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Thesis Abstract

The University of Manchester
Charlotte Cockroft

An exploratory study to investigate the usefulness of an affective reading intervention in supporting adolescents’ reading motivation and engagement

D.Ed.Ch.Psychol. 2013-2016

Background: There is increasing concern that as students move through to adolescence, motivation toward reading declines. When there is limited desire to read, less time is spent with text, which can eventually impact on literacy acquisition. A systematic synthesis of research which has measured outcomes relating to motivation and/or engagement as part of a reading intervention was conducted. Despite the wealth of literature surrounding adolescent literacy, only six studies met the inclusion criteria. The review highlighted a number of affective factors that may contribute to effective reading interventions. However, to date there has been no research on how Educational Psychologists (EPs) might work with students to address affective factors in reading.

Methods/ participants: An affective reading programme structured around a Motivational Interviewing (MI) based intervention was implemented with three Year 8 students in one high-school. Students were identified as having a primary reading difficulty and perceived to be disengaged or low in motivation toward reading. Five- 50-minute sessions were facilitated on a fortnightly basis by the researcher.

Analysis/ findings: Quantitative outcomes from pre-, post- and three-month follow-up indicated positive outcomes for two of the three students in relation to motivation and engagement toward reading. However, for one student, quantitative data were not indicative of self-report improvements across motivation domains. Qualitative data on the other hand suggested that all three students perceived the intervention to have a range of benefits. Four superordinate themes emerged from thematic analysis of the qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interviews, suggesting a perceived increase in motivation and engagement toward reading, in addition to increased self-efficacy. The current findings identified key factors in addressing reading motivation with adolescent students.

Conclusion/ implications: The present study adds a valuable contribution to current theory and research within adolescent literacy. It raises awareness in acknowledging and addressing the needs and complexities of addressing motivation to read amongst reluctant readers. A structured dissemination strategy is discussed, along with some of the potential implications for EPs. Further, a discussion with regards to evidence-based and practice-based evidence in the context of this study is presented.
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PAPER ONE

The Effectiveness of Literacy Interventions Promoting Adolescent Reading Engagement and Motivation: A Review of the Literature

Abstract

Leaving school without proficient literacy skills can impact future health and social outcomes. The complexities of addressing the specialist literacy needs of adolescent readers have led researchers to explore the use of technical reading interventions along with interventions targeting reading engagement and motivation. This systematic literature review found that while relevant published studies are good quality, there is little literature exploring the effectiveness of reading interventions for promoting adolescent reading engagement and motivation. Findings suggest instructors are mindful of affirming motivational factors and supportive instructional practices, but that these may not necessarily represent all components of the psychological theories from which they are derived. The socio-cultural context for adolescent reading, including peer values and contemporary literacy practices; and the delivery of interventions that target engagement and motivational factors for struggling adolescent readers may warrant further consideration.

Key words: adolescent literacy, affective, engagement, motivation, reading

1 It is anticipated that this paper will be submitted to the Journal of Literacy Research and has therefore been prepared in accordance with author guidelines which can be seen in Appendix M (Retrieved April 15, 2016, from https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/journal-of-literacy-research/journal202049#submission-guidelines).
Introduction

Learning to read is regarded as the most fundamental goal of education and begins during early schooling (Strommen & Mates, 2004). To leave high school as a proficient reader, a student must become skilful in a range of higher order reading behaviours including; constructing the meaning from text, making inferences, learning additional vocabulary, and summarising content from the text (Torgesen et al., 2007). Despite this, figures from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) indicated that both in the UK and US, 17% of 15 year olds did not achieve the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) baseline level 2 of proficiency in reading (OECD, 2013a); and that those without proficient literacy skills were more likely to report poor health and social outcomes (OECD, 2013b). Torgesen et al. (2007) identified that in order to maintain grade level reading proficiency, instructional support is required between grades 4 and 12 in six key areas; reading fluency, vocabulary knowledge, content knowledge, higher level reasoning and thinking skills, cognitive strategies, and motivation and engagement. Despite this, toward adolescence, direct reading instruction diminishes and the specialized needs of adolescents may be overlooked (Alvermann, 2002; Torgesen et al., 2007). Consequently, it is not surprising that students who had difficulty reading at an earlier age will continue to struggle through to adolescence where focus is not on reading instruction (Nelson & Manset-Williamson, 2006; Valleley & Shriver, 2003).

