas, to work at their levels, and to interact with text without depending on adults to solve reading problems (Sanden, 2012, p. 224).

Leisure Reading

Leisure reading is an out-of-school activity (Greaney, 1980, p. 340) or reading students choose to do on their own time as opposed to reading that is assigned to them (Mellon, 1987). It involves personal choice, choosing what one wants to read, and reading widely from a variety of sources – not just books (Hughes-Hassell, 2008, p. 2).

Whatever its designation, when students read for pleasure, it is because they have chosen to spend their time doing something they enjoy. Research shows that when students are given a choice of what they want to read and the time to read it, their motivation to read increases (DeNaeghel et al., 2012; Gambrell, 2011; Guthrie, Klauda, & Ho, 2013; Marinak, 2013; Merga, 2014). McGaha and Igo (2012) studied an urban, public high school that made significant progress encouraging students to read over the summer. They stated, “[we are] especially struck by how strongly students felt about having personal choice in their reading material, and the ability to have time to read” (p. 424).

The personal benefits gained from reading for pleasure are many: (a) a better understanding of other cultures, (b) breadth of vocabulary, (c) greater self-confidence as a reader, and (d) positive reading attitude (Clark & Rumbold, 2006). As students move from elementary school to high school, time for pleasure reading in the classroom is often eliminated from the curriculum. Students tend to read less as they progress in their educational trajectory unless it is required. Ercegovac (2012) found that “reading books for pleasure, in terms of volume and
enjoyment among adolescents, seems to be on the decline” (p. 36). Because the high school has become a place where teachers are faced with curriculum demands that require teaching to the test, “activities such as self-selected reading, which yield positive results over the long-term” (Merga & Moon, 2016, p. 124) have become practically non-existent.

An association exists between poor, struggling high school students with below grade level reading, negative attitudes, and low motivation to read (Melekoglu & Wilkerson, 2013). Reading motivation research suggests teachers should play a critical role, especially at the secondary level, in regularly stimulating their students’ intrinsic reading motivation. Thus, it is essential that teachers establish a reading climate in which high school students are motivated to read frequently (De Naeghel et al., 2012). The current literature on reading motivation provides some valuable information about how to motivate elementary students to read, and investigation on instructional strategies, such as pleasure reading, to increase reading motivation appears to be limited to elementary school students (De Naeghel et al., 2012; Logan et al., 2011; Marinak, 2013; Retelsdorf, Koller, & Moller, 2011; Villiger, Niggli, Wandeler, & Kutzelmann, 2012). There is a gap in the literature on the integration of instructional strategies into high school curriculums to motivate students to read. If students advance from grade level to grade level as struggling readers, the motivation to read for pleasure will decrease just as much as their achievement in school.

**Theoretical Context**

This study approached the issue of motivation based on Deci and Ryan’s (1985) self-determination theory. Specifically, this study approached motivation based on how intrinsic motivation affects a student’s desire to read independently with the facilitation of teacher-supported, daily pleasure reading.
**Self-Determination Theory**

Self-determination theory (SDT) guides motivation studies in educational settings examining how and why students succeed. It identifies intrinsic motivation and varied extrinsic sources of motivation and the roles they play in cognitive and social development (Ryan & Deci, 1985). Ryan and Deci (2000) define intrinsic motivation as “doing an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequences,” (p. 56). It is this natural motivation tendency that is critical in cognitive and social development because it helps humans grow in knowledge and skills (Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT posits that social and environmental factors either facilitate or undermine intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

“Self-determination theory assumes that inherent in human nature is the propensity to be curious about one’s environment and interested in learning and developing one’s knowledge” (Niemiec & Ryan, 2012, p. 133). Many characteristics of human nature include the desire to know, the need to understand, and a natural love of learning. Deci and Ryan (2002) described SDT as a theory of human motivation that takes an interest in factors that either help or hinder a student’s natural tendency to learn. A major focus of SDT asks the question, “What kind of motivation is exhibited at any given time?” (Ryan & Deci, 2000). According to Deci & Ryan (2002),

Self-determination begins by embracing the assumption that all individuals have natural, innate, and constructive tendencies to develop an ever more elaborate and unified sense of self. That is, we assume people have a primary propensity to forge interconnections among aspects of their psyches as well as with other individuals and groups in their social worlds (p. 182).
This section explores the autonomously controlled types of motivation: extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation that motivates students to read.

**Extrinsic motivation and reading**

Extrinsic motivation refers to the performance of an activity in expectation of some type of reward (Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT categorizes four types of extrinsic motivation: external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation. External regulation occurs when a student completes an assignment based on the assumption of receiving a grade. This type of motivation will produce a student who only studies for the test but will not remember any information once the test is over and doesn’t want to learn any more about the topic. Introjected regulation is a controlled form of regulation in which behaviors are performed to avoid guilt or anxiety or to attain ego enhancements (Ryan & Deci, 2000). An example of an introjected regulation is when a student reads a chapter of a book because they know they are going to be quizzed about it the next day. A student who is motivated by introjected regulation does not want to feel ashamed of a bad grade because they are unable to answer a question when called on in class. These two types of extrinsic motivation are prompted by external forces and do not provide a sense of autonomy for the student even though they may assist the student in gaining knowledge.

The other two types of extrinsic motivation, identified regulation and integrated regulation, move more toward autonomy and are considered valuable or relevant to the student (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Identified regulation occurs when a student reads because mastery of the information will help them in school or their career. A student motivated by identified regulation will read a non-fiction book about nursing because they are interested in becoming a nurse. The most autonomous type of extrinsic motivation is integrated regulation. A student motivated by
integrated regulation will enjoy reading the book *1984* because it is required reading in their 10th grade English class and because their favorite genre to read is dystopian literature. This type of extrinsic motivation is motivated by internal forces and is "critical for effective psychological and academic functioning among students" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 138). These types of activities might not be enjoyable for students. However, this “internalization of extrinsic motivation is essential for student’s self-initiation” and “motivation to learn” (Ryan & Deci, 2000 p. 138).

Although extrinsic motivation contributes to reading motivation, the value is often small and negative in regard to pleasure reading (Schiefele, Schaffner, Moller, Wigfield, Nolen & Baker, 2012). In an extrinsically motivated reading environment, there is usually some tangible reward, i.e., candy, money, grade, or a school incentive (Small, Arnone, & Bennett, 2017). If this kind of reward is given to the student, the reward becomes the focus, not the reading. When the reward disappears, so does the value of reading. Summer reading programs habitually provide rewards to students who read during the summer. Small, Arnone and Bennett’s (2017) study of public library summer reading programs offered a variety of incentives to motivate students to read including tickets to sporting events, t-shirts, and restaurant gift certificates. The participants in the study included students, parents, and public librarians. When students were interviewed at the end of the summer program their responses in regard to the impact of the extrinsic rewards found that some of the students liked receiving the rewards. Some stated they would have read regardless of the reward. Some stated they would not have participated in the program if there were no rewards but would have read despite the reward. While the reward was viewed as a positive incentive, most of the students would have still read over the summer without it.
Accelerated Reader (AR) is a program that was specifically developed to offer extrinsic rewards to students by way of a point system. The goal of AR is to “develop a lifelong love of reading in every student” (Accelerated Reader, 2015, p. 1). After its introduction, it became the most popular reading management system purchased by schools to encourage and motivate students to read. However, researchers showed that after implementation, students became more focused on earning points rather than enjoying reading. Smith and Westberg (2011) concluded that students had unfavorable views of the program and it “did not increase student achievement or self-efficacy about reading” (p. 2). Also, Schmidt’s (2008) research revealed that students only read for the AR points and not for the joy of reading. It can be surmised that although students were reading and library circulation statistics increased, the ultimate goal of creating students who are intrinsically motivated to read was ultimately not successful. There is a need for an instructional strategy that encourages intrinsic reading motivation in students without students expecting a reward and who read for the pleasure of reading.

**Intrinsic Motivation and Reading**

There are three basic psychological needs associated with academic engagement within intrinsic motivation: competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000). An instructional strategy that supports an individual’s autonomy, competence, and relatedness can foster the most volitional and high-quality forms of intrinsic motivation and voluntary engagement in activities. When intrinsically motivated, individuals freely engage in interesting activities simply for the enjoyment and excitement of doing so, rather than expecting a reward (Taylor et al., 2014). When students are motivated, they play games, read books, and do fun and challenging activities because they want to. They find the time to do the things they like because they find these activities exciting. Students are “autonomous” when they devote
personal time to reading for pleasure because they are doing so at their volition. Students are “competent” when they are successful and earn good grades on their school work. Students feel “relatedness” when teachers are involved in their reading activities and when teachers create a motivating classroom climate (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). Autonomous reading motivation happens when students engage in reading for their enjoyment and they find personal significance and meaning when they read. Teachers who provide an opportunity for pleasure reading in the classroom that can provide the conditions of competence and autonomy can create an “optimally motivating classroom climate” (DeNaeghel et al., 2012, p. 1007) for their students.

Deci’s (1971, 1972) early experiments on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation showed that rewards undermine people’s intrinsic motivation. The outcomes of these experiments demonstrate that rewards decrease intrinsic motivation because they limit a person’s self-determination. However, there are some behavior theorists (Carton 1996; Scott, 1975) who believe that the strategic use of rewards is an effective method to motivation. Teachers can still utilize a system of incentives in their classrooms and ensure there is no adverse impact on intrinsic motivation. However, it is more beneficial for students to find the task of reading intrinsically rewarding (Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014).

The instructional strategy used in this study will aim to increase intrinsic reading motivation in ninth- and 10th-grade students by providing a choice to read books, magazines, or newspapers that are relevant to the student’s interests and personal goals. Students will be required to read 10 minutes per day, and the rewards will be related to reading: i.e., bookmarks, free books, and an opportunity to keep the magazines at the end of the intervention. The design of this intervention focused on helping students not only read more but become passionate
readers who want to continue reading for the pleasure of reading while cultivating a lifelong reading habit (Small, Arnone, & Bennett, 2017).

**Reading Motivation**

An overwhelming number of leisure activities are available and competing for the attention of the young generation today (De Naeghel et al., 2012). There are more digital platforms than ever before available to read on and yet, the number of teenagers reading for pleasure has declined (Ludden, 2014). Between social media, video games, and extracurricular activities, it is incumbent upon teachers to find ways to motivate students to read. When students reach secondary school “the amount of time spent reading predicts achievement and research indicates that reading motivation declines as children grow older” (De Naeghel et al., 2012, p. 1006).

The fundamental goal of reading for pleasure is not to score at the advanced level on a reading assessment but to appreciate the written word and become a lifelong reader. However, juvenile literature research tends to focus on motivating students to read to increase cognitive reading outcomes rather than simply reading as an act of enjoyment. If teachers want students to be self-motivated to read for pleasure, they need to find ways to provide students with positive reading experiences, guidance, and support that extends past their primary education (Nielen, Mol, Sikkema-de Jong, & Bus, 2016). A decline in reading motivation as students enter high school has been blamed on the mismatch of required literature and what students prefer to read (Pitcher et al., 2007). Students might understand the necessity of teacher selected literature, but when reading is restricted to textbooks and English-language arts literature chosen by the teacher, students can become limited readers and reluctant to read (Pitcher et al., 2007). In this case, school literacy practices fail to motivate students to read because high school students often
find these texts “boring, irrelevant, and difficult to understand” (Wigfield, Gladstone, & Turei, 2016, p. 191).

Reading motivation can significantly impact a student’s academic performance in the classroom as well as on standardized tests as literacy development is an accurate predictor of academic success (Neugebauer, 2013). Even though literacy is a prerequisite for individual and educational success (Reardon, Valentino, & Shores, 2012), many students leave high school unable to read beyond a basic reading level (Strommen & Mates, 2004). The educational system graduates too many students who are not adequately prepared for the literacy demands of the 21st century (Goldman, 2012). Mathis (2004) suggested being a genuinely literate person means reading independently (pleasure reading) because reading is an innate desire. If high school students refuse to provide thoughtful responses to reading in class and during standardized testing, educational systems produce students who fail to see the importance of reading. However, if motivation for reading exists, students discover that reading is an effective tool for academia as well as a pleasurable activity in everyday life.

