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Abstract

With the advancement of technology, computerized reading management software systems (CRMSS) are being widely used in schools. The effectiveness of CRMSS to increase reading achievement, affect reading motivation of the learner, and foster a love of reading is the focus of this study. The dilemma is whether or not the current research indicates that CRMSS promotes academic achievement. This study will address the research that has been conducted. The findings indicated mixed results and further research must be done to determine a definite answer as to whether or not CRMSS promotes reading growth and/or motivates students to read. It is safe to say that a balanced approach with CRMSS is useful in the classroom.
**Chapter I – Introduction**

Technology is changing the way we teach our children how to comprehend what they silently read. In the early 1900’s, silent reading had not even been thought of as a method that should be assessed for student comprehension. In fact, it was not until the 1930’s when silent reading started to be tested by the use of stop watches and multiple choice questions. Even then, testing was only used as a psychometric analysis to measure intelligence instead of a cognitive aspect to measure comprehension. Finally, in the 1970’s, it was recognized how valuable comprehension is and it became part of the school curriculum (Pearson, 2000).

In 1964 the most expensive and largest education study in the history of the United States was conducted by the Federal Government. The study was called *Project Follow Through* and the purpose was to find what educational programs really work. After ten years, it was found that a method called *Direct Instruction* by Siegfried Engelmann and his acquaintances was the proven system. The program tested students using a paper and pencil method to find their reading ability level. After the level was determined, students were placed in groups with other students according to their skill level (Donaldson, R. n.d.). It was during this time period that the SRA Reading Laboratories materials were born. Developer Don Parker created leveled, color-coded story cards that students were able to score themselves. The goal was for students to progress in increments, and eventually become fluent readers (“SRA,” n.d.). This process may have worked for many in the past. However, today’s learners are experiencing a whole new culture of reading education due to the advancement in technology.

Computerized reading management software systems are becoming widely used in classrooms throughout the country to help promote literacy. These programs encourage students to read texts at their reading level by offering incentives. They are actually quite similar to the
SRA Reading Laboratories materials. However, the computer keeps track of student scores and students read regular trade books rather than text solely written for the program. Schools purchase the computerized programs, which consist of downloadable computer software that contains quizzes on many books available today. After students finish reading their book, a short quiz is taken and if passed, points are earned based on the book’s length and difficulty level. Each school district can decide what to make of the points, although some choose to award prizes to students based on the number of points they receive. There is some criticism when it comes to prizes being given to students for reading (Biggers, 2001; Carter, 1996). Biggers states that students need to be urged more to read, become reliant on the rewards, and when the rewards end read less often (2001). Carter takes it a step further by not only mentioning the rewards, but also the impact of restricted book choice. She noted how a group of middle school students loved two books from a particular reading series, but rejected to read the other books in the series because they were not part of the computer program where they would earn points (1996). However, some programs are credited for raising test scores and developing a love of reading among students (Groce & Groce, 2005). Computerized reading management programs are designed to get students to read texts at their readability level. The goal of the programs is that the more often students read, the better they will become which also fosters reading motivation. Thus, improve their reading scores. Hence the reason points are given, to persuade students to read more frequently.

**Statement of the Problem**

With the advancement of technology, computerized reading management software systems are widely being used in schools. Despite the fact that our children have been learning to read and comprehend in classrooms for centuries by reading traditional text, using a computer
Computerized Reading Management

To help aid that learning is relatively new. This is such a fresh topic of study that the National Reading Panel (2000) decided not to give an official conclusion concerning the use of computerized reading management software systems in the classroom to support reading. Prior to the release of the National Reading Panel’s publication of *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction* (2000), only 21 studies had been conducted that met the National Reading Panel’s criteria for research methodology. Because of the limited research, the NRP suggested that although studies have reported positive results with computer technology, there is a need to answer many questions that still persist (National Reading Panel, 2000).

The dilemma is whether or not the current research indicates that computerized reading management software systems increase comprehension, affect academic achievement, affect reading motivation of the learner, and foster a love of learning. More specifically, if the program Accelerated Reader helps to promote literacy for students in one elementary school.

**Research Question**

In what ways do computerized reading management software systems affect school-wide reading programs and what are the motivators for student reading? Specifically, the effectiveness of computerized reading management software systems to increase reading achievement, affect reading motivation of the learner, and foster a love of reading will be the focus of this study. Furthermore, how the computerized reading management software system, Accelerated Reader, helps to promote literacy for students in one elementary school and what motivates students to read.
Definition of Terms

**Accelerated Reader (AR).** AR is a computerized learning information system that gives assessment of student comprehension of trade books (“What Is The Accelerated Reader?,” 1999).

**Computerized Reading Management Software Programs (CRMSP).** A CRMSP is software installed on the computer that contains electronic assessments on chosen trade books and gives the teacher reading records of students through a database (Rogers, 2003).

**School-Wide Reading Programs.** Any learning program initiated in a school within the subject of reading.

Summary

The following chapter will be a collection of studies done on the use of computerized reading management software systems and the impact they have had on schools. The studies will address the issues on the programs’ effectiveness to increase comprehension, affect academic achievement, affect reading motivation of the learner, and foster a love of learning. The data will be analyzed by an explanation of the results and findings within the study. Studies conducted will be summarized as well as critiqued as to why there may be conflicting conclusions. Chapter III will synthesize the conclusions across the studies and chapter IV will make recommendations based on the findings.
Chapter II: Review of Literature

Accelerated Reader claims, “To Build a Lifelong Love of Reading in Every Student” (“Renaissance Learning,” 2011). To become a lifelong reader, one must be motivated to read, which in turn would create a positive reading experience for the student. This chapter will address the research questions by explaining the studies that have been conducted on Accelerated Reader and stating the results. Also, this chapter will provide information on studies that have been performed on reading motivation and the factors behind it.

Fostering Positive Reading Attitudes and Creating Lifelong Learners with Accelerated Reader

In 2002, McGlinn and Parrish studied how the Accelerated Reader (AR) program assisted English as a Second Language (ESL) students in fourth and fifth grade at a rural school in Western North Carolina. The purpose of this study was to research the effects of independent reading and the capability of the AR program to raise reading levels of ESL students while developing positive feelings toward reading. The Language Assessment Scales test (LAS) was given to fourth and fifth graders and ten were found to be limited English proficient. One student was from Romania while nine had emigrated from Mexico.