Alongside differences in reading needs, attitudes toward reading also change as students move through to adolescence. Findings from a large-scale

2 Students proficient at Level 2 are able to recognise “the main idea in a text, understanding relationships, or construing meaning within a limited part of the text when the information is not prominent and the reader must make low-level inferences. Tasks at this level may involve comparisons or contrasts based on a single feature in the text. Typical reflective tasks at this level require readers to make a comparison or several connections between the text and outside knowledge, by drawing on personal experience and attitudes” (p. 79; OECD, 2013c). Summary description for all of the seven levels of proficiency in reading can be located in the PISA (2012) Assessment for Analytical Framework (OECD, 2013c).
literacy survey involving nearly 30,000 UK children between the ages of eight to sixteen (Clark, 2014) found older students were typically more disengaged from reading than younger students. Furthermore, nearly half the sample indicated gaining little or no enjoyment from reading. Interestingly, a fifth of students reported reading rarely or never outside class and of these 48.3% were reported to be reading below the expected level. Clark (2014) also found students who were reading above the expected level spent three times more time reading fiction and non-fiction books outside class, compared to those reading below the expected age. While the pattern was consistent across all reading genres, smaller differences were seen with other reading media, such as text messages, websites, lyrics and social networking sites. Comparable US data are available from the Progress in International Reading Literacy (PIRL) where the country ranked 30 out of 45 countries in a survey exploring motivation to read (Mullis, Martin, Foy & Drucker, 2012). Data indicated that 6% of school age participants reported to not be motivated to read and 22% reported that they did not like reading at all. These results also implied that less motivated students had substantially lower reading achievement scores compared to those reporting higher levels of motivation.

Clark and De Zoysa (2011) used survey data gathered from 4,503 students aged 7-11 years, proposing a model of best fit which illustrated that both reading behaviour and reading enjoyment have direct relationships with reading attainment; and that reading enjoyment and reading attitudes precede reading behaviour. Therefore, as reading enjoyment has both direct and indirect relationships with reading attainment, it may be a “doubly powerful source” (p. 21).

**Motivation and Engagement in Adolescent Reading**

Researchers have identified that cognitive processes alone are not sufficient in describing reading behaviours (Lau, 2009). In particular, two affective factors are often referred to within literature surrounding adolescent reading; engagement and motivation. Research has examined the differences between proficient and less proficient readers and found variation, not only in terms or their reading
competency, but also their motivation to read (e.g. Chapman & Tunmer, 2003; Melekoglu, 2011; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Klauda and Guthrie (2015) proposed that some students’ reading difficulties may be related to unusually low motivation, leading to disengagement displayed as lack of effort, attention and persistence, which they identified as the ‘motivation challenge hypothesis’.

Guthrie and Davis (2003) argued that whilst cognitive difficulties may exist, the definition of a ‘struggling reader’ should encompass one who is disengaged or not connected with literacy activities. Such a reader may lack motivation and self-confidence; be extrinsically rather than intrinsically motivated to read (e.g. driven by grades, incentives or teacher request); and avoid work so difficulties can be attributed to insufficient effort rather than cognitive deficits. Froiland and Oros’ (2014) longitudinal study followed fifth graders through to eighth grade to examine the relationship between intrinsic motivation, classroom engagement and extrinsic motivation in predicting reading achievement. The nationally representative US sample concluded that reported scores of intrinsic motivation and perceived competence, as well as teacher reported classroom engagement, predicted reading achievement in the eighth grade.

While the terms, motivation and engagement are closely linked and often used interchangeably, Guthrie, Wigfield and You (2012) argued that they should be defined separately. Guthrie et al. (2012) described engagement as a multi-dimensional construct, encompassing behavioural, cognitive and affective processes. An engaged reader is one who is “motivated to read, strategic in their approaches to comprehending what they read, knowledgeable in their construction of meaning from text and socially interactive while reading” (p. 602). Motivation on the other hand is directing the behaviour in a given activity and driven by the individual’s goals, values and beliefs in a particular domain (e.g. reading).