Understanding the importance of reading motivation can help teachers make strategic decisions on what instructional strategies to implement in the classroom (DiBella, 2014). Even though reading motivation is necessary, it is often challenging for high school teachers to implement instructional strategies that motivate students to read. Because reading is a contributory factor in the overall success of students, the teacher must find ways to increase reading motivation in the classroom. Adolescents will be receptive to increasing their pleasure time reading in the right conditions with teacher support (Merga & Moon, 2016). The International Reading Association’s (2014) position statement on pleasure (leisure) reading offers several suggestions of how teachers should motivate students to read.
(1) Provide an opportunity on a daily basis for student’s to read during class.

(2) Support students in developing reading habits that will continue through their lives.

(3) Facilitate leisure reading outside the classroom as an extension of classrooms activities.

(4) Support student reading choices by making a broad range of print, digital, and multimodal texts available to them that expands on their interests.

(5) Serve as role models as lifelong readers. (p. 2)

Establishing these practices builds a student’s self-concept as a reader and also helps them appreciate the value of reading.

Assessing Reading Motivation

When teachers face students who are not motivated to read, they need a way to efficiently assess reading motivation by evaluating students’ self-concept as readers and the value they place on reading (Gambrell et al., 1996). The Motivation to Read Profile (Gambrell et al., 1996) was created to use with elementary students and the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) was created to use with secondary students to quantitatively and qualitatively measure these two constructs.

**Self-concept as a reader.** Reading self-concept is the confidence students feel about themselves as a successful reader. It arises from student’s “task specific perceptions of being able to successfully negotiate the various aspects and processes of reading, such as decoding new words, using comprehension strategies effectively, and expressing their thoughts about what they have read” (Malloy, Marinak, Gambrell & Mazzoni, 2013, p. 279). A student who has confidence in their reading ability or has a healthy self-concept as a reader is more likely to find the task of reading for pleasure an engaging activity (Malloy et al., 2013). If a teacher
understands a student’s self-concept as a reader, he or she can provide the support necessary for engaged reading (Malloy et al., 2013).

Using the analyzed data from the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) survey can provide a teacher valuable insight, which will allow the creation of meaningful motivational contexts for reading instruction in the classroom. Delaney, Pitcher, Gillis and Walker (2014) completed a study in an effort to compare what motivates adolescents to read and how their teachers’ instructional practices motivate them to read and whether or not teachers’ perspectives on reading motivation was similar to their students. Six teachers from five states (Maryland, Texas, New York, California, and South Carolina) participated in the study. The teachers varied in grade level (sixth, seventh, ninth, 10th, and 12th grades) and subjects taught (10th grade remedial reading; ninth, 10th, and 11th grade English; sixth grade English and social studies; ninth grade remedial English, 12th grade English, 9th grade physical science; and sixth grade reading). In total, 331 students participated in the study by completing a revised version of the AMRP survey that included five additional questions on their value of reading strategies. The six teachers completed the Teacher Motivation Profile (TMP). The researchers found that the “adolescents shared an overall low value of reading and did not find their instruction motivating” (Delaney et al., 2014, p. 19) and “student ratings for value of reading were higher than their value of instruction” (Delaney et al., 2014, p. 19). Careful consideration of the results of the survey could allow a teacher to alter their reading instruction to allow more time for individual or small group conferences with students to further isolate the difficulties experienced in decoding words. It would also allow teachers to modify instruction with a new comprehension strategy, providing more explicit instructions and modeling how to talk about what students have read (Malloy et al., 2013). This strategy follows the work of Wilson, Zygouris-Coe, and Cardullo.
(2014) who investigated fifth grade students’ reading comprehension and motivation when interacting with e-reading devices.

During an English language arts and social studies block over a period of six weeks, Wilson et al. (2014) completed a three-phase (pre-experimental, experimental, post-experimental) study to determine to what extent does delivery method of text influence students’ reading comprehension and do student’s experiences with e-reading devices (iPad and Kindle) affect their motivation to read. The study focused on 10 fifth-grade students’ reading behaviors and motivation to read. After completing a pre-posttest survey with the AMRP, the researchers found that “seven out of the ten participants experienced a change in their self-concept” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 40). For five of the seven participants, self-concept increased at least two percentage points, whereas the remaining two participants dropped more than two percentage points. This research indicated that “e-readers have the potential to affect how readers see themselves” (p. 40), although the researchers did indicate a need for further research and investigation. Further stating they would explore which devices, iPad or Kindle, “physical attributes are appealing and most useful to students for reading and comprehending text” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 41) so that “appropriate instructional decisions can be made” (Malloy et al., 2013, p. 273). This is one of the purposes of assessing a student’s motivation to read.

**Value of reading.** If students feel that reading is interesting and are able to become absorbed in the text they are reading, and if they believe that reading will in some way help them, they will engage in the reading task because they choose to (Malloy et al., 2013). The student who chooses to read is a student who finds an intrinsic and personal reason to read. Teachers can help students find value in reading when they help students find books that are interesting and on topics they enjoy learning about. Students can also find value in reading when
teachers employ them to find ways to modify practices or provide suitable texts to support individual reading. Assisting a teacher in adjusting or modifying classroom instructional practices can influence the value students place on reading (Malloy et al., 2013).

According to Malloy et al. (2013), if students feel that reading is interesting or if they think reading will help them in their careers, they will more than likely engage in pleasure reading because of intrinsic, personal reasons. Barry (2013) used the AMRP survey in order to find out if students saw themselves as capable readers and if they believed reading was important. As a whole, all students placed a low value on reading, with females placing a slightly higher value than males. Hispanic males and females reported valuing reading less than any other subgroup. Almost all of the students indicated “knowing how to read well” (Barry, 2013, p. 365) was important. Given the students’ lack of value in reading, the researchers further used the Reading Preferences Checklist (Fisher, Bonzo, Frey, & Ivey, 2011) in an effort to find out what students liked to read and if race or ethnicity of the characters in the books affected their willingness to read. Many of the students noted in their written responses they wanted some kind of connection with the characters they read about. African American females rated the highest feedback with 88% stating they would “read more if they had access to books with more African American characters” (p. 360). To entice minority readers, young adult literature must engage the reader with its familiarity (Bishop, 2003), be relevant to their lives (Hughes-Hassell, 2008), and be diverse (Merga & Moon, 2016). Therefore, not only must the minority reader see themselves represented in their material they read, the story should also reflect the circumstances of their lives (Barry, 2013).

While many studies have been implemented to assess the reading motivation of students using this profile (Gambrell et al., 1996; Pitcher et al., 2007), many researchers only administer
the survey once (Barry, 2013; Delaney et al., 2014; Kelley & Decker, 2009; Sturtevant & Kim, 2009; Wilson & Kelley, 2010). The original was created so teachers could collect information “prior to and following the implementation of a reading motivational intervention” (Gambrell et al., 1996, p. 531) or so that data can be collected “several times throughout the school year so that changes in a student’s attitudes and interests about reading can be documented and compared” (Gambrell et al., 1996, p. 531). Other than dissertation studies, few studies have implemented the survey the way the researchers intended (Melekoglu, 2011; Melekoglu & Wilkerson, 2013; Wilson et al., 2014), which still allows for a limited knowledge of literacy perspectives of a diverse group of secondary adolescents. A more thorough understanding in this area would enable secondary educators to establish a more robust English language arts curriculum that would better serve the needs of this population (Sturtevant & Kim, 2009).

Teachers should encourage students to read frequently to reduce the risk of students becoming struggling readers who then decide that other recreational activities are more enjoyable than reading. It is also important that students see themselves as readers. Teachers can create this atmosphere in the classroom by creating motivational classroom contexts where they explicitly discuss the value and importance of reading (Jang et al., 2015). According to the Clark and Akerman’s (2008) self-perception as a reader study, students who do not see themselves as readers find reading boring, they don’t see reading magazines or non-fiction books as reading, they feel real reading is only reading long books, and ultimately, no one encourages them to read for pleasure. This attitude must be changed for students to become life-long readers and appreciate the value of reading.
Pleasure Reading

Although the research on reading motivation and pleasure reading is extensive, studies that focus on high school students are lacking. It is necessary for secondary educators to provide opportunities in traditional English language arts instructional curriculums for students to read for pleasure and have a voice in what they read. Free choice is essential in reading motivation. Teachers must find a way to balance their literature curriculum requirements with books and materials that students want to read for reading motivation to be intrinsic. If rewards or incentives are made a part of a reading initiative, teachers must be careful not to produce readers who only read for the reward and not for the joy of reading. When students tap into their intrinsic motivation, they feel successful and appreciate the value in reading.

Pleasure reading in high school classrooms is not as prevalent as it is in elementary or middle school classrooms, which has led to a decrease in high school students reading for pleasure. However, when student choice is at the forefront of reading programs and literacy instructional strategies, it contributes greatly to the development of motivated and engaged readers (Daniels & Steres, 2011). When students are required to read novels selected by their teachers who select books based on their curriculum, this is not the case.

It is important for high school teachers to create literacy environments where students have a voice in the decision-making process when it comes to some of their reading material if they want students to be motivated to read and begin the process of creating lifelong readers (Bains, 2013). Because choice is a significant component of reading for pleasure, the opportunity to participate in 10 minutes of pleasure reading, choosing what they want to read as part of a daily classroom instructional strategy, could be the missing factor that ninth- and 10th-grade students need to engage in pleasure reading activities (Bains, 2013).
Reading self-concept is the confidence students feel about themselves as a successful reader. Teachers should encourage students to read frequently to reduce the risk of students becoming struggling readers who then decide that other recreational activities are more enjoyable than reading. It is also important that students see themselves as readers. If students feel that reading is interesting and can become absorbed in the text they are reading and if they believe that reading will in some way help them, they will engage in the reading task because they choose to (Malloy et al., 2013). The student who chooses to read is a student who finds an intrinsic and personal reason to read. Teachers can help students find value in reading when they help students find books that are interesting and on topics they enjoy. Students can also find value in reading when teachers employ them to find ways to modify practices or provide suitable texts to support individual reading. Assisting a teacher in adjusting or modifying classroom instructional practices can influence the value students place on reading (Malloy et al., 2013).

Most instructional reading strategies attempt to tailor literacy activities to the whole class, but when trying to increase the reading motivation of individual students, secondary institutions do little to increase the intrinsic motivation of high school students. The instructional strategy used in this study utilized the aspects of the psychological needs of intrinsic motivation to encourage pleasure reading in ninth- and 10th-grade students, providing autonomous support (students can choose what they want to read for pleasure), competence (a strategic instructional strategy that allows students to read for pleasure during their class period), and relatedness (supplying reading material that holds a perceived personal significance and meaning). This intervention was designed to assess if and how the classroom intervention of including 10 minutes of daily pleasure reading in an English language arts curriculum influenced students’ intrinsic motivation to read.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this quasi-experimental, pre-posttest nonequivalent control group study was to compare the influence of two types of reading instruction (English language arts instruction vs. English language arts instruction with pleasure reading) on ninth- and 10th-grade student’s reading motivation. While controlling for pretest scores, the study examined if the inclusion of 10 minutes of pleasure reading every school day for four weeks increased the self-reported reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading of ninth and 10th-grade high school students as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) in an English language arts classroom. A students’ motivation to read is associated with positive self-concept as a reader and the high value they place on reading (Ford, 1992; Gambrell et al., 1996; Henk & Melnick, 1995; Wigfield, 1994).

This chapter presents the method and design chosen for the study, describes the participants and learner characteristics, the setting, the instructional intervention, and the instrument used with the experimental and control groups involved in the research. Further, the procedures for data collection and analysis are specified, concluding with limitations, delimitations, and ethical issues related to this research.

Data were collected to inform the following research questions:

(1) While controlling for previous reading motivation, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference in ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ reading motivation after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?
(2) While controlling for previous self-concept as a reader, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference between ninth- and 10th-grade students’ self-concept as a reader after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

(3) While controlling for previous value of reading, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference between ninth- and 10th-grade students’ value of reading after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

**Method and Design**

A quasi-experimental, pre-posttest nonequivalent control group design was used for this study. According to Creswell (2012), a quasi-experimental design can be used to assess the difference between two or more intact groups. The researcher using this design employs the use of one or more interventions and observes if the intervention influences the dependent variables. Quasi-experiments often use non-equivalent groups in education because of the ability to use “intact groups” and when researchers are unable to “artificially create groups for the experiment” (Creswell, 2012, p. 309). Because the setting was a public high school, I was unable to artificially create the experimental and control groups because this would have disrupted students already assigned to a teacher or class.