Each student was given about forty-five minutes of daily free reading and they were expected to read an AR book of their choice at their appropriate level. Upon completion of an AR book, students took a comprehension test and if they scored an 80% or above, their results were recorded on a class chart. Incentives were given to students in order to encourage participation in the program. An ice-cream or popcorn party was given to the class when the chart became full.
The researchers drew their conclusions through the use of monthly test reports, whether or not there was an increase in students’ reading levels, and amount of student reading. Half of the students who participated in the study displayed an improvement in the average level of AR books they were reading. There was an increase from .4, to 1.9 grade levels. The other half either stayed the same, or either increased their average reading level with the downside of decreasing their accuracy. The report also determined that there was an increase in the reading amounts of students. In September the average student read 0-3 books, while at the conclusion of the study the average student read 21 books, which is a positive reflection of the students’ attitudes and reading habits. Specifically, it was witnessed that many of the students became engaged in the text and full of laughter when completely comprehending; something that they lacked before.

Although there was not an increase in reading levels for all students who took part in the study, there was an increase in the amount of books read and strong anecdotal evidence that reading became a positive experience. It is the goal of the AR program to encourage reading, and with that goal all students benefit by getting into the practice of reading which was displayed in this study.

Unlike McGlinn and Parrish (2002), Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski (2003) seemed to have determined different results when it came to AR. Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski conducted a quasi-experimental study in 2003 on the Accelerated Reader program and the lasting effects it had on elementary students during their middle school years. The purpose of this study was to investigate the claim that Accelerated Reader builds lifelong learners and to examine whether or not students who participated in AR in elementary school were more likely to continue reading for enjoyment while in middle school. The participants included 1,536 seventh
grade students from ten different middle schools in the United States. The schools ranged from rural schools, to small city schools. Several of the districts used Accelerated Reader in their elementary schools, while others did not use it or any other form of computerized reading management software.

The Title Recognition Test (TRT) was given to the participants to determine the amount of reading done by middle school students who were involved with the AR program in elementary school compared to those who weren’t. The TRT is a test that is designed to measure the recognition of actual book titles when they are surrounded by inaccurate titles of texts. The test included a total of 42 titles: 25 were accurate children’s book titles, while 16 were inaccurate titles.

When comparing districts that had AR with districts who did not, the results indicated that there was no major difference between the groups. When comparing the reading levels between districts who had AR and those who did not, there was no significant difference. However, it was found that the districts who continued to implement AR in their middle school curriculum, after elementary school, had students who had a major positive difference in recreational reading when compared to the districts who ended AR in middle school.

Incidentally, having AR in the middle school, after elementary school, does not suggest that AR had a positive lasting effect from elementary school. The study indicated that one district that does not use AR showed a decline in recreational reading by students who participated in AR in elementary school.

The final result of this study did not support Accelerated Reader’s claim that they create lifelong readers. The study suggested that students who used AR as elementary students did not read more in middle school when compared to those students who did not use it. Actually, the
opposite was found in which students who did not use AR were found to read more than those peers who did.

Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski (2003) found that AR was not promoting lifelong readers. However, Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor (2008) not only found that the program wasn’t promoting lifelong readers; it was actually pushing students away from reading. In 2008, Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor implemented an inter-textual analysis study that involved the compilation of focus group data and questionnaires from high school students. Its purpose was to examine student views about the usefulness of the Accelerated Reader (AR) program. The study took place at a high school in southern California with a population of 3,294 students, with 18% being African-American, 37% Caucasian, and 40% Hispanic. Out of the student population, 268 questionnaires were collected and 144 of the students who handed-in the questionnaires volunteered to take part in the focus groups. There were eight separate focus groups which ranged from 13 to 29 participants. All grade levels and academic backgrounds were represented in the focus groups and 51% were male students, 43% were African-American, 38% Latino, and 19% were white.

The AR program was a new series at the high school when the study began. It was required by the school that students’ English class grade be attached to the program and it just so happened that the number of AR points that the students received made up 15-20% of their grade. Within the focus group, many students expressed how they were not in favor of the way the program was being implemented. They said they did not enjoy being “forced” to read, the reading took up too much of their time, they did not enjoy how their grade was tied to the points they received on a test, and the book choices were unpopular. Many of the students stated how
they loved to read in the past but the way AR was currently being used in their school was counterproductive. Also, because of the discontent, many of them cheated on the AR program.

Based on the findings of student views of the AR program, it is easy to say that most students in this study would like a choice on books to read, as well as a limit on the time available for them to read. Sometimes it is very important for educators to listen to the views of students, especially if a program that was designed to help students develop a love of learning was becoming counterproductive.

The limitations of this study include being based on a self-selected sample, African Americans were overrepresented with the opposite true of whites, and the school had not used the AR program for very long when the study was conducted.

The study conducted by Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor (2008) found students to be discontent with Accelerated Reader and not wanting to read because of it. However, Mallette, Henk, and Melnick (2004) conducted a study and found that students did have a positive effect on students who read for academic purposes, but not for recreational purposes. Mallette, Henk, and Melnick (2004) conducted a study in self-efficacy theory. This theory takes into account the factors that sway children’s motivation to read which include their progress, observational comparison, social feedback, and physiological states. The Accelerated Reader (AR) program might be directly related to the factors of progress, observational comparison, and social feedback. The purpose of this study was to find out how Accelerated Reader influenced the reading attitudes on intermediate grade girls and boys with diverse reading abilities. The participants in this study included 358 students in fourth and fifth grade from two different school districts. One district had 235 students in these grades, while the other district had 123 students in these grades. Altogether, 167 of the students were in fourth grade, while 191 were in
fifth grade. The schools were very comparable in regard to socioeconomic demographics and student achievement on the state reading assessment. However, the way the schools used the AR program was quite different.

The school with 123 students in fourth and fifth grade was required to partake in AR activities every day for a full hour and it was a main part of their reading program. Their report cards reflected their AR performance and teachers’ primary instructional function was to assist students in meeting their reading goals for AR and obtaining their points. The other school district used AR as well, but in a fractional way compared to the first school. Their primary instructional function was to read novel texts at each grade level. Some classrooms would read these texts as a whole group, while other classrooms would divide the class into groups and then have students complete a worksheet on the books. Also, within this school some teachers would implement AR daily for 15-20 minutes, while other teachers would use it a few times throughout the week. The students’ AR performance was not reflected on their report card and most students saw AR as a time to attain points in order to obtain items from the school store.