When an individual holds the positive self-beliefs about their reading ability, they are more likely to engage in the activity (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Struggling
readers often develop motivational difficulties resulting from perceptions of low ability. Torgesen et al. (2007) summarised that low motivation and interest can result in less time spent with the text, which in turn limits practice and experience. This can affect maintenance, fluency and development of reading skills. Indeed the consequences of lower than average reading proficiency and limited engagement have been referred to as the Matthew Effect (Stanovich, 1986). Perceptions of reading competence will affect an individual’s motivation (Alvermann, 2002) and perceptions of low ability can result in reading attitude becoming more negative. This may be due to feelings of frustration, with the reader subscribing to a belief that reading is a frustrating experience. Such negative attitudes contribute to less time with the text, compounding existing difficulties with the acquisition of reading skills and knowledge, and leading to an increasing gap between struggling and proficient readers (McKenna, Kear & Ellsworth, 1995).

Motivated readers exhibit more engaged behaviours (e.g. persistence, effort and time spent) whilst reading text, resulting in them being able to process the information read on a deeper, cognitive level. In comparison, less motivated readers are less engaged and find it more difficult to develop the skills required to become a proficient reader such as vocabulary and content knowledge (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1998). For adolescents who may have spent years struggling to master the technical aspects of reading, Alvermann (2002) noted the importance of providing ways of increasing self-efficacy and student engagement, alongside reading instruction, through providing a variety of texts to promote literacy interest.

Ho and Guthrie (2013) proposed eight aspects of motivation derived from four separate theories of motivation. These included both affirming motivations, or factors positively associated with achievement, and undermining motivations which are negatively related with achievement. These are shown in Table 1 below:
Table 1.
**Theoretical derivation of affirming and undermining motivations (from Ho & Guthrie, 2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying theoretical position</th>
<th>Affirming motivation*</th>
<th>Undermining motivation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Determination Theory (SDT) (Ryan and Deci, 2000)</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation – interest and enjoyment in reading and desire for frequent reading</td>
<td>Avoidance – aversion to reading in school and limiting time and effort toward reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy-Value Theory (EVT) (Wigfield &amp; Eccles, 2000)</td>
<td>Value – the belief that reading for school is important</td>
<td>Devalue – reading is not important and lacks usefulness for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy – beliefs about one’s capability to complete reading tasks</td>
<td>Perceived difficulty – perception that reading books in school is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on impact of sense of relatedness on academic engagement and performance (Furrer &amp; Skinner, 2003)</td>
<td>Peer value – belief that one’s reading habits and viewpoints are valued by peers</td>
<td>Peer devalue – belief that one’s reading habits and viewpoints are devalued by peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *~From Klauda & Guthrie (2015); *Definitions from Ho & Guthrie (2013)*

To briefly explain the underlying theories: Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Ryan & Deci, 2000) proposes that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation lie on a continuum, with intrinsic motivation relating to completing an activity for inherent enjoyment or interest, and extrinsic referring to motivation about doing something for a separate outcome. Ryan and Deci (2000) suggested that extrinsically motivated behaviours could be increasingly integrated and internalised when these are consistent with the person’s developing values. Furthermore, Ryan and Deci (2000) proposed three central factors in enhancing self-regulation as: competence - to what extent the individual feels efficacious in relation to a goal; autonomy – the extent to which actions are self-initiated and self-endorsed, rather than being controlled by external forces; and relatedness - the extent to which significant others, who are genuinely interested in the individual and their well-being, are seen as being related to the behaviour.
Expectancy-Value Theory (EVT) (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) observes how a significant number of cultural, social, engagement and motivational factors impact on the value judgements individuals make about different tasks. Atkinson (2009) proposed that the EVT framework was particularly useful for understanding the reading behaviours of adolescent boys in a high school context within which there was significant literacy underachievement. Bandura (1997) purported that self-efficacy, a domain-specific concept, “is concerned not with the number of skills you have, but with what you believe you can do with what you have under a variety of circumstances” (p.37). The least studied of the constructs (Klauda & Guthrie, 2015), peer value, derives from research which postulates that peers play a role in children and young people’s academic motivation and success at school (Furrer & Skinner, 2003). Through perceptions that peers value an individual’s opinions and views, a sense of relatedness is believed to be established, which has shown to have positive correlations with reading achievement (Guthrie & Ho, 2013).