Typically, pretests are used with a quasi-experimental design to control for the selection threat to validity because of the possible difference between groups before the intervention and because random assignment is not used (Creswell, 2012). A pretest, the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) was used to measure the student’s motivation to read before
the independent variable, pleasure reading, was introduced. The AMRP is a profile created to aid teachers in assessing the reading motivation of their students, and it is one of the few assessments that specifically target the reading motivation of secondary students.

Control and manipulation are also a distinguishing element of quasi-experimental designs. Manipulation occurs when a researcher implements an intervention and observes the effect of that intervention on the dependent variable. The intervention, English language arts instruction, with the inclusion of in-class pleasure reading, occurred on a daily basis over a four-week period. Control occurs when a researcher compares the effect of the intervention to a control group who did not receive the intervention because scientific evidence requires at least one comparison (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Six ninth-grade and six 10th-grade classes in the experimental group participated in the 10-minute per day pleasure reading intervention and received the pretest and the posttest, the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), to see if the intervention had an effect on the students’ motivation to read for pleasure (Creswell, 2012). The control group was also comprised of six ninth-grade and six 10th-grade classes and received the pretest and posttest, the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007). The purpose of the control group was to control for threats to validity.

Participants

The population of this study included approximately 1,200 ninth- and 10th-grade males and females between the ages of 14-16 who had satisfactorily met the curriculum, grade point average, and credit requirements by a public high school and department of education to advance to these grade levels. Individuals who are students of this high school are required to earn credits in English during their ninth- and 10th-grade years to earn a high school diploma. Therefore,
these students were enrolled in one of the 24 English language arts ninth or 10th-grade classes at the participating urban, public high school.

For the purpose of this study a nonrandomized convenient sampling method was used to select 24 intact classrooms of participants. The 24 classes were randomly assigned to the experimental group or the control group. However, the students assigned to these classes were not randomly assigned to the groups because this would have disrupted classroom learning.

After student and parent consent forms were received, the experimental group included six ninth-grade English language arts classes with 32 students and six 10th-grade English language arts classes with 90 students, resulting an experimental group comprised of 122 students. The control group included six ninth-grade English language arts classes with 68 students and six 10th-grade English language arts classes with 26 students; thus the control group was comprised of 94 students. According to Creswell (2012), in a quasi-experimental study, each group should have at least 15 participants to ensure an adequate sample size as well as the adequate sample size for the statistical analysis (Cohen, 1988). This study met this criterion as it had a total of 216 participants with 122 in the experimental group and 94 in the control group.

Setting

The high school where the study took place is in a city of approximately 62,000 and a county of 382,000 located in in the American Southeast. City demographic data indicates a population that is 54% Caucasian, 39% African-American, less than 1% Hispanic, and 6% other (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

The school district where the high school is located had a population of approximately 11,000 students with 70% of students who received free and reduced lunch. There are 12 schools in the district, which include one high school with approximately 2,600 ninth- through 12th-
grade students; one middle school that serves approximately 1,800 sixth- through eighth-grade students; and 10 elementary schools that serve approximately 6,600 pre-K through fifth-grade students. The high school is a large, modern high school consisting of four towers where classroom instruction occurs. Each tower has at least two floors with one grade level (nine through 12) for each tower. Non-core classes are located on the bottom floor of each tower. Within this high school, ninth- and 10th-grade English language arts classrooms served as the specific setting (see Appendix A).

**English Language Arts Classrooms**

The study took place over a four-week period in 24 ninth- and 10th-grade English language arts (ELA) classrooms, a course required by the Arkansas Department of Education. Students enrolled in ELA are required to complete and successfully pass the course, earning one credit, by the end of the school year. The 9-12 Arkansas ELA Frameworks and the K-12 Arkansas Library Media Frameworks served as the curriculum framework for this study. Specifically, ELA Frameworks RL.9-10.3 (analyze how complex characters develop over the course of a text, interact with other characters, and advance the plot or develop the theme), RL.9-10.4 (determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone, e.g., how the language evokes a sense of time and place and how it sets a formal or informal tone), and RL.9-10.5 (analyze how an author's choices concerning how to structure a text, order events within it, e.g., parallel plots, nonlinear plots, and manipulate time, e.g., pacing, flashbacks, create such effects as mystery, tension, or surprise) (Arkansas Department of Education, 2016). Moreover, LM frameworks PG.6.9-10.1 (read for pleasure and personal learning) and PG.8.9-10.1 (demonstrate knowledge gained from reading self-selected
informational texts, literary texts, and multicultural texts) were also addressed (Arkansas K-12 Library Media Curriculum Framework, 2013).

The ELA classrooms were set up with chairs and desks. However, when there was a need for group work or pair work, the chairs could be arranged to accommodate those needs. Technology in each classroom consisted of a Smart TV, and each class had a cart with Dell Chromebooks allowing one-to-one technology instruction. ELA classrooms also had classroom libraries consisting of fiction and nonfiction novels. The number of students per class in this study varied with the smallest class size at 11 and the largest class size at 30.

**Classroom Teachers**

Four veteran classroom teachers who had taught in the school for at least five years agreed to participate in this study (see Appendix B). The classroom teachers had a professional teaching license in the state of Arkansas and were deemed highly-qualified teachers in good standing as measured by yearly professional evaluations completed by a building principal or assistant principal. The intervention received approval from the English Department Chair, the literacy coach, and the building principal and aligned with current district curriculum and state standards.

**School History with Pleasure Reading**

Before 2012 at the high school where the study took place, classes were scheduled in 90-minute blocks with four classes per day with each class occurring every other day. Pleasure reading occurred for 10-minutes each class period by implementing the DEAR (Drop Everything and Read) program. All classwork was put aside and everyone, including the teacher, read for 10 minutes (Lee-Daniels & Murray, 2000). When DEAR was implemented, students read for pleasure, visiting the school library regularly to check out books of his or her choice. The results
of this implementation demonstrated that students embraced reading as a part of their regular school day. The students reported improvements in reading and writing skills and became better readers as seen in increased literacy test scores. One student even remarked, “It is time well spent during the normal school day” and “thanks to D.E.A.R. my reading score on the ACT went from a 20 to a 27. Thanks to the constant ten minutes of reading in each class, I developed a better reading comprehension and a greater love of reading” (Baker, 2009, p. 2). By embracing DEAR, teachers set a tone in their classrooms by reading with their students, giving the students a choice of what to read, and giving students time to visit the library to find books of choice. Teachers indicated that the students enjoyed having time in class to read for pleasure and even took the books they were reading home because they wanted to continue reading.

In 2013, the school district changed the daily school schedule and switched to a seven-period, 50-55-minute class period day. Due to this alteration, DEAR was eliminated from daily instructional practice because teachers did not have the time available in their schedule to implement it on a daily basis. Since the high school no longer required 10 minutes of pleasure reading in every class, students who were not intrinsically motivated to read no longer found it necessary to come to the library to check out library books for pleasure. A personal conversation with a teacher revealed a desire to incorporate pleasure reading during the class period but a lack of time in the schedule prevented this. She also stated, “If more students were into pleasure reading then it would be beneficial to incorporate that time into my class. Unfortunately, students no longer run to the library to check out books for pleasure” (Q. Spring, personal communication, July 28, 2017).

**Instructional Intervention**

According to self-determination theory (SDT),
Students’ autonomy can be supported by teachers minimizing the salience of evaluative pressure and any sense of coercion in the classroom, as well as by maximizing student’s perceptions of having a voice and a choice in academic activities in which they are engaged (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009, p. 139).

Thus, SDT allows students to read for pleasure without the requirement of the type of material they read (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). The instructional intervention used in this study provided students with a choice of reading material without the evaluative pressure of a grade as part of their English language arts instruction.

For the four weeks of the study, all students in the control group and the experimental group received their normal English language arts instruction based on the ninth and 10th-grade ELA curriculum frameworks. The control group received 50-minutes of English language arts instruction each school day. The ninth grade English language arts instruction during this time period focused on expository writing, parts of speech, subject verb agreement, pro/anti-agreement, and parts of sentences and ACT writing strategies. The teacher-selected reading was *Romeo and Juliet* by William Shakespeare, *Animal Farm* by George Orwell, and *Bad Boy* by Walter Dean Myers. The 10th grade English language arts instruction during this time period focused on argumentative rhetoric, embedding quotations, and using colons and semicolons in clauses. The teacher-selected reading was *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare. The control group only came to the library to check out assigned novels or on their own time (before school, during lunch, after school, or pass from a teacher).

The instructional intervention implemented in experimental classrooms during the study included pleasure reading materials of books, magazines, newspapers, and student-selected materials from the library. Pleasure reading is defined as the reading of books by choice in
contrast to reading assigned by a teacher (Merga & Moon, 2016) and Ercegovac (2012) suggested teachers should create a more flexible reading for pleasure program students can enjoy. The instructional intervention for this study augmented the English language arts instruction with 10 minutes of pleasure reading at the beginning of each class followed by 40-minutes of traditional English language arts instruction for four weeks.

**Instrumentation**

This study used three instruments to measure fidelity of intervention implementation and one research instrument for data collection to address the research question as described below.

**Instruments For Fidelity Of Intervention Implementation**

This study used the following instruments to ensure the fidelity of intervention implementation: Student Response Bookmark, the Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist, and the Student Request for Materials.

**Student response bookmark.** The Student Response Bookmark (see Appendix H) is a researcher-developed form used by students in the experimental group to record their thoughts on what they read during pleasure reading time. Students recorded their student identification on the form and submitted it to the teacher on a weekly basis. The form was used to provide self-reported fidelity or proof what students were reading in class.

**Teacher weekly reading checklist.** The Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist (see Appendix I) was a researcher-developed form completed by teachers in the experimental group. Teachers used the form each day of the week to record the percentage of students engaged in a reading task during pleasure reading time. The forms were submitted to the researcher at the end of each week of the study. The form was used to assist teachers in monitoring students during
pleasure reading, to uphold fidelity of the study, to increase accountability of teachers, and provide self-reported data regarding student involvement in pleasure reading.

**Student request for materials.** The Student Request for Materials (see Appendix K) is a researcher-developed digital [Google] form used by students to request material for the pleasure-reading segment of their English language arts class. Students used the form to request reading resources such as books, magazines, newspapers, etc. Student name, grade, and classroom teacher were recorded in order to deliver the requested materials to the student. Forms were reviewed on a weekly basis to determine types of reading resources requested by students.

**Research Instrument for Data Collection**

The instrument used in this study was the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) (see Appendix C) created by Pitcher et al. (2007). This instrument is the revised version of the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP), an instrument created to assess students reading motivation. It was normed and validated for use with students in the second through sixth grades (Gambrell et al., 1996).

The Motivation to Read Profile is a 20-item instrument created as a public domain instrument that aims to measure motivation. It consists of two subscales: self-concept as a reader and value of reading. It also includes an interview component. To construct the items for the instrument, Gambrell et al. (1996) examined several reading instruments and reviewed research and theories related to motivation. The content and face validity of the instrument was established by seven experts who examined and analyzed over 100 items for sustainability. Validity and reliability was established using “330 third and fifth grade students from 27 classrooms in four schools from two school districts in the Eastern United States” (Gambrell et al., 1996, p. 4). Construct validity was established via a confirmatory factor analysis that
confirmed a two-factor solution demonstrating that motivation to read consisted of self-concept and value of reading. Cronbach’s alpha results for the subscales yielded high reliability with “self-concept as a reader at .75 and value of reading at .82” (Gambrell et al., 1996, p. 4). Test retest reliability coefficients were calculated for the subscales confirming the moderately high reliability of the instrument (self-concept = .68; value of reading = .70).