At the conclusion of the school year, both schools administered two affective standardized tests: the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey and the Reader Self-Perception Scale. The findings suggested that AR had a positive influence on the attitude of students toward reading academically, yet not reading recreationally. Additionally, low achieving male readers were negatively influenced with AR with low reader self-perceptions for progress and social feedback.

**Reading Growth with Accelerated Reader**

Melton, Smothers, Anderson, Fulton, Replogle, and Thomas (2004) conducted an ex-post facto study to conclude whether or not participation in the Accelerated Reader (AR) program had
a considerable difference between the reading success growth of fifth grade students as measured by the Terra Nova standardized reading achievement. The purpose was to compare fifth graders at two separate schools in which one had the AR program and the other did not over the course of a year. Two schools with comparable demographics were chosen from the Jackson, Mississippi area for the study. Students at Eastside Elementary participated in the AR program with a total of 322 fifth grade students: 142 African-American and 180 Caucasian. Students at Gary Road Elementary did not participate in the AR program and had 270 fifth grade students: 128 African-American and 142 Caucasian.

In order to determine reading achievement growth, the Terra Nova standardized achievement test was given to students as a pretest and posttest. The results indicated that students who did not participate in the AR program scored extensively higher than the students who did participate in the AR program. By adding the AR program on top of the existing reading program, students in the participating school did not have a significant increase in reading achievement growth when measured against students who did not have AR in their school.

Implementing Accelerated Reader into the classroom did not reflect a major increase in reading achievement growth when compared to a school who did not implement AR. There was no noteworthy discrepancy between the lower-performing readers at either school. However, students in the middle-performing and high-performing reading areas and did not participate in the AR program received higher adjusted mean rank scores when compared to those who did. In order to conclude on the long-term effect of the AR program on reading success, closely examined longitudinal studies should be performed.
Nunnery, Ross, and McDonald (2006) conducted a randomized field experiment study to evaluate how Accelerated Reader (AR) and Reading renaissance (RR) impacted the reading achievement of 978 third through sixth grade students. The main purpose of this study was to complete an experimental evaluation of students enrolled at urban, high-poverty elementary schools and the effects that AR/RR had on their reading achievement.

Out of the 978 students, 250 were in third grade, 381 were in fourth grade, 215 were in fifth grade, and 132 were in sixth grade. There were also 44 teachers who took part in the study. The student body was made up of 89.9% African Americans, 83% qualified for free or reduced lunch, 53.5% were female, and 3.3% were diagnosed with a certain learning disability. The study took place in nine inner-city schools within a southern United States school district. Teachers were either assigned to the treatment condition or the control group curriculum. The treatment condition consisted of teachers implementing AR and RR within their classroom. When using AR, students were expected to read books at their reading level and take quizzes to assess their comprehension level. When using RR, teachers were expected to provide 60 minutes each day for student reading, use reading logs with the students, locate suitable and challenging reading material for the students, and recognize students who need remediation through AR diagnostic reports. This study did not execute any extrinsic incentives for the students.

The control group curriculum required teachers to apply a 90 minute block of reading in the classroom. All schools used the same basal readers and the suggested schedule for whole-group and small-group activities. Sustained silent reading was also executed in the classroom and the district had a goal of each student reading 25 books. In order to measure student achievement, the STAR Reading test was given to the control and treatment groups at pretest, midterm, and posttest times.
The results indicated that students who participated in the AR/RR classrooms showed much higher growth rates when compared to students in the control classroom. By implementing AR/RR into the classroom, students showed positive effects on reading achievement.

Toppings, Samuels, and Paul (2007) conducted a study to find out if positive reading achievement from student independent reading within a computerized assessment program differed by teacher execution of the program. They also wanted to know if the student’s grade, cultural background, or preliminary reading ability affected the performance of the student.

Data were collected from 139 schools that used a computerized assessment program for reading during a whole school year. The schools came from 24 different states in the United States of America (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin). Out of the schools, 2,365 classrooms with 12-30 students participated in the study. Grades 1-12 were used and there were somewhat more boys than girls. Each grade level included students with varied pretest scores. Within the study, 63.8% of the students were white, 19.6% black, 14.3% Hispanic/Latino, 1.2% Asian, and 1.1% Native American. Over 3 million books were read from a database holding the reading results of 50,823 students. Out of the schools, 1,171 teachers previously met benchmark standards for minimum quality execution of the program, or high quality execution, and achieved certification for doing so. This was done through inspecting records to see how often they used it and the average of correct student responses. The measures used to collect the student data included the STAR Reading test and the Accelerated Reader program.
The results indicated that when teachers met the minimum quality criteria for executing the program, the positive effect of computerized assessment was higher for lower achieving students and students in the earlier grades. Teachers who met the minimum quality criteria for executing the program tended to decrease at higher grade levels. When teachers met the high quality criteria for executing the program, reading achievement was higher for all students across all grade levels and abilities, but especially higher for students in the upper grade levels. It was very evident that students who had teachers with high quality criteria had very high gains, especially students in grades 1-4.

The limitations of this study include “minimum quality” of teachers being addressed solely on the use of the AR program and correct response tests taken by students. Many teachers may have been using the program by getting students to use books in the classroom until they are comfortable with them enough to take a test.

Cuddeback and Ceprano (2002) conducted a study on using Accelerated Reader (AR) with beginning readers. The purpose of this study was to research if AR was useful to the reading comprehension growth of beginning readers and if AR will assist in developing the attitudes and comprehension skills of struggling, young readers. The participants included twelve students who were enrolled in summer school because they did not meet their rural, high need school’s benchmark test in order to get promoted to second grade.

The children attended summer school for four hours a day, four days a week. The AR study took place for four weeks during that time. The students received AR treatment approximately 20 to 40 minutes a day, except for the last day of the week in which they were required to write about their favorite AR book of that week. Students were required to read books at their reading level and take at least one test a day during the first two weeks of AR.
Students were allowed to increase their leveled reading choices up one level during the following two weeks. Students were also rewarded with prizes for accumulating AR points. In order to determine student attitudes on reading, surveys were administered at the end of the four weeks.