From the work of Guthrie and Wigfield (2000), Guthrie et al. (2012) adapted the engagement model of reading to describe how classroom context and instruction, reading motivation, behavioural engagement (e.g., time spent reading, attention and persistence) and achievement are related, as illustrated in Figure 1. Guthrie et al. (2012) highlighted the direct and indirect links that the classroom context has on engagement processes in reading and consequently, on reading achievement, and concluded that behavioural engagement in reading directly impacts on reading competence and motivation to read. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) also identified nine supportive instructional practices within their engagement model of reading (later adapted by Guthrie et al., 2012) which were: learning and knowledge goals, real-world interactions, autonomy support, interesting text, strategy instruction, collaboration, rewards and praise, evaluation, and teacher involvement. These relate to students’ reading motivation, engagement and achievement.
Rationale and Research Questions

Despite arguments for supporting engagement and motivational factors for struggling adolescent readers, to date research has focused primarily on technical reading interventions. Scammacca et al. (2007) synthesised findings from 31 studies which focused on adolescent reading outcomes measuring fluency of text reading, vocabulary and use of comprehension. Whilst their findings demonstrated benefits in terms of reading efficacy, motivation and engagement were not focus areas. In a later meta-analysis, Edmonds et al. (2009) claimed social and affective factors such as motivation and engagement may have contributed to improved adolescent outcomes in reading comprehension, but were unable to explore these variables in their synthesis, concluding instead that future research should gain a better understanding of their impact. Similarly, Torgesen et al. (2007) stated that “evidence-based methods for improving student motivation and engagement should have a high priority in efforts to improve adolescent literacy outcomes.” (pp. 53).

While there is a growing focus within the literature on effective technical reading interventions, much less is known about how engagement and motivational factors within reading interventions might support adolescent reading
development. Acknowledging this gap, the current paper aims to provide a systematic synthesis of research that has measured outcomes relating to motivation and/or engagement as part of a reading intervention targeted for adolescent readers; and to identify factors that may contribute to its effectiveness.

**Method**

**Selection of Studies**

The current review follows guidance set out within the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) Statement (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009) which consists of a 27-item checklist outlining the processes for identifying and reporting studies (see Appendix A). The PRISMA framework is particularly useful for evaluations of interventions (Moher et al., 2009).

To be included within this current systematic literature review, the article had to be: (a) published within a peer-reviewed journal between 2000 and 2014, (b) an evaluation of an intervention aimed at increasing reading motivation and/or engagement as at least one of the intervention outcomes, (c) conducted within a mainstream high school setting with young people aged between eleven to seventeen, and (d) written in the English language. Electronic databases (PsychInfo, ERIC and Web of Science) were searched using the following terms: read* motivation or read* engag* AND adolescen* OR child* OR youth* or young pe* OR teen* OR pupil* OR student* OR learner* AND interven* OR program* OR package AND school. Reference lists of papers identified were examined for any additional publications that may have met inclusion criteria.

**Screening and Study Quality Assessment**

The quality of the remaining papers was assessed. As both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were accepted, two frameworks were used to assess quality. The frameworks developed for a systematic literature review exploring the effectiveness of solution-focused brief therapy (Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes &
Green, 2013) were used as will now be described.

Quantitative studies were assessed using criteria drawn from the American Psychological Association (APA) (2006) which gives credit for six specific criteria including: the use of randomised group design; focus on a specific well defined problem; comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo, or less preferably, standard control; use of manuals and procedures for monitoring and fidelity checks; sample large enough to detect effect (from Cohen, 1992); and, use of outcome measure(s) that has demonstrably good reliability and validity. Points were given for criteria met, with seven points as the maximum. Once scored, a quality description of high was given for five to seven points, medium for three to four points and low for zero to two points. Quality ratings for quantitative evaluation research can be found in Appendix B.