The conversational interview assesses students’ thoughts about narrative reading, informational reading, and general reading (Pitcher et al., 2007). The initial pool of interview items included 60 open-ended questions regarding narrative and informational reading, general and specific reading experiences, and home and school reading practices (Gambrell et al., 1996). The 60 open-ended questions were field tested with a stratified random sample of 48 students. Two experienced classroom teachers who were also graduate students analyzed the protocols of the 48 students and selected 14 questions that revealed the most useful information about students’ motivation to read. These 14 questions were used for the final version of the conversational interview (Gambrell et al., 1996). Teachers were encouraged to deviate from the basic script of the conversational interview to glean information specific to their needs (Gambrell et al., 1996), which some studies have done by adding additional questions (Sturtevant & Kim, 2009; Wilson & Kelley, 2010; Barry, 2013; Delaney et al., 2014; Wilson, Zygouris-Coe, & Cardullo, 2014) or not including the interview at all (Melekoglu, 2011; Melekoglu & Wilkerson, 2013), which has shown not to inhibit the validity of the MRP instrument when assessing motivation to read.

Although much was known about elementary students’ motivation to read, existing research did not contribute to the understanding of what motivates adolescents to read. Pitcher et al. (2007) worked as a team to revise the MRP to use with adolescents. The resulting survey was
the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP), which was normed and validated for use with sixth to 12th grade students (Pitcher et al., 2007). Based on recommendations of adolescent research literature and the author’s experiences working with teens, the language of the questions were amended to apply to adolescents. For example, the phrase “When I grow up…” was changed to “As an adult…” The revised AMRP provides a “flexible instrument for secondary teachers to better understand their student’s motivations to read” (Pitcher, et al., 2007, p. 379).

Exactly like the MRP, the AMRP consists of 20 four-point, Likert-type scale questions with 10 questions assessing self-concept as a reader and 10 questions assessing value of reading (see Table 2 for example questions). It also includes a conversational interview. For the purposes of this quantitative study, the conversational interview was omitted because the researcher only assessed students’ self-concept as a reader and value of reading.

The 10 items that measure self-concept of a reader provide data relating to perceived reading ability and how students compare reading ability to peers. The 10 items that measure value of reading measure engagement in reading activities and tasks. Both subscales have a total raw score of 40 points each. The full survey has a total score of 80 points obtained by combining the raw scores of the subscales (Pitcher et al., 2007, p. 389). The raw scores are converted to percentage scores (see Appendix D), and the higher the percentage score, the higher the motivation to read.
### Table 2

**Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile Example of Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Question</th>
<th>Example Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My friends think I am ______</td>
<td>A <em>good reader</em> will receive a point value of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A very good reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A good reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o An OK reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A poor reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading a book is something I like to do.</td>
<td><em>Often</em> will receive a point value of the most positive of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Not very often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007)*

Although the authors of the AMRP (Pitcher et al., 2007) changed the wording of some of the questions of the MRP reading survey, the original format of the MRP survey scoring sheet was not altered. The teacher directions for the survey portion of the AMRP changed; however, the teacher directions for the conversational interview did not. The teacher directions (see Appendix E) for this study were slightly changed to accommodate the students completing the survey in a digital format.

The AMRP has good reliability and validity. The validation study used a sample population of 384 students; 54% were girls, and 46% were boys; 43% were in the sixth through eighth grades, 35% in grades 9-10, and 21% were in grades 11-12 (Creswell, 2012). Concurrent validity showed that students responded consistently on both the reading survey and the conversational interview across the two constructs: self-concept as a reader and value of reading. However, there were some discrepancies between students’ views of themselves as readers in school and out of school. A Cronbach alpha was calculated to assess the internal consistency and it revealed high reliability for both subscales (self-concept = .81; value = .81). A Cronbach above .70 is considered adequate in social science research (Creswell, 2012).
Internal reliability of the AMRP for the current study was computed in the SPSS program through calculating the Cronbach’s alpha value. A value of 0.7 or higher is an acceptable alpha value (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of reliability for the AMRP pre-posttest surveys were .86 and .86, respectively, making it a reliable instrument for social science research.

Reliability and validity of the MRP and AMRP has been established thus, making the instrument appropriate to use in a dissertation that aimed to examine reading motivation (Gambrell et al., 1996; Pitcher et al., 2007). A number of research and/or dissertation studies have also used the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), further establishing it as a worthwhile instrument to use with adolescents (see Table 3) to assess their motivation to read.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th># of Dissertations</th>
<th># of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global and Research Gate using search parameter: “Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007)”

Procedures

This research study occurred over a six-week period (four weeks for the study, two weeks for pre-posttest administration) for 216 ninth and 10th grade students at an urban high school.
The procedures for this study involved steps for the researcher, the experimental group teacher, and the experimental group students.

**Researcher Procedures**

As seen in Table 4, the researcher procedures involved gaining district and IRB approval (see Appendix E) prior to the start of the study. Upon approval, I randomly assigned four teachers to an experimental or control group then met with each to teacher to explain details of the study and the daily procedures and to schedule a visit to each classroom. The researcher met with each class in the experimental and control group to introduce the study to the students. Following the introduction to the study, any student who chose to participate signed a digital consent form and completed the AMRP (Pitcher et al., 2007) pretest. Parent consent forms were sent home with students. Any consent form not returned was mailed to parent.

The instructional intervention began the following week and continued for four weeks. I delivered newspapers to each experimental classroom each day and retrieved and secured student bookmarks and teacher checklists every Friday during the study. At the end of the study, I visited each classroom in the control and experimental group and administered the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) posttest.
Table 4

*Researcher Procedures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August/September 2017</td>
<td>Secure district approval (Appendix A) and Teacher approval (Appendix B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>Secure IRB approval (Appendix E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Randomly assign teachers to experimental or control groups, then meet w/teachers to outline research study and daily procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Introduce study to students in experimental and control groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Secure student assent (Appendix F). Parent consent forms (Appendix G) sent home with students. Consent forms not returned were mailed to parent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Administer AMRP pretest to experimental and control groups (Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb./Mar. 2018</td>
<td>Implement study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily during study</td>
<td>Deliver 3 newspapers to each classroom in the experimental group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Friday during study</td>
<td>Collect and secure Student Response Bookmarks (Appendix H) and Teacher Weekly Reading Checklists (Appendix I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>Administer AMRP posttest to experimental and control groups (Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Experimental Teacher Procedures*

As seen in Table 5, once the study began, the teachers in the experimental group were scheduled to visit the library media center every Monday so that students could secure their choice of reading material for the study. The teachers in the experimental group reminded the participants to read their choice of pleasure reading material the first 10 minutes of each class period. When the tardy bell rang, the teacher asked all students to take a seat at a desk and begin reading. All reading material except the daily newspaper and the magazines were chosen at the beginning of each week on Monday’s during a regularly scheduled visit to the library. Magazines were delivered to the classroom on Friday, and the newspaper was delivered daily. The teachers in the experimental group had a checklist where they recorded the level of engagement each day
(see Appendix I). The teacher received a labeled checklist for each week at the beginning of the study. The teacher also had a daily script to read before and after the 10 minutes of pleasure reading (see Appendix J).

Table 5

*Experimental Teacher Procedures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bring each class (experimental) to the library to check out reading material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily (Monday – Friday)</td>
<td>Read script (Appendix J) provided by researcher as soon as the tardy bell rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the end of 10 minutes of pleasure reading, read script provided by researcher which directs students to record their reading in the daily Student Response Bookmark (Appendix H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Collect reading Bookmarks and store in envelope at the end of each class period. (Researcher will pick up at the conclusion of 7th period.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Experimental Group Student Procedures*

As outlined in Table 6, students in the experimental group selected reading material for the week each Monday when they visited the library with their class. Students also were issued a Student Response Bookmark (see Appendix H) where they recorded daily thoughts about their reading. Students received a new bookmark every Monday. If the student lost or forgot their bookmark, the teacher had extras in the class to pass out when needed. In addition, if students wanted to read material not readily available in the library, they completed the Student Request Form (see Appendix K) so these items could be obtained and delivered to them at a later time. Every day from Monday through Friday, students read self-selected materials for 10 minutes at the start of each English language arts class.
Table 6

**Experimental Group Student Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monday           | Select reading material for the week during weekly visit to the library.  
                  | Students receive bookmark to record thoughts about reading each week  |
| As Needed        | Students may complete the Student Request Form (Google Form - Appendix K) created by the researcher to request a novel, non-fiction book, graphic novel, magazine, and/or comic book. |

**Data Collection**

Data were collected to assess fidelity of intervention implementation and to address the research questions for this study.

**Data Collection to Assess Fidelity of Intervention Implementation**

Data were collected to assess the fidelity of intervention implementation with three instruments: Student Response Bookmark, the Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist, and the Student Request for Materials

**Student response bookmark.** Experimental students completed the Student Response Bookmark each day at the end of the 10-minutes of pleasure reading. Students recorded their student ID number and had their choice of writing how they felt about reading, what they read about that day, the page numbers read, and/or answered one of the prompt questions on the bookmark.

**Teacher weekly reading checklist.** Teachers in the experimental group completed the Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist each day during the 10-minutes of pleasure reading. As the
teachers monitored the students, they recorded a percentage of the students who were actively involved in the pleasure reading instructional intervention.

**Student request for materials.** Experimental students completed the Student Request for Materials using a Google form. Students recorded their name, grade, and classroom and the resources requested for pleasure reading, e.g., books, magazines, newspapers, etc. The researcher collected the information at the end of each week during the study to assess types of reading materials being requested.

**Data Collection to Address Research Questions**

Data to address the research questions were collected with the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) (Pitcher et al., 2007) administered as a pretest and a posttest.

**Pretest**

After the study was introduced but before the intervention began, the AMRP was provided to experimental and control teachers by placing the survey in the teachers Google Classroom for easy accessibility and to avoid instrumentation threat to validity. The teachers then made the survey available to students through the use of a classroom set of Dell Chromebooks, which provided one-to-one technology access for each student. Teachers in the experimental and control groups instructed students on how to locate and complete the AMRP. The survey began by asking students to enter their district provided identification number then respond to multiple-choice items asking for grade level, teacher, gender, and ethnicity. Following this, students responded to the 20 multiple-choice AMRP items associated with reading motivation. After the experimental and control group students completed the pretest survey, the researcher collected the data via Google Sheets and entered the data into an SPSS statistics program for analysis. Students were identified by their district-generated student identification.
number in an effort to keep personal information private. This procedure ensured the researcher was unaware of a student's identity.

**Posttest**

At the conclusion of the four-week study, the AMRP was once again provided to experimental and control teachers by placing the survey in the teacher’s Google Classroom as a posttest. The teachers then made the posttest available to students with the classroom set of Dell Chromebooks. Teachers in the experimental and control groups instructed students on how to locate and complete the AMRP. The survey began by asking students to enter their district-provided identification number, but did not ask for grade level, teacher, gender, and ethnicity. Following this, students responded to the same 20 multiple-choice AMRP items associated with reading motivation. After the experimental and control group students completed the posttest survey, the researcher collected the data via Google Sheets and entered the data into an SPSS statistics program for analysis. The district-generated student identification numbers were used to group the pretest and posttest data by individual students. This procedure ensured the researcher was unaware of a student's identity.

**Data Analysis**

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to examine the null hypothesis stating that there was no statistically significant difference in the reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading levels (as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher, et al., 2007) of ninth- and 10th-grade students when participating in English language arts instruction as compared to students participating in English language arts instruction augmented with 10 minutes of pleasure reading while controlling for pretest scores. The overall reading motivation composite score was analyzed in addition to the separate subscales: self-
concept as a reader and value of reading. The one-way ANCOVA is often used to analyze the results of two different types of study design: (a) analyzing pre-posttest study designs and (b) reducing the effect of an extraneous variable. In a quasi-experimental study, a researcher is not always able to select a comparison group that is equal to the intervention group on all relevant variables except for the study’s independent variable (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). An ANCOVA is sometimes used to statistically adjust for differences that may previously exist between groups (Gall et al., 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). An ANCOVA is similar to an analysis of variance (ANOVA) but has one additional independent variable and a covariate. Covariates are continuous and are included to adjust for relevant differences in participants (Rovai, Baker & Ponton, 2013). In addition, a Bonferroni adjustment was made to the P values because independent statistical tests were performed simultaneously on the reading motivation data set for self-concept as a reader and value of reading to control for pairwise/family wise error. The requirements for an ANCOVA include having (a) a continuous dependent variable, (b) an independent variable that is categorical with two or more independent groups, (c) a continuous covariate variable, and (d) an independence of observations.