The results from week one to week two indicated that using a 5 point gain or loss, all children, with the exception of two, sustained or improved their comprehension, with only one child testing below 70%. When students were allowed to up their choice of leveled books, five students decreased their comprehension. However, they still tested within the 70%-100% adequate range. From week one to week two, the class mean rose from an 81% to 83.9% and from week three to week four, the class mean increased from a 74.2% to a 76.4%. The instructor also suggested that the use of extrinsic rewards as motivators did not harm the study. At the conclusion of the study, the children indicated within a survey that AR made them better readers by giving them more practice and all students placed AR as one of their top two favorite summer school activities. The authors concluded that children’s reading comprehension improved with the use of AR when used with other teaching methods.

A limitation of the study would be the short amount of time the researchers had to conduct the examination. Also, only a selected amount of students were used which included only at-risk students. It would be interesting to see the results with students who met and exceeded the benchmark standards to enter second grade. The researchers also made a mistake when they let students choose books above their reading level, especially when conducting a study with at-risk readers. At-risk readers have a hard time reading books at their own level and to let them leave that level when conducting a study skewed the results. The students were showing a good amount of growth from weeks 1 to week 2, and then dropped that growth due to reading books aimed at more proficient readers.
Johnson and Howard (2003) conducted a one-group pre-test post-test design study on how Accelerated Reader (AR) affected the reading comprehension of students in third through fifth grade. The main purpose was to see if the AR program was effective and whether or not it was reliant on the amount of time students used it. In particular, study if students who were classified as “Low” and “Average” readers increased their reading comprehension as much as students who were classified as “High” readers.

The participants included 755 students in grades three through five that attended one of the seven inner-city schools that were researched. The study lasted for one year and the majority of the students qualified for free lunch and were considered at-risk. Students’ reading comprehension and reading vocabulary were tested at the beginning and end of the school year. Three types of AR usage were used in the treatment and included High participation (scoring 75 points and above), Average participation (scoring 21-74 points), and Low participation (0-20 points).

The results indicated that the reading skills of all three groups were improved. Thus, the AR program was effective. Students with High participation gained 2.24 years with their reading comprehension and accounted for less than 12% of the sample; students with Average participation gained 1.52 years and accounted for 36% of the sample; and students with Low participation gained .73 years and accounted for 52% of the students. The least participation came from students who already read below grade level. Hence, AR is not useful in increasing reading comprehension and vocabulary without continuous participation by the students.

The limitations of the study include conducting a large study on students participating in the AR program, yet setting a small goal for students to reach to become High participation readers (75 points or above). It was found that students who were considered Low participants
approximately read less than three books during the school year; students with Average participation read three to five books; and students with High participation read more than eight to ten books. Also, books have different points assigned to them based on their reading level. The Low participation group may have been reading lower leveled books, therefore did not receive as many points after reading one book when compared to students at higher reading levels.

**Using Rewards with Accelerated Reader**

Pappas, Skinner, and Skinner (2010) addressed the effects of an interdependent group-oriented contingency on the performance of fourth grade students with Accelerated Reader (AR). The article is a multiple-baseline design method study that focuses on the reward program of AR quizzes passed. The purpose was to analyze the number of quizzes passed when students were told they would receive an intervention of a tangible group-reward for passing a randomly selected number of quizzes. Some of the rewards included a popcorn party, an ice-cream party, and pajama day. Participants included 32 fourth-grade students, 8-11 years old. Out of the 32 students, 17 were boys, 15 were girls, 24 were white, and 8 were black.

Students were given 30 minutes each day for independent silent reading. When they finished their independent seatwork, they were encouraged to read their AR books. Teachers reminded students often to take their AR quizzes. Once a week teachers printed off student assessment data from the AR program. The number of AR quizzes passed was the primary dependent variable. The average number of quizzes taken and passed each day was analyzed in order to evaluate data. In order to compare between students, students were divided into low-performing, middle-performing, and high-performing groups.
The results indicated that each class had a rise in quizzes passed after the intervention was initiated, but the increase was not maintained throughout the study. When it came to the comparison among student performance groups, the lowest performing students had a major increase in quiz performance. However, there were no considerable changes found in the middle-performing and high-performing groups.

The group-oriented reward may have been the motivator for the low-performing readers to raise their reading performance. Sometimes giving students a choice to read texts they enjoy and at their own reading pace may not be enough, particularly for low-performing readers. The current study suggests that group-oriented rewards within the AR program may boost the likelihood of low-performing readers choosing to read.

Marinak and Gambrell (2008) conducted a post-test only design with a control group study on what continues young students to stay occupied with a book. The purpose of this study was to examine third-grade students and find the effects of rewards, as well as the choice of rewards, on their intrinsic reading motivation.

The participants included 75 third-grade students from three elementary schools in a large suburban school district in the mid-Atlantic region. Each student scored between the 30th and 50th percentile on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition and were selected from a pool of 288 students. There were five treatment groups that the children were randomly assigned to and were balanced for gender which included the control group (no reward/no choice), book/choice group (student selected book), book/no choice group (randomly selected book), token/no choice group (randomly selected token), and token/choice group (student selected token). The independent variable was the reward type, which was close to the wanted behavior of reading motivation and was a book, as well as not as close to the wanted behavior and
included a token. The second independent variable was the reward choice in which students got to choose a literacy reward (choice of book) or a choice of a nonliteracy reward (choice of a token). The intrinsic motivation to read was the dependent variable and was measured by three indicators: number of words read, first activity selected (reading, jigsaw puzzle, math game), and time spent reading.

There were two phases involved in the study which included the observation of a free-choice activity and a library book selection. The books that were used for the rewards included paperbacks that were valued at approximately $2.50. The token rewards included friendship bracelets, key chains, Nerf balls, and Pez dispensers that were each valued around $2.00. The free-choice activities included reading books, completing jigsaw puzzles, and doing math games.

The major findings of the study included that students who were given no rewards and students who were given the reward that was close to the wanted behavior of reading motivation (a book) were more likely to engage in continued reading than students who were given a token. The findings suggest that the closeness of the reward to the desired behavior of the student is a relevant factor in enhancing students’ motivation to read. And that students’ intrinsic motivation to read is not demoralized by rewards that are proximal to the wanted behavior.

The limitations of the study include using low readers and a short time period. This study could have had different results if students of all reading abilities were tested. Likewise, it would be interesting to study students throughout the rest of their grade school career to see if the type of reward continues to play a part in their intrinsic motivation to read.