Qualitative studies were assessed using criteria drawn from Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis and Dillon (2003) and Henwood and Pidgeon (1992). Points were awarded for each criterion met with a total of twelve points being the maximum. Criterion included the appropriateness of the research design; clear sampling rationale; well executed data collection; analysis close to the data; emergent theory related to the problem; evidence of explicit reflexivity; comprehensiveness of documentation; negative case analysis; clarity and coherence of the reporting; evidence or researcher-participant negotiation; transferable conclusions; and, evidence of attention to ethical issues. Once scored, a quality description of high was given for nine to twelve points, medium for five to eight points and low for zero to four points. Quality ratings for qualitative evaluation research can be found in Appendix C. Where mixed-method research approaches were used, both frameworks were applied and the higher quality score was awarded.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

For all included studies, data were extracted and synthesised into tables which included data relating to: (a) the aims of the study, (b) the study design and content, (c) the participants, and (d) pre- and post-intervention measures and
outcomes. The current paper first considers the appraisal of the studies included within this review by providing a brief summary of the focus, delivery and targeted population of the interventions included. The subsequent section provides an overview of each of the articles reviewed along with the main findings.

Results

A total of 664 papers were identified as being potentially relevant from electronic searches and reference harvesting. Further examination of title and abstract excluded 628 leaving a total of 36 papers remaining. After reading full papers, a further 30 were excluded as not meeting inclusion criteria, leaving six to be included in the current review. A flow chart in Figure 2 illustrates the number of articles at each stage of the review (Moher et al., 2007). Quality assessment concluded that four of six studies were of high quality (Cantrell et al., 2014; Cuevas, Russell, & Irving, 2012; Guthrie, Klauda, & Ho, 2013; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014) and the remaining two studies were of medium quality (Lau & Chan, 2007; Mercurio, 2005). All quality ratings can be found in Appendix B and C.

Table 2 illustrates the studies included along with the main characteristics. The first aim of the current review was to identify effective reading interventions that aimed to also improve adolescents’ reading motivation and/or engagement. A further aim was to identify factors that might contribute to effective reading interventions, specifically in relation to engagement and motivational factors. In order to detail these aims, firstly, an overview of key characteristics across all of the studies is provided. A narrative account of each included paper will then follow to provide descriptions of the interventions and their outcomes. Finally, engagement and motivational factors identified within the reading interventions will be discussed.
Figure 2. *PRISMA* flowchart.

- **Identification**: 664 records identified through database searching and reference harvesting.
  - 664 records screened
    - 628 records excluded (not meeting inclusion criteria or duplicates)
    - 36 full texts assessed for eligibility
      - 30 full text articles excluded
      - 5 studies included in quantitative synthesis
      - 1 study included in qualitative synthesis
Table 2