As is convention in social science research (Gall et al., 2007), a significance level of .05 was used to make a decision of whether or not to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis. The reported effect size was partial eta squared, which was interpreted using Cohen’s (1988) conventions set forth for interpreting effect size. The interpretation was based on thresholds of .01 for a small effect, .06 for moderate effect, and .14 for a large effect (Cohen, 1988, pp. 284-287). In addition, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) asserted “some guidelines for small .20, medium .50, and large .80 effects” (p. 55) in determining effect size. Descriptive statistics (M, SD
for the pretest and posttest and the adjusted $M, SD$ for the pretest), the number ($N$), the number per cell ($n$), and the degrees of freedom were reported.

Prior to conducting the ANCOVA, assumption testing was conducted. The first four assumptions of the ANCOVA relate to the study design and were discussed above, and for this study, these assumptions were met. In this research, the continuous dependent variable was the AMRP posttest, the independent variable that was categorical with two or more independent groups were the control group and experimental group, the continuous covariate variable was the AMRP pretest, and independence of observations was met because the participants were either in the control group or in the experimental group.

The remaining six assumptions relate to how the data fit the ANCOVA model in order to provide a valid result. These assumptions include linearity, homogeneity of regression slopes, the dependent variable should be normally distributed, homoscedasticity, homogeneity of variances, and no significant outliers.

The assumption for linearity was decided by creating a grouped scatterplot of the dependent variable against the covariate, grouped on the independent variable. If the scatterplots appear randomly scattered and spread out, the assumption of linearity and homoscedasticity are met. The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes is completed to ensure there is no interaction between the covariate and independent variable. This assumption is determined by looking at the between-subjects effects table. If the $p$ value is greater than .05, homogeneity of regression slopes is not violated. The assumption of normality is examined by conducting a normality test with the Shapiro-Wilk test. For the Shapiro-Wilk tests, a non-significant result (a significance level more than .05), indicates tenability of the assumption. The assumption of homogeneity of variance is evaluated using Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance. A
significance level larger than .05 indicates that equal variance can be assumed. A significance level less than .05 means that variance cannot be assumed; that is, the assumption is not tenable. The assumption for outliers is decided by generating a boxplot to determine if there are any outliers with data points more than 1.5 box-lengths from the edge of the boxplot. Any data point more than three box-lengths away from the edge of the boxplot was considered an extreme outlier. If the assumptions for the preliminary ANCOVA are met (non-significant results), the final ANCOVA can be performed. The final ANCOVA was used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores on the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile of the experimental and control comparison.

All analyses were conducted using the statistical software IBM SPSS version 23.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

Creswell (2012) defined research as a process of collecting and analyzing data to allow researchers to gain an understanding of a research problem. Even though researchers attempt to pose analytical questions and carefully collect and analyze data, delimitations and limitations to research can be found within.

**Delimitations**

This study has several delimitations that limited the scope and defined the boundaries of this study. These factors influences may have placed restrictions on the methodology and conclusions of this study. Despite the large sample size, it was not a random sample of participants. The researcher was unable to artificially create the experimental and control group.

(1) The study was restricted to high school students in one school in one geographic location.
(2) The instrument used (Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile) was adapted from a survey with demonstrated validity and reliability (Gambrell et al., 1996). However, the original survey was used for elementary students.

(3) The survey instrument used a Likert scale to measure the quantitative data and open-ended questions, which can provide greater accountability in reporting and analysis (Creswell, 2012). However, the researcher only used the quantitative part of the instrument for this study.

**Limitations**

This study had several limitations the researcher was unable to control. These shortcomings, conditions, and influences placed restrictions on the methodology and conclusions of this study.

(1) The internal validity of the study was affected because the students were self-reporting. Quantitative data relies on self-reporting, which depends on students being honest in reporting answers and there are always concerns when participants self-report.

(2) The researcher faced a margin of students who agreed to participate in the study but did not read the required 10 minutes each day of the study. Overall results showed that on average, about 95% of the students who participated in the study read each day of the study.

(3) This study had the potential to have a larger amount of students who could participate for the study ($N = 45$. However, data was collected from some students and/or parents who opted to not participate in the study or return consent forms.
(4) Time was a limitation to this study. The study was conducted over a four-week period. It is possible that a greater and significant increase in reading motivation could occur if the time period were longer for the study.

(5) Participants in this study were not randomly selected because the researcher was unable to artificially create the experimental and control groups because this would have disrupted students already assigned to a teacher or class.

(6) The participants in the study who were monitored as non-readers by their English language arts teacher were not identified. It is possible that the fidelity percentage of the Student Response Bookmark would have been higher if these participants were identified and eliminated from the study.

**Ethical Issues**

Ethical issues to consider were that the participants in this study were student human subjects. Even though the study was conducted in an educational setting and it was a normal educational practice, the students completed a survey which did not qualify for exemption under Subpart D on the Use of Exemptions with Children. This required permission from the IRB. To reduce any hint of bias or subjectivities, I avoided using any language that did not describe individuals with a level of specificity. For example, instead of stating “boy or girl,” I stated young man or young woman since the study participants are high school students. I used pseudonyms for any student that needed to be referenced specifically. I also encoded the research with appropriate quantitative terminology. At the end of the research study, the results were reported to the English department of the high school, the principal of the high school, the participants and teachers who volunteered for the study, and the administrative staff of the school district. The research was honestly reported and was absent of plagiarism (Creswell, 2012).
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this quasi-experimental pre/posttest nonequivalent control group study was to compare the influence of two types of reading instruction (English language arts instruction vs. English language arts instruction with pleasure reading) on ninth and 10th grade students’ reading motivation. This study examined if there were differences in a student’s reading motivation, based on whether or not they participated in a pleasure reading instructional intervention over a period of four weeks.

This chapter presents the results of this of the study in three sections: description of sample, fidelity of intervention implementation, and findings from the AMRP pre-posttest survey using a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA).

Description of Sample

Two hundred and sixteen students from an urban, public high school in the southern United States participated in the study. For the purpose of the research, the experimental group, which received the instructional intervention of 10 minutes of pleasure reading each school day for a period of four weeks, included 122 students. The control group, which continued with their traditional English language arts instruction, included 94 students. Table 7 displays the gender and ethnicity composition of the sample by group.
Table 7

*Student Participant Demographics by Group (Experimental, Control)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Experimental (n = 122)</th>
<th>Control (n = 94)</th>
<th>Total (N = 216)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fidelity of Intervention Implementation Results**

This research study occurred over a six-week period (four weeks for the intervention, two weeks for pre-posttest administration) for students at an urban high school with students in grades nine and 10. Data were collected to assess fidelity of intervention implementation and to address the research questions for this study with three instruments: Student Response Bookmark, the Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist, and the Student Request for Materials.

**Student Results – Student Response Bookmarks**

Experimental students were encouraged to complete the Student Response Bookmark (see Appendix H) each day at the end of the 10 minutes of pleasure reading. Students recorded their student ID number and had their choice of writing: how they felt about reading, what they read about that day, the page numbers read, and/or they answered one of the prompt questions on the bookmark. The data reveal that 55% to 73% of the students completed the Student Response Bookmark during each week of the pleasure reading instructional intervention (see Table 8).
indicates that an average of 37% of the students did not complete the Student Response Bookmark, which may be attributed to the Student Response Bookmark not being a graded daily requirement for the participants. In addition, as noted in the following section, 96% of the students were observed monitored by the teacher actively engaged in the reading intervention.

Table 8

Percentage of Experimental Students Who Completed the Student Response Bookmark by Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly avg.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Results – Teacher Weekly Checklist

Teachers in the experimental group completed the Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist (see Appendix J) each day during the 10 minutes of pleasure reading. As the teachers monitored the students, they recorded a percentage of the students who were actively engaged in the pleasure reading instructional intervention. Results from the teacher checklist show that over the four-week period, an average of 96% of the students were engaged in the pleasure reading instructional intervention. Specifically, Table 9 shows the teacher-reported average percentage of students actively engaged in pleasure reading ranged from 94% to 100% during the four-week intervention. During weeks one through three, the teacher recorded an average of 3% to 6% of the students who were not actively engaged in the reading intervention. Since the participants in this instructional intervention were anonymous, the researcher was unable to eliminate these
students from the analysis. It is also worth noting that the percentage of students who were monitored as not participating in the pleasure reading instructional intervention may have been comprised of different students each week and may not have involved lack of active participation each day of the week.

Table 9

**Percentage of Student Engagement Recorded by Teachers in Experimental Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Weekly Checklist</th>
<th>Average Percentage of Students Actively Engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Researcher Results – Student Request Form**

The instructional strategy used in this study aimed to increase intrinsic reading motivation in ninth- and 10th-grade students by providing a choice to read books, magazines, or newspapers that were relevant to the students’ interests and personal goals. Experimental students completed the Student Request for Materials using a Google form (see Appendix K). Students recorded their name, grade, and classroom and the material requested for pleasure reading, e.g., books, magazines, newspapers, etc. I collected the information at the end of each week during the study to assess types of reading materials that were requested. Results from the student request form showed that over the four week period, 92 materials were requested by students participating in the pleasure reading instructional intervention. Table 10 outlines the type of reading material ordered during the instructional strategy based on the student request form.
Table 10

**Types and Numbers of Materials Ordered with Student Request Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Requested</th>
<th>Number Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiction Novel</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiction Book</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic Book / Graphic Novel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Materials Requested</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) Results**

A one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading levels (as measured by the AMRP, Pitcher et al., 2007) of ninth- and 10th-grade students when participating in English language arts instruction as compared to students participating in English language arts instruction augmented with 10 minutes of pleasure reading, while controlling for pretest scores. The AMRP results are presented as associated with the three research questions.

**Research Question 1**

The first analysis examined the following question and null hypothesis:

While controlling for previous reading motivation, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference in ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ reading motivation after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?
**Null Hypothesis.** There is no significant difference between ninth and 10th-grade high school students’ reading motivation when participating in traditional English language arts instruction as compared to traditional English language arts instruction with pleasure reading.

**Descriptive statistics.** Descriptive statistics explored student’s reading motivation measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP). The descriptive statistics for the experimental group and the control group are outlined in Table 11.

Table 11

*Means, Adjusted Means, Standard Deviations and Standard Errors for the AMRP Pretest and Posttest for Reading Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>55.94</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>55.79</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumption testing for reading motivation.** Prior to conducting the ANCOVA, assumption testing was conducted for no significant outliers, homogeneity of variances, linearity and homoscedasticity, homogeneity of regression slopes, and normality. Via inspection of the boxplot (see Figure 1), there were no extreme outliers in the data; thus, the assumption of no extreme outliers was met.
Figure 1. Boxplot of overall Reading Motivation scores

The results of the Levene’s test for equality of variances ($p = .543$) demonstrated the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated. After examining the scatterplot (see Figure 2), it was determined that there was a linear relationship between the pretest and posttest reading motivation scores between the control group and the experimental group.
Figure 2. Scatterplot of Reading Motivation scores for the experimental and control groups.

The assumption of the homogeneity of regression slopes was not violated as the interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 212) = 2.87, p = .09$. The dependent variable was normally distributed for the experimental group as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p = .101$); however, the data for the control group was not normally distributed ($p < .05$). However, the ANCOVA remains robust against minor violations of normality; therefore, the decision was made to continue with the ANCOVA (Warner, 2013).

After adjusting for pretest scores, the ANCOVA indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the posttest scores between the two groups of instruction $F(1, 213) = 12.39, p = .001, \eta^2 = .055$; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Inspection of descriptive statistics indicated that students receiving the pleasure reading intervention in addition to traditional English language arts instruction scored higher on the AMRP posttest than the
students receiving only traditional English language arts instruction. Effect size, based on Cohen (1988), was small, $\eta^2 = .055$. The strength of the relationship between the intervention and the AMRP scores was small, with the intervention accounting for 5.5% of the variance of the dependent variable. The power was strong at 1.00, indicating 100% accuracy.

**Research Question 2**

The second analysis examined the following question and null hypothesis:

While controlling for previous self-concept as a reader, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference in ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ self-concept as a reader after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

**Null Hypothesis.** There is no significant difference between ninth and 10th-grade high school students’ self-concept as a reader when participating in traditional English language arts instruction as compared to traditional English language arts instruction with pleasure reading.