**Positive Reading Motivation**

Morgan, Fuchs, Compton, Cordray, and Fuchs (2008) conducted a study on whether or not early reading failure decreased children’s motivation to read. A pretest-posttest control
group design with random assignment was used to measure if a child’s reading motivation is decreased with failing at beginning reading. The main purpose was to investigate if first-grade children who initially struggle with reading and consistently fail at learning to read report of being less motivated than peers who are successful at reading right from the start. Also, the researchers wanted to investigate whether or not there would be a gain in self-reported motivation by the poor readers if they improved their word identification skills when compared to the students who did not increase their skills.

The participants included 15 schools from a large metropolitan school district in the Southeast United States. There were 30 classroom teachers who took part, with a total of 75 students who were studied. Children who were highly skilled accounted for 30 of the students, 30 students were identified as being low skilled non-responders, and 15 students were found to be low-skilled non-responders who were tutored. The low skilled non-responding students were tutored with small-group instruction on top of their standard reading curriculum for approximately 36 sessions which were each 45 minutes for 4 times a week.

The results suggested that as students’ reading level changed, so did their reading motivation. Unlike their more skilled peers, low skilled readers had a low reading self-concept. Teachers reported these students as trying to avoid reading during lessons and being less intrinsically motivated to read. It was found that when the study increased the tutoring time for students and helped to develop their reading skills, no related changes in their intrinsic motivation, self-concept, or task orientation took place. Likewise, they did not advance in their reading practice.

It was suggested that students who demonstrate reading motivation and practice had an early beginning level of reading motivation and practice, and that the relationship between
reading motivation and reading skills develops quickly. It was found to be that students who struggle with early reading lag far behind in reading motivation and reading practice than their more successful peers at the start of schooling.

The limitations of the study include small sample sizes, the span of time between pre- and post-data collection, and the strategies used by the tutors. There were only 15 students in the treatment group (low-skilled non-responders who were tutored). One would think with a treatment group you would want a larger sample size. Also, there was only ten weeks between the first part of the data collection and the last part. To fully develop as a reader, a student needs more time than just a short amount of weeks. The tutors may also have not used the proper ways to get students to improve their word identification skills, thus improving their motivation to read.

Putnam and Walker (2010) conducted a quantitative and qualitative study on using a nontraditional learning atmosphere as a means for literacy instruction when motivating children to read and write. The purpose of this study was to research the impact on children’s reading and writing motivation when assessed in various settings.

The participants in the study included 22 children that ranged from 7 to 12 years old. The children voluntarily took part in a summer tutoring program at a midsized university in the Midwestern United States. Each student was in need of reading assistance which included word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. The program took place within one academic semester and consisted of tutors who were enrolled at the university as preservice teachers and had taken classes on effective literacy instruction and were trained in administering diagnostic assessments.

The settings of the program took place at two main places: a community regional cultural and nature center, and the university building which housed the geology department and
university art museum. The regional cultural and nature center was designed partly as a museum but also had gardens and houses which consisted of exhibits and educational experiences. Students could explore dinosaur bone casts, fossils, and representative ecosystems. Inside the museum as an exhibit about children from other cultures and backgrounds and was titled “Children Just Like Me.” In order to comprehend the exhibits in the museum, many exhibits included print, informational plaques, and directions. In addition, the tutors involved with the summer program provided the students with materials such as self-produced writing and books. The children also used computers that had access to the internet to interact with text and search websites. The university building was filled with many geology resources such as fossils, rocks, dinosaur bone casts, and pictures with information. In addition, the university art museum had an assortment of art including paintings, drawings, sculptures, African masks, and an interactive exhibit titled “Engaging Technology” which included robots that sense human presence, televised text, and an interactive timeline of “Intermedia.”

For a duration of 10 weeks, the children and the tutors met twice a week for an hour at a time. Before instructional activities took place, the children’s motivation was assessed by the tutors through a reading survey. At the beginning of the program the tutors walked the children through the exhibits and read them the signs in order to build relationships and assess their strengths and weaknesses. They then developed and taught lessons based on the exhibits and were related to reading and writing. The tutors wrote reflections on the students’ success and behaviors throughout the program. At the end of the program, the students were assessed with the same reading survey once more.

The results indicated that children were motivated by the materials within the many settings and connected them to reading and literacy. Many of them were engaged with reading
information about what they had an interest in at the museum. Students seemed to take pleasure in reading more when it was not from a book and linking books to hands-on activities was extremely beneficial to the students. There was increased motivation by the students who took part in the study.

The limitations of the study include small sample sizes, convenient access to museum settings, students with similar reading backgrounds, and a short time span. It would be interesting to conduct this study again using a larger sample size to compare the results of the students. The students in the study did very well with instruction at the museum. However, not every school has easy access to a museum which makes it hard to implement the results of this study. The students in this study also shared the same skill level with reading. The study could have used students at all levels to see if using nontraditional instructional locations would be beneficial to all students. Also, this study was completed within a short amount of time and a larger time frame would be nice to see.

Differences in Reading Motivation

Marinak and Gambrell (2010) conducted a post-test design study to investigate gender differences in reading motivation on young, average achieving readers. Participants included 288 third grade readers. The gender difference was about equal, with 145 students being girls and 143 being boys. Three elementary schools from a large suburban school district in a mid-Atlantic state took part.

The readers were assessed by the Motivation to Read Profile (Gambrell et al., 1996) which consisted of a reading survey and an oral interview. The reading survey measured reading motivation by finding students’ self-concept as a reader and value of reading. The survey was administered by a reading specialist unknown to the students and consisted of 20 items.
The results indicated that girls who are average readers have a higher motivation to read than boys who are average readers. When it came to self-concept as a reader, there were no major differences between girls and boys and they are equally self-confident. However, within the value of reading category, boys value it less than girls.

The limitations of the study included using students of the same age, using students with the same approximate reading level, and using only certain factors of reading motivation. The study would have been more beneficial if all types of students were used and they were able to offer other areas that motivate them to read.

Everett (2005) conducted a study on the effects of using Accelerated Reader (AR) in the classroom on student motivation and the degree of their reading as well as the affect AR has on student attitudes and reading practices after implementation of the program. Quantitative and Qualitative methods were used to gather data for the research. The participants included two schools from Scotland in which one was primary and the other secondary, and one other school from England which was primary.