**Intervention Characteristics and Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article authors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Age and presenting difficulties (if any)</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Intervention description</th>
<th>Intervention intensity and duration</th>
<th>Measures and outcomes</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantrell, Almasi, Rintamaa, Carter, Pennington and Buckman (2014)</td>
<td>851 (intervention group 462)</td>
<td>Sixth grade students with reading difficulties</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial</td>
<td>The Learning Strategies Curriculum is designed to help students derive meaning from the text, identify and remember key information and develop writing and competence.</td>
<td>250 minutes per week over one academic year</td>
<td>Reading comprehension (GRADE;c)= ( r^2 = .226 ) (moderate to large) Use of reading strategies (MARS; c)* ES ( r^2 = .228 ) (moderate to large)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuevas Russell and Irving (2012)</td>
<td>107 (intervention group 62)</td>
<td>High school students aged between 15 – 17</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental design</td>
<td>Independent Silent Reading (ISR) computer module programme.</td>
<td>14 x one hour sessions over 18 weeks</td>
<td>Comprehension ability (GMRST; c)* ES ( d = .61 ) (moderate to large) Total reading ability (GMRST; c)* ES ( d = .60 ) (moderate) Text specific reading assignments (TSRA; c)* ES not given Motivation to read (AMRS; c)* ES ( d = .66 ) (moderate to large)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article authors</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Age and presenting difficulties (if any)</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Intervention description</td>
<td>Intervention intensity and duration</td>
<td>Measures and outcomes</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie and Klauda (2014)</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Seventh grade students</td>
<td>Switching replications design</td>
<td>Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI): Cognitive strategy instruction combined with motivational-engagement support.</td>
<td>90 minutes daily over four weeks</td>
<td>Information text comprehension: (ITCA; c)* ES $d = .26$ (small to moderate) Reading fluency: (WJRF; c)= Motivation and engagement: (RME; c)* ES $\beta = .25$ (small to moderate)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie, Klauda and Ho (2013)</td>
<td>1159 (intervention group 854)</td>
<td>Seventh grade students</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental design</td>
<td>Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI): Cognitive strategy instruction combined with motivational-engagement support.</td>
<td>90 minutes daily over six weeks</td>
<td>Reading achievement: (ITCA; c)* Reading motivation: (MRIB-S; c)* No effect sizes are reported.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau and Chan (2007)</td>
<td>88 (intervention group 22)</td>
<td>Seventh grade students with reading difficulties</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental design</td>
<td>Cognitive strategy instruction supporting reading comprehension, reading strategy use, metacognitive skills and reading motivation.</td>
<td>32 x 35 minute sessions, delivered once or twice daily over a period of six weeks.</td>
<td>Reading strategy and comprehension (RSCT; c)* ES $\eta^2 = .18$ (large) Reading motivation (RMQ; c)= Transfer effects (RTT; c)= Use of reading strategies Descriptive statistics demonstrated that the EG scored higher that the CG in three of four strategies assessed.</td>
<td>Four-month follow-up:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article authors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Age and presenting difficulties (if any)</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Intervention description</th>
<th>Intervention intensity and duration</th>
<th>Measures and outcomes</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercurio (2005)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Seventh grade students</td>
<td>Interviews and field notes</td>
<td>Self-selection reading programme.</td>
<td>Three x 90 minute sessions a week over one academic year.</td>
<td>Seven emerging themes: (1) students naturally reflected on literacy elements discussed in class, (2) students engaged in serious self-reflection while reading books, (3) students learned how to choose books that were right for them, (4) students learned they could enjoy a book, (5) students learned they could enjoy more than one genre, (6) students chose reading over other activities, and (7) students became more involved, interested readers.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Outcome measures used; GRADE = Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation. MRQ = Motivation to Read Questionnaire. MARSII = Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory. GMRST = Gate-MacGinitie Reading Skills Test. TRSA = Text Specific Reading Assignment. AMRS = Adult Motivation for Reading Survey. ITCA = Informational Text Comprehension Assessment. WJRF = Woodcock-Johnson Reading Fluency Test (third edition). RME = Reading Motivation and Engagement survey. MRGB-S = Motivation for Reading Information Books in School. RSCT = Reading Strategy and Comprehension Test. RMQ = Reading Motivation Questionnaire. RTT = Reading Transfer Test. Motivation measures are in boldface. * indicates presence of statistically significant difference. = indicates no significant change from baseline to post-test or no significant difference between intervention and control group. c = child report
Key Characteristics

Focus/aim.

Five different interventions were evaluated within the six studies, as illustrated in Table 2. A common focus of five of the studies was to improve both reading performance and motivation, by focusing on technical (for example, comprehension skills such as vocabulary development and inferencing) and, engagement and motivational components of reading. The exception was Mercurio (2005), which evaluated a programme that focused on engagement and motivational components, in aiming to increase students’ reading engagement and enjoyment.

Delivery, group size and time.

All of the interventions were delivered within school as whole class sessions. Teachers within the participating schools delivered the interventions, with the exception of one intervention that was delivered directly by the researcher, who was an experienced teacher (Lau & Chan, 2007). The length of the intervention varied from between four weeks to a whole academic year, as illustrated in Table 2. Intensity of the delivery also varied from daily sessions (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013; Lau & Chan, 2007) to a single session per week (Cuevas et al., 2012).

Target group and age range.

Interestingly, only two of the selected studies specifically targeted adolescents with identified reading difficulties (Cantrell et al., 2014; Lau & Chan, 2007) whilst the remaining four studies were aimed more universally. Five of the six studies selected for review targeted early adolescence, with the exception of Cuevas et al.’s (2012) research, which examined the impact of their reading programme with students in the tenth grade.