**Descriptive statistics.** Descriptive statistics explored student’s self-concept as a reader measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP). The descriptive statistics for the experimental group and the control group are outlined in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumption testing for self-concept as a reader. Prior to conducting the ANCOVA, assumption testing was conducted for no significant outliers, homogeneity of variances, linearity and homoscedasticity, homogeneity of regression slopes, and normality. Via inspection of the boxplot (see Figure 3) there were no extreme outliers in the data; thus, the assumption of no extreme outliers was met.

![Boxplot of self-concept as a reader scores](image)

Figure 3. Boxplot of self-concept as a reader scores

The results of the Levene’s test for equality of variances ($p = .582$) demonstrated the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated. Examining the scatterplot (see Figure 4), it was determined that there was a linear relationship between the pretest and posttest reading motivation scores between the control group and the experimental group.
Figure 4. Scatterplot of self-concept as a reader scores for the experimental and control groups.

The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was not violated as the interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 212) = 1.75, p = .19$. The dependent variable was normally distributed for the experimental group as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p = .108$); however, the data for the control group was not normally distributed ($p < .05$). However, the ANCOVA remains robust against minor violations of normality; therefore, the decision was made to continue with the ANCOVA (Warner, 2013).

After adjusting for pretest scores, the ANCOVA indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the posttest scores between the two groups of instruction $F(1, 213) = 4.86, p = .029, \eta^2 = .022$; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Inspection of descriptive statistics indicated that students receiving the pleasure reading intervention in addition to traditional English language arts instruction scored higher on the AMRP posttest than the
students receiving only traditional English Language arts instruction. Effect size, based on Cohen (1988), was small, $\eta^2 = .022$. Bonferroni was used to determine significance. The strength of the relationship between the intervention and the AMRP scores was small with the intervention accounting for 2.2% of the variance of the dependent variable. The power was strong at 1.00, indicating 100% accuracy.

**Research Question 3**

The third analysis examined the following question and null hypothesis.

While controlling for previous value of reading, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference in ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ value of reading after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?

**Null Hypothesis.** There is no significant difference between ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ value of reading when participating in traditional English language arts instruction as compared to traditional English language arts instruction with pleasure reading.

**Descriptive statistics.** Descriptive statistics explored students’ value of reading measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP). The descriptive statistics for the experimental group and the control group are outlined in Table 13.
Table 13

Means, Adjusted Means, Standard Deviations and Standard Errors for the AMRP Pretest and Posttest for Value of Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumption Testing for Value of Reading

Prior to conducting the ANCOVA, assumption testing was conducted for no significant outliers, homogeneity of variances, linearity and homoscedasticity, homogeneity of regression slopes, and normality. Via inspection of the boxplot (see Figure 5) there were no extreme outliers in the data; thus, the assumption of no extreme outliers was met.
Figure 5. Boxplot of value of reading scores

The results of the Levene’s test for equality of variances ($p = .478$) demonstrated the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated. Examining the scatterplot (see Figure 6), it was determined that there was a linear relationship between the pretest and posttest reading motivation scores between the control group and the experimental group.
Figure 6. Scatterplot of value of reading scores for the experimental and control groups.

The assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was not violated as the interaction was not statistically significant, $F(1, 213) = 3.54, p = .06$. The dependent variable was normally distributed for the experimental group as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p = .654$); however, the data for the control group was not normally distributed ($p = .001$). However, the ANCOVA remains robust against minor violations of normality; therefore, the decision was made to continue with the ANCOVA (Warner, 2013).

After adjusting for pretest scores, the ANCOVA indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the posttest scores between the two groups of instruction $F(1, 213) = 11.51, p = .001, \eta^2 = .051$; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Inspection of descriptive statistics indicated that students receiving the pleasure reading intervention in addition to traditional English language arts instruction scored higher on the AMRP posttest than the
students receiving only traditional English language arts instruction. Effect size, based on Cohen (1988), was small, \( \eta^2 = .051 \). Bonferroni was used to determine significance. The strength of the relationship between the intervention and the AMRP scores was small, with the intervention accounting for 5.1% of the variance of the dependent variable. The power was strong at 1.00 indicating 100% accuracy.

**Summary**

This research study involving the implementation of a pleasure reading instructional intervention for a sample population of ninth- and 10th-grade students provided statistically significant results. The null hypotheses were that the inclusion of 10 minutes of pleasure reading would not increase student’s overall reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading over time for the experimental group. Students in the experimental group were given time in their English language arts classroom each school day over a period of four weeks to read self-selected material. Novels by requested authors, magazines, graphic novels, non-fiction books as well as newspapers were available. These reading materials, along with a conducive classroom environment to read, helped foster an overall increased level of reading motivation for students in the experimental group. Regarding fidelity of implementation, teachers reported that an average of 96% of the students were actively engaged in pleasure reading during the four week intervention, during which 92 reading resources were requested. However, on average only two-thirds (63%) of the students summarized their daily reading on a Student Response Bookmark.

The results from the AMRP demonstrated that student’s overall reading motivation did increase as revealed by analyzing the pretest and posttest scores. The overall reading motivation mean scores of the experimental group increased from 55.94 to 58.11. The students’ self-concept
as a readers and value of reading scores increased slightly from 29.79 to 30.66 and 26.15 to 27.45, respectively. The control group did not demonstrate any substantial change as their pretest and posttest scores stayed essentially the same and did not demonstrate any significant growth.

The pleasure reading instructional intervention did have a significant impact on the overall total sample population of students’ reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading. Studies suggested that providing time during the school day for pleasure reading can increase students’ motivation to read (Hughes-Hassell, 2008; Morgan & Wagner, 2013; Pruzinsky, 2014; Walker, 2013). In addition, providing students’ choice in what materials they read such as magazines, graphic novels, and newspapers can reinforce reading strategies that subjects such as science, math, and social sciences require (Clark & Akerman, 2008; Hughes-Hassell, 2008; Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Morgan & Wagner, 2013; Walker, 2013). Results suggested pleasure reading was an integral component that led to students increased motivation to read.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this quasi-experimental, pre-posttest nonequivalent control group study was to compare two types of reading instruction (English language arts vs. English language arts with pleasure reading) on ninth- and 10th-grade students’ reading motivation. Much of the research on reading motivation was focused on elementary and middle school students, even though the decrease in reading motivation is detrimental at the high school level. Therefore, this research focused on high school students and included a total of 216 students who consented to participate in this study based on a nonrandomized convenience sample to a control or experimental group. Both groups completed the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) as a pretest, while the experimental group also participated in a four-week, pleasure reading instructional intervention. After the instructional intervention, both groups completed the AMRP a second time to assess their overall reading motivation, which included subscales for self-concept as a reader and value of reading. Inferential statistics were used to analyze the data and indicated a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups for overall reading motivation, self-concept as a reader, and value of reading.

This chapter includes the summary and discussion of the study’s findings for each research question, implications for practice, recommendations for future research for researchers who want to further examine pleasure reading as way to impact student’s motivation to read, and conclusions.
Summary of Findings

Research Question One

Research Question One stated, “While controlling for previous reading motivation, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference in ninth- and 10th-grade high school students’ reading motivation after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?”

The Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) was used to measure the reading motivation of ninth and 10th-grade students after a pleasure reading instructional intervention. As discussed in Chapter Three, the AMRP was a 20 question, self-reported survey created to assess students’ reading motivation. A pretest was conducted to serve as a covariate. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the post-test scores between the intervention group who participated in a traditional English language arts instruction augmented with a pleasure reading instructional intervention and the control group who received traditional English language arts instruction.

At the conclusion of the posttest survey, there was a statistically significant difference between the participants in the experimental group and the control group reading motivation with a mean of 56.14 for the control group and 58.11 for the experimental group. The overall mean point values of student reading motivation were used to understand how the groups as a whole rated their motivation to read. The practical significance was moderately high. This indicated that the use of pleasure reading to augment existing traditional English language arts instruction as opposed to not augmenting traditional English language arts instruction was effective in improving ninth- and 10th-grade students’ reading motivation.
Research Question Two

Research Question Two asked, “While controlling for previous self-concept as a reader, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference between ninth- and 10th-grade students’ self-concept as readers, after participating in English language arts instruction as compared to English language arts instruction with pleasure reading?”

The Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) was used to measure the self-concept as a reader of ninth- and 10th-grade students after a pleasure reading instructional intervention. As discussed in Chapter Three, the AMRP was a 20-question, self-reported survey created to assess students reading motivation with 10 questions that assessed self-concept as a reader. The subscale of self-concept as a reader consisted of the combination of odd numbered items of the AMRP. These survey items asked the reader to compare his/her reading ability to those of their peers, self-assess his or her ability to figure out new words, and determine how well he or she comprehended text (Barry, 2013). A pretest was conducted to serve as a covariate. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the post-test scores between the intervention group who participated in a traditional English language arts instruction augmented with a pleasure reading instructional intervention and the control group who received traditional English language arts instruction.

The posttest survey results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants in the experimental group (M adj = 30.72, SE = .415) and the control group (M adj = 30.06, SE = .468) in self-concept as a reader after the pleasure reading instructional intervention. The practical significance was moderately high. This indicated that the use of pleasure reading to augment existing traditional English language arts instruction, as
opposed to not augmenting traditional English language arts instruction, was effective in improving ninth- and 10th-grade students’ self-concept as a reader.

**Research Question Three**

Research Question Three asked, “While controlling for previous value of reading, as measured by the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007), is there a difference between ninth- and tenth-grade students’ value of reading, after participating in English Language Arts instruction as compared to English Language Arts instruction with pleasure reading?”

The Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) was used to measure the value of reading of ninth- and 10th-grade students after a pleasure reading instructional intervention. As discussed in Chapter Three, the AMRP was a 20-question, self-reported survey created to assess students reading motivation with 10 questions assessing value of reading. The subscale of value of reading consisted of the combination of the even-numbered items of the AMRP. These survey items were designed to gather the value students place on reading tasks, how often they read, and what other reading related activities they may participate in (Gambrell et al., 1996). A pretest was conducted to serve as a covariate. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the post-test scores between the intervention group who participated in a traditional English language arts instruction augmented with a pleasure reading instructional intervention and the control group who received traditional English language arts instruction.

The posttest survey results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants in the experimental group ($M_{adj} = 27.34$, $SE = .502$) and the control group’s ($M_{adj} = 26.16$, $SE = .533$) value of reading. The practical significance was moderately
high. This indicated that the use of pleasure reading to augment existing traditional English language arts instruction, as opposed to not augmenting traditional English language arts instruction, was effective in improving ninth- and 10th-grade student’s self-concept as a reader.

**Discussion of Findings**

The results of this study were consistent and extended the research demonstrating that the inclusion of pleasure reading to a traditional English language arts instruction, as compared to traditional English language arts instruction without pleasure reading, increases student reading motivation. The following is a discussion of findings as interpreted and supported with relevant literature.

**Self-Determination Theory**

This study’s findings suggest that pleasure reading improves intrinsic reading motivation, which aligns with self-determination theory supporting this research (DeNaeghel et al., 2012; Small et al., 2017; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000). According to SDT, instructional strategies that support a student’s autonomy, competence, and relatedness foster intrinsic motivation and voluntary engagement in activities (Taylor et al., 2014; Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this study, traditional English language arts instruction augmented with 10 minutes of pleasure reading, as compared to traditional English language arts instruction without it, includes the three basic psychological needs associated within intrinsic motivation associated with SDT, which may have contributed to the outcomes. The pleasure reading instructional intervention included these three needs, which are central to reading motivation: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009).

**Autonomy.** During this study, the students were immersed in a pleasure reading instructional intervention that represented autonomy. Pleasure reading gives autonomy to readers
because students prefer choosing materials related to their lives, dealing with topics they are interested in, and engaging in personal interest (Hughes-Hassel, 2008; Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015; Small et al., 2017). The students in this study were able to choose materials such as fiction, non-fiction, graphic novels, magazines, or newspapers to satisfy their need of autonomy. When students are able to choose their reading material, they feel competent in their ability to understand what they are reading and “feelings of competence will not enhance intrinsic motivation unless accompanied by a sense of autonomy” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 70).

**Competence.** Students were also immersed in a pleasure reading instructional intervention that represented competence. The ability to choose material they wanted to read insured they were choosing material they were able to read and understand.

**Relatedness.** In a classroom, relatedness is associated with a student feeling that a teacher values their choices, and by valuing those choices, teachers allow students the opportunity to read self-selected material. During the pleasure reading instructional intervention, students were able to feel a sense of relatedness because their teachers were involved in their reading activities and created a classroom environment specifically attuned to their reading motivation (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009).