The primary school from England was seen as a high implementation school of AR. The AR program from that school had been used for nine years and is the school’s complete reading program for third grade and above. Teachers intensely oversee student reading progress and the STAR diagnostic report of AR is used by most teachers to determine a child’s reading level and to aim for set reading targets. Students are allotted two sessions of twenty-minute periods a day to silently read their AR books. Because there is no school library, students move freely throughout the school during the day because the hallways are filled with shelves of books that are labeled by reading level. Each classroom in the school has approximately 500 AR books in it and at least one computer where students are allowed to take AR quizzes. If a teacher finds a
book that is not part of the AR program, they will design a quiz that goes with the text. Teachers identify the school as having a “reading culture” and take part in book discussions with their students. There are not many rewards that are involved in this school. Students can receive certificates that are part of the AR program, when they reach a goal their name can be placed on a bulletin board in the hall, and they are recognized at an assembly with a sticker from the principal when they reach a certain level of achievement.

The primary school from Scotland was considered a middle-level implementation school. AR had been used for five years by fifth and sixth grade students and provides additional reading activities. The STAR diagnostic report, to earners report, and target history report are used to oversee student progress at specific intervals throughout the year. Approximately 200 books are in each classroom and there is a library for students to go to in order to check out additional books. However, there is no librarian at the library and it is simply used as a room to store books, so students depend mostly on their classroom collection which consist of many low-levels. If students have extra time throughout the day they are allowed to take quizzes on a classroom computer and for reading practice an unpredictable amount of time is given in the morning and in the afternoon. Many extrinsic rewards are used to motivate students which include small prizes, team competitions, and placing names on a bulletin board. One thriving motivator was the Star Chamber which is a bulletin board that displays the names of students who reach 100 percent of their AR goals. However, while the researchers were visiting it only accounted for less than 25 percent of the students. As time passes, teachers report that student enthusiasm for the AR program declines, as well as student reading.

The secondary school from Scotland was considered a low-level implementation school. AR had only been used for one year by language arts teachers in ninth and tenth grade. Students
are expected to do AR for homework and every two weeks read one AR book. Students are not assessed to determine reading levels or set reading targets. Students use the computers of the school library in order to take quizzes. The school has a library where the books are kept and overseen by the school librarian. The shelves of the library contain 718 AR books in circulation that are combined with non-AR books and are acknowledged with an orange sticker. The library staff are not fans of purchasing AR books with budget funds and do not like being responsible for monitoring students when they are taking quizzes. The staff also expressed that they have seen students cheat on AR quizzes and while AR books are getting checked out, books being left on the shelves include new and quality books that are not in the AR program. When passing a certain number of quizzes, students earn extrinsic rewards such as highlighters, pens, and book tokens.

To collect data many factors were used. Researchers videotaped student focus groups, observed classrooms, set up structured interviews with students and teachers, initiated a student survey on self-reported reading, examined AR, and gave the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire which measures reading motivation aspects. It was found that there may be a relationship between the amount of books students read and their motivation to read. Also, girls tended to like AR better than boys and were motivated by book discussions and reading with others. However, AR prizes seemed to be more valuable with boys but recognition and praise equally motivated the boys. The study found no link between the amount of books read and the quantity of AR points attained because students could have read many books worth a low amount of points, books that were not in the AR program, a low number of books with a high point value, or not passing an AR quiz and therefore not receiving any points. The AR software installed on the teacher’s computer is filled with many student reports that the teachers can print.
off and gain information about students on. The data from this study lead the researchers to believe that teachers tend to overlook many of them, which could be helpful for student reading guidance. It was also found that the program’s implementation level did not correspond with the extent of student reading.

The limitations of the study include only using one school from each implementation category and different extrinsic and intrinsic rewards for the categories. It would be interesting to see the effects on student motivation with the use of AR in many schools. Also, I feel as if the researchers made a mistake by not setting up the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards as controls. If each school had the same motivating factors that lead students to take AR quizzes, then it would be beneficial to see which students tend to read more; the high implementation leveled school, the medium implementation leveled school, or the low implementation level school.

Mata (2011) conducted a factor analysis study on kindergarten students’ motivation in reading and writing. The main purpose was to consider reading and writing variation on kindergarten students’ reading motivation. The participants included 32 kindergarten classrooms in Lisbon, Portugal. All students were almost completed with kindergarten and expected to continue on to first grade. The ages included 5 years 4 months to 6 years 5 months. The gender difference was almost equally split, with a slightly higher amount of boys. Likewise, the education of their parents was almost equally split. Of the parents, 44.8% had a higher education, 43% had anywhere between a 9th through 12th grade education, and 12.2% had not completed essential education.

The Scher and Baker’s (1997) Motivation for Reading Scale (MRS) was used as a reference to assess four areas of reading motivation: enjoyment, value, self-concept, and library-related activities. Ten items from the scale were taken and another 26 were formulated. Each
item had opposing statements which were linked to two different stuffed animal toys. Students were asked which animal they closely resembled and if it was a lot or a little. Each of the items contained three different parts of motivation: enjoyment of reading/writing, value/importance of reading/writing, and self-concept as a reader/writer. A scale of 1 to 4 was used on each item. Positive confirmation would be a 3 or 4, and less positive confirmation would be a 1 or 2.

Each child who participated was interviewed for 15 minutes within the last 3 months of the school year. They used two stuffed animals in a quiet room and the instrument was read aloud. The students’ answers were written down on the 4-point scale.

The results of the study specified that kindergarteners have a high motivation for reading and writing. They are mostly motivated by the value of reading and writing. Self-concept as a reading motivator came in second, and enjoyment was the least of the reasons for reading and writing.

The limitations of the study include only researching one area, using only three factors that motivate students, and the time-frame of the study. Motivation for reading and writing by kindergarteners is most likely different depending on the area of study. If a student lives in a more wealthy area where education is valued, more than likely students will have a high motivation to read and write. On the other hand, if students are raised in an area filled with poverty and not a strong emphasis on education, then the motivation to read and write will be low. The study also only used three limited questions when seeking what motivates students. Some students may have had other factors that motivated them, yet, since the questions were closed ended; they were not able to express that. Also, meeting with a student for only 15 minutes is only a fractional amount of time that is needed to find what truly motivates students.
An oral questionnaire by students who are at an age where it is difficult to comprehend their surroundings is difficult to study.