Reading materials.

The focus of reading materials that were offered within the interventions
mainly focused on curriculum-based text (Cuevas et al., 2012; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013; Lau & Chan, 2007). For example, the text read by students in Guthrie and Klauda’s (2014) study was focused around historical topics. Similarly, the reading material used in Cuevas et al.’s (2012) study was focused around canonical passages from American Literature. However, both Cantrell et al. (2014) and Mecruio (2005) used a mix of both curriculum and non-curriculum text within their reading programmes emphasising an increased element of text choice.

**Narrative Descriptions of Qualifying Studies**

**Cantrell et al. (2014)**

A randomized-controlled trial of 462 sixth-grade students with below average reading scores was used to examine the year-long impact of a supplemental reading course, the Learning Strategies Curriculum (LSC), which comprised of strategy-based instruction. Students in the intervention group were provided with a minimum of 250 minutes per week of the LSC.

The authors aimed to explore two dimensions of students’ reading engagement; motivational and cognitive. They also sought to examine the impact on reading achievement. Trained on the implementation of the intervention, teachers delivered lessons based on a number of LSC strategies to support students to derive meaning from the text, identify and remember key parts of the text and develop writing competence. Eight critical instruction procedures were used to teach each of the strategies within the programme. These included: pre-test and make commitments, describe, model, verbal practice, controlled practice and feedback, advanced practice and feedback, post-test and make commitments, and generalization.

The results indicated positive student perceptions for strategy use, along with significantly improved scores for reading motivation for the intervention group. These two measures produced moderate to large effect sizes. Interestingly, reading motivation domains measured (efficacy, extrinsic and intrinsic) also highlighted significantly improved scores, with the exception being the social
domain. Cantrell et al. (2014) speculated that this may have been due to insufficient opportunities for social interaction (e.g. discussion). Finally, the authors noted no significant improvements in reading comprehension and postulated that students may not have had sufficient time to ‘internalize’ the strategies learnt.

**Cuevas et al. (2012)**

The aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of a technology supported Independent Silent Reading (ISR) programme on high school students’ reading comprehension and reading motivation. The researchers developed a computer package, which consisted of scaffolding techniques to address four components seen as essential in improving adolescents’ reading comprehension: improving vocabulary; prior knowledge and background information; inferencing and prediction; and cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Participants were 145 high school students aged 15-17 years with a range of reading abilities. They were randomly assigned to one of three groups (two experimental and one control group).

The results indicated a positive effect for the computer-based ISR with significantly improved scores in reading achievement and reading motivation when compared to the control group with moderate to large effect sizes.

Because the next two studies both use the Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI), they will be considered chronologically.

**Guthrie, Klauda and Ho (2013)**

This study examined the impact of the CORI intervention on students’ reading motivation, reading engagement and reading achievement. CORI emphasises the use of motivational practices that are associated with affirming motivations (intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, peer value and value) by enabling success, providing choice, fostering collaboration, emphasising importance and affording relevance. CORI also includes cognitive strategy instruction mainly in the forms of teaching inferencing, summarising and concept mapping.
This large-scale study consisted of 1,159 seventh grade students across four middle-schools. CORI was delivered by the students’ usual reading and language arts class teachers who had received training and underwent fidelity checks. CORI was implemented daily in place of traditional reading and language instruction over a 90-minute session.

Using structural equation model comparisons for analysis, findings highlighted that students who received CORI had significantly higher scores in affirming motivations, dedication and reading achievement than those receiving traditional instruction.

**Guthrie and Klauda (2014)**

This study explored whether CORI combined with explicit support for student motivation and engagement would increase informational text comprehension and student motivation. Four motivational constructs were provided by teachers through CORI (competence support; providing choice; emphasising importance of reading; and arranging collaboration) to 615 seventh-grade students within four middle schools. Cognitive scaffolding was also embedded within the current approach in the forms of strategy instruction, summarisation and concept mapping. The study extended previous literature which had mainly focused on elementary students and used quasi-experimental research methods. Using within-subjects experimental design allowed for more rigorously defined controls.