**Reading Motivation**

This study’s findings suggest that pleasure reading improves student reading motivation, which align with self-determination theory, which supports this research (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Pitcher et al. (2007) suggested that reading motivation can be nurtured in students by not limiting the reading assignments of students to materials inherently selected by the teacher because students tend to reject literacy tasks that are “lacking in purpose and interest” (p. 395). Rather, teachers should blend and utilize various instructional strategies to increase student reading
motivation in their classrooms because reading motivation is an important factor in daily reading instruction (Melekoglu & Wilkerson, 2013). When reading is limited to textbooks and whole-class literature, teachers risk negatively affecting the reading habits of their students (Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015). By implementing 10 minutes of pleasure reading during English language arts instruction, the students become immersed in pleasure reading they are interested in. Teachers encourage the students to read material of their choice without the pressure of grades or testing (Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015). These tenets, situated in self-determination theory, provide a rationale for including pleasure reading as a viable way to significantly increase a student’s self-concept as a reader and value of reading (Gambrell et al., 1996).

**Self-concept as a reader.** Highly-motivated students read for pleasure and determine their own destiny as literacy learners (Gambrell et al., 1996; Guthrie, 1996). Students who exhibit high self-concept as readers are able to successfully negotiate the high rigor of scholastic literacy in addition to engaging in pleasure reading with enthusiasm and interest (Malloy et al., 2013). The 10 questions that made up the subscale for self-concept as a reader were meant to ascertain how students perceive themselves as readers. If students do not perceive themselves as good readers, then classroom teachers face students who may have problems decoding words and comprehending academic text (Malloy et al., 2013). In the case of pleasure reading, a student’s self-concept can have a direct effect on the literacy activities they choose to participate in (Walgermo, Frijters, & Solheim, 2018). This may be the reason that students avoid literacy activities, even the ones where they have choice.

The implementation of a pleasure reading instructional intervention in an English language arts classroom for this study presented a unique opportunity for students to read choice material in an environment where they were normally faced with teacher-selected texts. The
posttest survey results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants in the experiment group and the control group self-concept as reader scores. However, the low effect size revealed the students did not feel confident speaking up in front of their peers during group discussions about reading or expressing their feelings about reading in a classroom setting in front of their peers. Similarly, Wilson and Kelley’s (2010) study of 10 avid adolescent readers’ post-survey results revealed less than half of the students admitted they share what they read, and they were uncomfortable in groups talking about books. It is possible that the four-week intervention was not sufficient enough time to cause students in the experiment group to feel more confident about themselves as readers. Although the teachers in the English language arts classrooms were only instructed to monitor students during the intervention (see Appendix J), perhaps the pleasure reading intervention required more explicit scaffolding in the experimental group to help students grow in self-concept as readers (Hilden & Jones, 2012; Sanden, 2012; Walker, 2013). Therefore, a pleasure reading instructional intervention of longer duration and with scaffolded reading strategies may be necessary to increase student self-concept as readers.

**Value of reading.** Learning experiences in schools can negatively affect the reading habits of high school students. Identifying effective instructional strategies that encourage students to read simply for the pleasure of reading has become difficult for secondary teachers (Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015). Teachers who use the AMRP and other analyses discover students who find reading valuable and believe that knowing how to read well is important should modify their literacy practices on reading as socially-mediated practices (Malloy et al., 2013). Literacy instruction should involve authentic purposes for students to use the library, individualized reading plans that target personal interest, and cooperative group activities where students teach
each other a particular topic (Gambrell et al., 1996; Malloy et al., 2013). These activities enrich literacy instruction, motivate students to read, and increase their value of reading.

During the pleasure reading, the teacher and I provided authentic purposes for students to use the library by coming to the library at least once a week to choose new material to read. Although the students did not have individualized reading plans, students were able to choose books or materials that targeted their personal interest by filling out the Student Request Form (see Appendix K). The posttest survey results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants in the experimental group and the control group value of reading scores. The results revealed that the students know that knowing how to read is very important and that reading is an important skill. However, these scores contradicted the low effect size for value of reading. But, these scores could mirror the possibility that students who are in English language arts classrooms and only read the texts and novels selected by their teacher do not find reading valuable when the reading is not personally interesting (Malloy et al., 2013). Although I gathered the requests from the Student Request Form and obtained those materials for the students to read, perhaps the pleasure reading instructional intervention should have included a more detailed analysis of student reading preferences (Barry, 2013). These tenets, along with teacher monitoring, may have contributed to students’ overall value of reading, but the low effect size of the value of reading subscale indicates more needs to be done at the secondary level to increase students’ value of reading.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study illustrated the potential of pleasure reading to increase the reading motivation of ninth- and 10th-grade students. It thereby provided an additional instructional intervention for educators to use to create an optimal learning environment. There
are many practical applications of the findings of this study that can be adopted by this school and other schools with similar settings.

First, teachers should build connections with students by making reading personal and relevant to student’s lives. They should use the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) as well as other interest inventories that specifically identify how students feel about reading and what they like to read (Barry, 2013; Wilson & Kelley, 2010). When teachers intentionally make personal connections with students, they can create a classroom environment specifically attuned to a student’s reading motivation. After implementing the AMRP, teachers can use the results to design pleasure reading instructional activities that are geared to increase students’ self-concept as readers and value of reading (Gambrell et al., 1996). For example, if you learn from the survey that a student likes to read about sports, the teacher can find reading materials on sports that include sports magazines, the sports section from the newspaper, non-fiction books about specific sports teams, and fiction books about sports that are geared toward increasing that student’s self-concept as a reader and value of reading.

In addition, this student could be paired with other students in his/her class to have book discussions about sports-related reading material and create projects or presentations around what has been read. Students who experience trepidation about sharing in large group settings may feel more comfortable in smaller group settings with students who share common interests. Literacy is a social process. Providing time for students to share what they read may provide the boost of motivation for those students who need social interaction (Hilden & Jones; 2012; Jang et al., 2015; Kelley & Clausen-Grace, 2006). While these instructional activities are occurring, the teacher is providing active teacher instruction and guidance, monitoring what the student is reading, facilitating regular book conferences with students, and providing feedback to book
responses or reading portfolios for assessment purposes (Walker, 2013). Feedback that encourages effort and emphasizes effort can do much to embolden a student’s self-concept as a reader. It helps increase engagement and nurtures a gradual building of value of reading (Jang et al., 2015).

This study has shown that participants began to increase their self-concept as readers and value of reading. Prioritizing pleasure reading as a non-negotiable component of literacy programs can be used to improve literacy achievement among high school students and cultivate a lifelong habit of reading (Walker, 2013).

**Recommendations for Future Practice**

Future research should explore the inclusion of pleasure reading and its possibilities for improving students’ reading motivation as well as their reading achievement in standardized exams. Exposing students to more than the canonical reading texts in their English language arts classroom may increase their reading motivation and achievement, but this has not been examined empirically to a great extent at the secondary level. Thus far, only a few studies have attempted to look at pleasure reading as a way to improve reading motivation (Barry, 2013; Chua, 2008; Dickerson, 2015; Howard, 2011; Hughes-Hassell, 2008; Judge, 2011; Merga, 2015; Siah & Kwok, 2010). Although the data from this study showed statistical significance in the overall reading motivation of students, the scores on the self-concept as a reader and value of reading leaves this researcher to wonder why students do not value reading as much as they should since reading is a fundamental and necessary skill in order to successfully navigate education and society as a whole (Kelley & Decker, 2009).

Another recommendation would be that the time period of measuring the reading motivation of high school students be more than four weeks. Longitudinal studies are
recommended to determine the effectiveness of instructional interventions with school-aged students because participants can be observed over a longer period of time. Gambrell et al. (1996), the designer of the original Motivation to Read Profile (MRP), suggested that the reading profile be given at the beginning of the year to provide teachers valuable information about each student in their classrooms and administering it several times throughout the year so that students’ attitudes and motivations about reading can be documented and compared over time.

Continued use of the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) is also recommended since the instrument has demonstrated reliability and is useful for teachers in English language arts classroom to understand students’ motivation to read. It was specifically designed to provide teachers with an efficient and effective way to assess reading motivation. Pitcher et al. (2007) suggested that the results from the AMRP be used to plan developmentally-appropriate instruction. However, in addition, this instrument could be coupled with additional standardized instruments along with implementing Scaffolded Silent Reading techniques that include student and teacher book talks, quarterly reading goals set by students, and consistent time to read independently during the school day (Walker, 2013).

In addition, student anxiety regarding reading and reading discussions among their peers should be explored. The results of this study revealed that students feel uncomfortable reading in front of and discussing what they read in front of their peers. Monitoring the impact of reading anxiety could reveal ways to help teachers negate this feeling in the classroom.

Ultimately, what matters most is that students become motivated to read. The differences in the value students place on reading and their personal self-concept as readers should be considered as educators in secondary classrooms make curriculum and instructional decisions (Kelley & Decker, 2009). When students lack the motivation to read, whether it is for pleasure or
academic reasons, the effect can be devastating to their overall educational achievement (Kelley & Decker, 2009).

Conclusions

Intrinsic reading motivation is a dynamic construct that must be nurtured in the subconscious of every student. A decline in reading of high school students has created alliterate students who are in danger of illiteracy (Jennifer & Ponniah, 2015). Even students who have well-developed literacy skills opt not to engage in pleasure reading or academic reading if unmotivated (Kelley & Decker, 2009). Although the experimental group showed an increase in overall reading motivation, the lack of significant effect in participants’ self-concepts as readers and value of reading supports the claim that current instructional strategies must be altered to increase reading motivation. Gambrell et al. (1996) posited that a student’s reading motivation is defined by his or her self-concept and the value he or she places on reading. According to Malloy et al. (2013), “Assessing the individual and collective views of students in a classroom regarding their value of reading and self-concept as readers is a classroom practice that supports effective teaching, group planning, and individual instruction” (p. 281). The significant, low-effect results of this study demonstrated that more research and improved interventions involving independent reading that involves pleasure reading need to continue in an effort to counteract this effect. Research in the area of independent pleasure reading of high school students has a long way to go if educators want to create a culture of reading among their students.
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Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) – Digital and Administrator Script

Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile
Reading Survey

PRE-TEST
* Required

Email address *
Your email

What is your STUDY NUMBER?
Your answer

I am in the *
○ 9th Grade
○ 10th Grade

My teacher is *
○ Mrs. Bell
○ Mrs. Bacon
○ Mrs. Fulton
○ Mrs. Friedman
I am a *
- Female
- Male

My race/ethnicity is *
- African-American
- Asian/Asian American
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- Native American
- Multi-Racial / Multi-Ethnic
- Other

My friends think I am *
- a very good reader
- a good reader
- an OK reader
- a poor reader

Reading a book is something I like to do. *
- Never
- Not very often
- Sometimes
- Often

I read *
- not as well as my friends
- about the same as my friends
- a little better than my friends
- a lot better than my friends

My best friends think reading is *
- really fun
- fun
- OK to do
- no fun at all

When I come to a word I don't know, I can *
- almost always figure it out
- sometimes figure it out
- almost never figure it out
- never figure it out
I tell my friends about good books I read. *
- never do this
- almost never do this
- do this some of the time
- do this a lot

When I am reading by myself, I understand *
- almost everything I read
- some of what I read
- almost none of what I read
- none of what I read

People who read a lot are *
- very interesting
- interesting
- not very interesting
- boring
I am *
- a poor reader
- an OK reader
- a good reader
- a very good reader

I think libraries are *
- a great place to spend time
- an interesting place to spend time
- an OK place to spend time
- a boring place to spend time

I worry about what other kids think about *
- every day
- almost every day
- once in a while
- never

Knowing how to read well is *
- not every important
- sort of important
- important
- very important

When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I *
- can never think of an answer
- have trouble thinking of an answer
- sometimes think of an answer
- always think of an answer

I think reading is *
- a boring way to spend time
- an OK way to spend time
- an interesting way to spend time
- a great way to spend time

Reading is *
- very easy for me
- kind of easy for me
- kind of hard for me
- very hard for me

As an adult, I will spend *
- none of my time reading
- very little time reading
- some of my time reading
- a lot of my time reading
When I am in a group talking about what we are reading, I *

☐ almost never talk about my ideas
☐ sometimes talk about my ideas
☐ almost always talk about my ideas
☐ always talk about my ideas

I would like for my teachers to read out loud in my classes *

☐ every day
☐ almost every day
☐ once in a while
☐ never

When I read out loud, I am a *

☐ poor reader
☐ OK reader
☐ good reader
☐ very good reader

When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel *

☐ very happy
☐ sort of happy
☐ sort of unhappy
☐ unhappy
Say to students…

Click on the link in your Google Classroom for the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pretest).