The participants included 384 students who took part in a reading survey, in which about 100 were orally interviewed. The students were from many parts of the United States and the Caribbean and included grades 6-12. The school settings included charter, public, alternative, and government-sponsored schools. Out of the 384 students, 37% were Caucasian, 30% were Afro/Indo-Trini, 22% were African American, 10% were “other”, and 1% did not state an ethnic background.

The results from the reading survey indicated that across all the age groups, females valued themselves as readers more than males. It was also found that as the grade levels increased, so did females’ importance of reading. However, the opposite was true for the males. When compared to Caucasians or students from other ethnic backgrounds, adolescents who were African American and Afro/Indo-Trini valued reading considerably more.

The results from the oral reading interview found that some students find themselves as poor readers and only define reading as comprehending a book that has been assigned in school. However, some expressed how they enjoyed reading magazines, emails, and their friends’ stories. Many students in the oral interview expressed how electronic literacies are often used by them to email, instant message, and find informational resources. Many times, students mentioned how their mothers or grandmothers recommend and buy books and magazines for them. It was found that teachers also influence students when it comes to reading. Students enjoyed literature circles, book choice, and teacher recommendations for comprehension.
strategies. The participants stated how their teacher’s reading enthusiasm impacted their reading habits.

The findings of the study revealed to the researchers that teachers should incorporate the ways students use multiple literacies outside of the classroom, into the classroom. Teachers should model the enjoyment of reading to show students the importance of it to them. Implementing literature circles and book clubs into the classroom should be done on a regular basis. Reading materials of all levels, formats, and topics should be available in the classroom. Also, students should have some choice when it comes to projects and readings.

The limitations of the study include using a small sample size of the oral interviews and not having any quantitative data to backup their findings. Even though 384 students took part in the reading survey, only 100 were orally interviewed. The researchers consistently compared students’ reading survey answers to their oral interview, but were unable to do that with 284 of the students. Also, there is no quantitative data that was used in this study. It would have been interesting to have teachers incorporate the suggestions given by the researchers from the findings into their classrooms, then conduct the study again at a later time to see if there was an increase in student reading awareness.

**Conclusion**

After reviewing the research, it is safe to say that students need a balanced reading program in order to affect reading motivation of the learner, foster a love of reading, increase comprehension, and affect academic achievement. In addition to AR, students need to have reading instruction to gain a love of reading and achievement. Reading motivation is enhanced when rewards close to the desired behavior, such as books, can be earned. Encouraging lower achieving students to read is very beneficial and they may benefit from receiving rewards such as
books; whereas, middle and high performing students do not really need instructions such as AR as much as their lower achieving peers. To increase their reading levels, students need to have consistent reading opportunities.
Chapter III: Results and Analysis Relative to the Problem

Determining student reading growth is not a new concept. In the past, many educators assessed student reading through the use of running records, written comprehension assessments, and oral reading evaluations. However, assessing reading growth with the use of technology and concluding whether or not students increase reading achievement by using computerized reading management software systems is a new idea. Additionally, giving credit to a computerized reading management software system for becoming a lifelong reader and fostering a love of reading is a current notion (“Renaissance Learning,” 2011). Years before, students could give credit for their reading enjoyment to teachers, parents, relatives, and friends. The thought of “thanking” technology never even occurred to some, but that is not the case of today’s readers. Like the past, if technology isn’t the driving force behind the reading motivation of the learner, then what is?

Reading Motivation of the Learner

Years before computerized reading management software systems claimed to increase reading motivation in students, learners were either motivated to read intrinsically (for self-worth), extrinsically (for some type of reward), or not at all. With the advancement in technology and implementation of computerized programs into the classroom, are readers like those of the past? Researchers found that students are motivated by the value attached to reading and writing, their own self-concept, and enjoyment (Mata, 2011); by receiving no reward or a reward close to the behavior of reading, e.g. a book (Marinak and Gambrell, 2008); and by reading from texts other than books and when reading was linked to hands-on activities (Putnam and Walker, 2010).
Researchers conducted a study on kindergarten students’ motivation in reading and writing. The results of the study specified that kindergartners have a high motivation for reading and writing. They are mostly motivated by the value of reading and writing. Self-concept as a reading motivator came in second, and enjoyment was the least of the reasons for reading and writing (Mata, 2011). A study was also implemented by researchers on what continues young students to stay occupied with a book. The major findings of the study included that students who were given no rewards and students who were given the reward that was close to the wanted behavior of reading motivation (a book) were more likely to engage in continued reading than students who were given a token. The findings suggest that the closeness of the reward to the desired behavior of the student is a relevant factor in enhancing students’ motivation to read. And that students’ intrinsic motivation to read is not demoralized by rewards that are proximal to the wanted behavior (Marinak and Gambrell, 2008). Additionally, researchers performed a study on the effects of using a nontraditional learning atmosphere for literacy instruction as a motivation for reading and writing. The outcome indicated that children were motivated by the materials within the many settings and connected them to reading and literacy. Many of them were engaged with reading information about what they had an interest in at the museum. Students seemed to take pleasure in reading more when it was not from a book and linking books to hands-on activities was extremely beneficial to the students. There was increased reading motivation by the students who took part in the study (Putnam and Walker, 2010). Researchers have provided insights into factors that motivate children learning to read and write.
Reading Achievement Correlated to Computerized Reading Management Software Systems

When using a computerized reading management software system in the classroom the results of the studies concluded mixed results. Most studies showed reading growth in students (Cuddeback and Ceprano, 2002; Johnson and Howard, 2003, Nunnery, Ross, and McDonald, 2006; Toppings, Samuels, and Paul, 2007), while very few did not show any improvement (Melton, et al., 2004). This may lead some to conclude that computerized reading management software systems do increase reading achievement in students.

By implementing AR into the classroom, students showed positive effects on reading achievement in one study. Researchers carried out a study in order to evaluate how AR impacted the reading achievement of 978 third through sixth grade students. The results indicated that students who participated in the AR classroom showed much higher growth rates when compared to students who did not (Nunnery, Ross, and McDonald, 2006). Additionally, researchers conducted a study on how AR affected the reading comprehension of students in third through fifth grade. The results indicated that the reading skills of all three groups were improved (Johnson and Howard, 2003). Thus, the AR program was effective. The previous studies suggest that AR is a successful program that increases reading achievement. The students showed reading achievement growth and signs that computerized reading management software systems have a positive effect.

One study concluded that by implementing Accelerated Reader into the classroom there was not a major increase in reading achievement growth in students. Researchers who conducted a study over the course of a year to compare fifth graders at two separate schools in which only one school had the AR program found that students who did not participate in the AR
program scored extensively higher in reading achievement than the students who did participate in the AR program (Melton, et al., 2004). This study shows that while AR might be successful for some, it does not work for all.

One reason that the studies are not conclusive may be how Accelerated Reader and reading is being implemented into the classroom. The study conducted by Melton, et al. (2004) may have been affected by the educators not promoting the program. The classrooms with Accelerated Reader may not have read as often, or taken quizzes as often. However, the classrooms that did not have Accelerated Reader may have had a teacher who fostered a love of reading and instilled lifelong reading into his or her students. Moreover, the studies that found Accelerated Reader to positively affect reading growth may have had teachers who consistently used the program and challenged students to read. Because the findings are not decisive, further research must be done to determine if Accelerated Reader promotes reading growth.

**Fostering Lifelong Reading with Computerized Reading Management Software Systems**

Some computerized reading management software systems lead educators to believe that their students will develop a love of reading by using the product (“Renaissance Learning,” 2011). Researchers have found very little evidence to support this claim (Mallette, Henk, and Melnick, 2004; Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski, 2003; Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor; 2008). In fact, some research has found just the opposite to be true.

Research reviewed in one study indicated that students who did not use AR read more than students who did use AR (Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski, 2003) and in another study AR actually pushed some students away from reading (Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor, 2008). The study suggested that students who used AR as elementary students did not read more in middle school when compared to those students who did not use it. Actually, the opposite was
found in which students who did not use AR were found to read more than those peers who did (Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski, 2003). Furthermore, not only did another study find that AR wasn’t promoting lifelong readers; it was actually pushing students away from reading. High school students who took part in the study expressed how they were not in favor of the way the program was being implemented. They said they did not enjoy being “forced” to read, reading took up too much of their time, they did not enjoy how their grade was tied to the points they received on a test, and the book choices were unpopular. Many of the students stated how they loved to read in the past but the way AR was currently being used in their school was counterproductive. Also, because of the discontent, many of them cheated on the AR program (Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor, 2008). From this study one could take away the notion that students were unhappy with the way the program was being implemented and not the program itself.

The lone study that was found to support the concept that computerized reading management software systems foster a love of reading in students was actually done by accident. Researchers were studying how the Accelerated Reader (AR) program assisted English as a Second Language (ESL) students in fourth and fifth grade at a rural school in Western North Carolina. Although there was not an increase in reading levels for all students who took part in the study, there was an increase in the amount of books read and strong anecdotal evidence that reading became a positive experience. It is the goal of the AR program to encourage reading, and with that goal all students benefit by getting into the practice of reading which was displayed in this study (McGlinn and Parrish, 2002).

Although AR did not seem to be beneficial to some for creating lifelong learners, it did help students in one study. It might be safe to say that the way AR is used in the classroom may
have an effect on whether or not students become lifelong readers. If AR is forced on students without giving them choices to read material that is not at their level or part of the program, then students may start to resent the program. Educators need to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners and if a student wants to read a book that is not part of the AR program, then maybe the teacher can accommodate the students’ needs by reading the book along with the student and creating a quiz for him or her.

**Summary**

With the difference in results in the study, it is safe to say that a balanced approach with computerized reading management software systems is the best way to go if using them in the classroom. Too much of anything can be a bad thing. Accelerated Reader seems to increase reading achievement, but also can have a negative effect on student reading attitudes. Teachers need to be careful with the amount of stress or pressure they attach to the program and possibly let students read books of their choice in addition to reading AR books. Also, solely using computerized reading management software systems may not be the best practice to motivate students to read. While examining the results of the studies, students are motivated to read when they value reading and writing, are given rewards associated with reading, and when books are linked to hands-on activities (Mata, 2011; Marinak and Gambrell, 2008; Putnam and Walker, 2010).
Chapter IV: Conclusion

Recommendation

Students are surrounded by technology almost everywhere they go. It can be found in most classrooms, as well as many homes. With so many students turning towards technology, why not use it to help with reading gains? Implementing AR into the classroom may be exactly what some students yearn for – a piece of technology attached to their trade book.

If teachers are able and willing to implement the AR program into the classroom, then it is beneficial to students when used appropriately. AR can be a motivating factor for students when they make achievement gains, or when rewards are given to them that are proximal to the desired behavior, such as books. AR can be an excellent instrument to use when determining reading achievement gains in students. It measures reading growth that students make and provides feedback instantly. However, AR can be counterproductive if not used correctly. AR should be used as one piece of a balanced reading program. It was not intended to be the sole reading program for students to use. It should be used in conjunction with teacher tested materials that meet state standards. Teachers may want to use it for the fact that it instantly measures how well students have comprehended a particular book and it is an extra component to a reading program. If more advanced students finish their core reading curriculum sooner than others during the day, then they can challenge themselves by reading a book at their reading level and then taking a test on it. AR should be viewed by teachers as just one small piece of the entire reading puzzle.

Areas for Further Research

When it comes to the field of education, there is always room to grow and learn more about the way our minds work. Even though there have been many research studies conducted
on AR and reading motivation factors, we are still not clear on any definite answers. Because the findings are not decisive, further research must be done to determine if Accelerated Reader promotes reading growth and/or motivates students to read.

Not only could research be conducted to determine if AR enhances student reading achievement and motivates students to read, it could also be used to determine how beneficial the points system is with AR. Do points really matter? Or is just sheer joy of knowing you passed a quiz motivation enough to continue reading? Because findings are not decisive, further research must be done to determine in what ways Accelerated Reader does or does not promote reading growth and/or motivate students to read.

Summary

Teaching reading is a current topic in schools today, especially using technology to assist with instruction. Using computerized reading management software systems in the classroom can be useful. Accelerated Reader can help motivate students to read and help with reading achievement gains if it is part of a balanced reading program. However, there were mixed findings within the topic and further research must be done to determine if there is a definite answer as to whether or not Accelerated Reader promotes reading growth and/or motivates students to read.
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