Complete the sections for email address, student ID#, grade, and teacher, sex, and ethnicity and then STOP.

Give the students about 60 seconds to complete this section of the survey.

Then say…

I am going to read some sentences to you. I want to know how you feel about your reading. There are no right or wrong answers. I really want to know how you honestly feel about reading. I will read each sentence twice. Do not click an answer until I tell you to. The first time I read the sentence I want you to think about the best answer for you. The second time I read the sentence I want you to click in the space beside your best answer. Click only one answer. If you have any questions during the survey, raise your hand. Are there any questions before we begin?

Wait about 10 seconds. If there are no questions…say:

Remember, do not answer until I tell you to. OK. Let’s begin.

Read the first item.

My friends think I am: a very good reader (pause), a good reader (pause), am OK reader (pause), a poor reader (pause).

Read the sentence again and then say: click in the space beside your best answer.

Read the remaining items in the same way, pausing after each statement and each answer giving the specific directions for students to click their answer.

After the last question, tell the students to click the BLUE Submit button and then mark the assignment DONE.

Note: Adapted from the Adolescent Motivation To Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) to be given to students in a digital format instead of paper format.
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Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile Scoring Directions and Scoring Sheet

(Gambrell et al., 1996; Pitcher et al., 2007)

Figure 5
Scoring directions: MRP reading survey

The survey has 20 items based on a 4-point scale. The highest total score possible is 80 points. On some items the response options are ordered least positive to most positive (see item 2 below) with the least positive response option having a value of 1 point and the most positive option having a point value of 4. On other items, however, the response options are reversed (see item 1 below). In those cases it will be necessary to recode the response options. Items where recoding is required are starred on the scoring sheet.

Example: Here is how Maria completed items 1 and 2 on the Reading Survey.

1. My friends think I am _______.
   - a very good reader
   - a good reader
   - an OK reader
   - a poor reader

2. Reading a book is something I like to do.
   - Never
   - Not very often
   - Sometimes
   - Often

To score item 1 it is first necessary to recode the response options so that
- a poor reader equals 1 point,
- an OK reader equals 2 points,
- a good reader equals 3 points, and
- a very good reader equals 4 points.

Because Maria answered that she is a good reader the point value for that item, 3, is entered on the first line of the Self-Concept column on the scoring sheet. See below. The response options for item 2 are ordered least positive (1 point) to most positive (4 points), so scoring item 2 is easy. Simply enter the point value associated with Maria’s response. Because Maria selected the fourth option, a 4 is entered for item 2 under the Value of reading column on the scoring sheet. See below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring sheet</th>
<th>Self-concept as a Reader</th>
<th>Value of reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*recode 1. 3</td>
<td>2. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To calculate the Self-concept raw score and Value raw score add all student responses in the respective column. The full survey raw score is obtained by combining the column raw scores. To convert the raw scores to percentage scores, divide student raw scores by the total possible score (40 for each subscale, 80 for the full survey).

Note. Reprinted with permission from the Motivation to Read Profile (Gambrell, Palmer, Colding, & Mazzoni, 1994)
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Student Assent Form

Student ASSENT Form (Control)

The Effect of Pleasure Reading on 9th and 10th-Grade Students' Reading Motivation in an English Language Arts Classroom

University of Memphis IRB ID: #PRO-FY2018-33

You are invited to be in a research study being done by Raquell Barton from the University of Memphis. You are invited because you are a 9th or 10th grade student enrolled in a 9th or 10th grade English Language Arts class.

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to complete a 20 question pre-test and post-test survey about your reading habits.

There is no payment or compensation for participation.

Your parent and/or guardian will know that you are in the study. If anyone else is given information about you, they will not know your name. Your district-issued identification number will be used instead of your name. Your private information will be kept confidential. Any data collected digitally will be stored in a password-protected Google account. Any data collected in paper form will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s office.

If something makes you feel bad while you are in the study, please tell Mrs. Barton. If you decide at any time you do not want your data to be included in the study, tell Mrs. Barton.

You can ask Mrs. Barton questions any time about anything in this study. You can also ask your parent or teacher any questions you might have about this study.

Signing the digital copy of this paper means that you have read this or had it read to you, and that you want to be in the study. Including your data in the study is completely up to you, and no one will be mad if you do not agree or even if you change your mind later. By selecting YES or NO below, you agree that you have been told about this study and why it is being done and what to do.
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Parent Consent Form

Parental Permission for Your Child to Participate in a Research Study

The Effect of Pleasure Reading on Ninth and Tenth Grade Students Motivation to Read in an English Language Arts Classroom

WHY IS YOUR CHILD BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

Your child is being invited to take part in a research study about reading motivation. Your student is being invited to take part in this research study because he or she is a 9th or 10th grade student enrolled in a 9th or 10th grade English Language Arts class. If your student takes part in this study, your student will be one of about 340 children to do so.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Bagwell Baron (Lead Investigator, Ed) of University of Memphis Department of Instructional Design & Technology. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Chip Mims. There may be other people on the research team assisting at different times during the study.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to compare the influence of two types of reading instruction (English language arts instruction vs. English language arts instruction with pleasure reading) on 9th and 10th grade students' reading motivation.

By doing this study, we hope to learn if pleasure reading has an effect on a student's motivation to read.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOUR CHILD SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no reason your child should not participate in this research study.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The research procedures will be conducted in your student’s English Language Arts classroom at North Little Rock High School. The research study will last for 4 weeks beginning February 12, 2018 and ending March 9, 2018. The pre-test will occur the week of February 5-2018 and the post-test will occur the week of March 12, 2018. If your student is part of the “control” group, they will only be involved in the pre-and-posttest. If your student is part of the experiment group, they will participate in the pleasure reading research study. Each test (pre and post) will take about 10-15 minutes to complete. The total amount of time your child will be asked to volunteer for this study is 10 minutes per day for 4 weeks (not including the pre or posttest) if they are a participant of the experiment group. The total amount of time your child will be asked to volunteer for this study if they are in the control group is 30 minutes (10-15 per test).
WHAT WILL YOUR CHILD BE ASKED TO DO?

Experiment Group

If your student is a participant in the experiment group your student will read for 10 minutes every day at the beginning of their English Language Arts class. Your student will be able to read a novel, non-fiction book, magazine, or newspaper. Before the research study and at the end of the research study your student will take a reading motivation survey, the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007). The teachers who have been randomly chosen to be a member of the experiment group are Mrs. Bell (9th grade English Language Arts) and Mrs. Fulton (10th Grade English Language Arts).

Control Group

If your student is a participant in the control group your student will complete reading motivation survey, the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (Pitcher et al., 2007) at the beginning and end of the research study. The teachers who have been randomly chosen to be a member of the experiment group are Mrs. Bacon (9th grade English Language Arts) and Mrs. Friedman (10th Grade English Language Arts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Week of February 5, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Study</td>
<td>February 12, 2018 to March 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>Week of March 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of our knowledge, the things your child will be doing have no more risk of harm than your child would experience in everyday life.

WILL YOUR CHILD BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no guarantee that your student will get any benefit from taking part in this study. However, some people have experienced an increased motivation to read for pleasure when participating in similar research studies. Your student’s willingness to take part, however, may, in the future, help society as a whole better understand this research topic.

DOES YOUR CHILD HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to allow your student to take part in the study, it should be because your student really wants to volunteer. Your student will not lose any benefits or rights your student would normally have if your student chooses not to volunteer. Your student can choose at any time during the study to not have their data from the pretest or posttests included in the study, and still keep the benefits and rights your student had before volunteering. As a student, if you or your student decides not to have their data included in the study, your
student’s choice will have no effect on your child’s academic status or grade in their English Language Arts class.

**IF YOUR CHILD DOESN’T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?**

If your child does not want to take part in the study, their data will not be included in the study. However, students who are participants of the “experiment group” will still participate in the pleasure reading intervention.

**WHAT WILL IT COST YOU FOR YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE?**

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.

**WILL YOUR CHILD RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?**

Your child will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

**WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOUR CHILD PROVIDES?**

We will make every effort to keep private all research records that identify your child to the extent allowed by law. Any data collected digitally will be stored in a password-protected Google account. Any data collected in paper form will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s office.

Your child’s information will be combined with information from other children taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. Your child will not be personally identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your child’s name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that your child gave us information, or what that information is. Students will be identified by his or her district-issued student identification number only. All data, including paper records and computer records will be stored on a portable jump drive. When not being used by the lead researcher, the portable jump drive or computer will be located in a locked area.

We will keep private all research records that identify your child to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we may have to show your child’s information to other people. For example, the law may require us to show your child’s information to a court, if applicable, or to tell authorities if your child reports any information about a child being abused or if your child poses a danger to your child or someone else. Also, we may be required to show information which identifies your child to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from such organizations as the University of Memphis or North Little Rock School District.
CAN YOUR CHILD’S TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?

If your child decides to take part in the study your child still has the right to decide at any time to no longer participate in the study. Your child will not be treated differently if your child decides to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw your child from the study. This may occur if your child is not able to follow the directions they give your child, if they find that your child’s being in the study is more risk than benefit to your child, or if the agency funding the study decides to stop the study early for a variety of scientific reasons.

WHAT IF YOUR CHILD HAS QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation for your child to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Raquell Barton at 501-771-8100 or at raquell.barton@gmail.com. If you have any questions about your child’s rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the Institutional Review Board staff at the University of Memphis at 901-678-2705. You will be provided with a signed copy of this permission form to take with you.

https://goo.gl/forms/hSFwau2typY8LTnX2

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Student ID#

Name of [authorized] person obtaining informed consent

Date

IRB ID# PRO-FY2018-33
Expiration Date: Feb 2, 2019
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### Appendix H

**Student Response Bookmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ</th>
<th>READ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONDAY</strong></td>
<td><strong>THURSDAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUESDAY</strong></td>
<td><strong>THURSDAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEDNESDAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What did you like about the story/article? Why?
- Pick one character and explain why you would/would not like to have him/her as a friend.
- What real live people or events are you reminded of by characters or events in the story. Explain why.
- How do the main characters actions affect other people in the story?
- Would you like to check out other books like this?
- Did you have time to read in your other classes this week?
- Do you enjoy reading?
- Did you read at home this week?
# Appendix I

## Teacher Weekly Reading Checklist

### Weekly Reading Checklist

#### Week 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Percentage of students engaged in a reading task.</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher:** Bell Fulton
Appendix J

Teacher Daily Scripts

**Teacher Script to be read/said to begin 10 minutes of Pleasure Reading**

Students, please pull out your reading material and your response bookmark. You will have 10 minutes to read. If you do not have a book to read, please select a newspaper or a magazine from the shelf in the back of the classroom. (After 30 seconds) -> The timer will start now.

*During reading...Teacher will monitor students and fill out the teacher weekly reading checklist and make any notes the teacher feels appropriate about the day's reading.*

---

**Teacher Script to be read/said at the end of 10 minutes of Pleasure Reading (after the timer stops)**

Pleasure reading time is now over. Please take two minutes to respond to what you read on your bookmark on the appropriate day.

*(After 2 minutes)*

Please put up your reading material and put your bookmark in your English folder. You will need it tomorrow.

*On Friday's...*

Please put up your reading material. Pass your bookmark to the front of the classroom.

**Teacher will collect bookmarks and place them in an envelope provided by the researcher. Researcher will collect bookmarks and checklists at the end of the day on Friday’s.”**
Appendix K

Student Request for Materials – Digital

Email address *
Your email

What is your STUDY NUMBER?
Your answer

Who is your English Language Arts teacher? *
- Mrs. Bell
- Mrs. Friedman

What period do you have English? *
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- 4th
- 5th
- 6th
- 7th

I would like to read a *
- Fiction book
- Non Fiction book
- Magazine
- Comic Book / Graphic Novel