The results indicated positive student perceptions’ of teachers’ use of instructional supports along with significantly improved scores on the informational text comprehension and reading motivation measures with small to medium effect sizes.

**Lau and Chan (2007)**

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of a new approach to
teaching reading comprehension to Hong Kong low achievers - Cognitive Strategy Instruction (CSI). The authors noted that traditionally, Chinese language instruction was predominately teacher-focused (e.g. delivering all of the information of a prescribed text), rather than being theoretically driven and more student-focused. Adapting CSI to fit with Chinese language teaching, the authors aimed to enhance reading comprehension, strategy use, metacognitive skill development and improve reading motivation. The programme consisted of four sets of reading comprehension strategies taught through teacher explanation and modelling, along with guided and independent practices. Metacognitive skills were also embedded within instruction. To enhance reading motivation, the programme emphasised the use of motivational elements, which included recognising students’ improvements to support self-efficacy; using a range of interesting reading materials; activities to promote peer collaboration and co-operative learning; and, an emphasis on effort and optimism.

Eighty-eight low achieving seventh grade students were randomly assigned to one of four groups - the intervention group or one of three control groups. The intervention group received thirty-two, 35 minute sessions over six weeks whilst the control groups received traditional instruction.

Findings indicated the CSI programme significantly improved reading comprehension with large effect sizes calculated. This positive trend was maintained for the most part during a follow-up analysis four months later. Results also indicated positive improvements in strategy use and metacognitive skills. However, data for students’ overall reading motivation did not significantly improve.

**Mercurio (2005)**

This study aimed to elicit student perceptions of a self-selection reading programme and to examine changes in attitudes toward reading. The authors proposed that a reading programme that provided middle school students with choice in what they read would foster reading engagement and make reading a
more enjoyable experience. One hundred and eight seventh-grade students in one middle school took part in an additional reading class, which took place for 90 minutes, three times a week over one academic year.

The intervention had several elements embedded within it. Firstly, students were given autonomy in choosing their own reading material. Although there were some restrictions, the choice of material was broad. Along with providing time within the session to read their chosen text, students also participated in a range of activities including group discussions, projects and mini-lessons. Students were required to take responsibility by reading for an additional 30 minutes per evening and writing a book journal, which aimed to engage the reader with the text and foster critical thinking. Therefore, as well as identifying ways to engage and motivate students in reading practices, cognitive reading processes were also factored in.

Data was collected through field notes, surveys and in-depth interviews. This yielded seven emergent themes (see Table 2). In addition to qualitative data, supplemental descriptive statistics of students’ attitudes toward reading and time spent reading were gathered prior to, and following the reading programme. These data demonstrated a higher percentage of positive student attitudes toward reading and more time spent reading per week out of school.

Engagement and motivational factors of interventions

The content of the interventions described within the papers reviewed was organised into the four affirming motivational constructs - intrinsic motivation, value, self-efficacy and peer value - that are suggested to be positively associated with achievement (Guthrie et al., 2012) (see Table 1). The following sections will provide a brief overview of how the constructs were incorporated (where explicitly defined) within the interventions. Further details are provided in Table 3.
Table 3.

**Affirming motivational factors represented in the interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article author</th>
<th>Motivational Components</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Peer value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantrell et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Self-selected reading material</td>
<td>Variety of reading material (e.g. newspapers, magazines, plays)</td>
<td>Feedback provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of using reading strategies emphasised</td>
<td>Make verbal commitment to improve skills</td>
<td>Opportunities to monitor own progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuevas et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Reading material provided on a computer</td>
<td>Benefits of using reading strategies emphasised</td>
<td>Opportunities to monitor own progress and understanding</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie and Klauda (2014)</td>
<td>Self-selected reading material</td>
<td>Opportunities to demonstrate learning</td>
<td>Student input of topic areas</td>
<td>Relating texts to personal background Building concrete knowledge from the text (e.g. explaining how reading complements videos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Self-selected reading material</td>
<td>Opportunities to demonstrate learning</td>
<td>Student input of topic areas</td>
<td>Relating texts to personal background Building concrete knowledge from the text (e.g. explanation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intrinsic motivation

All six studies promoted intrinsic motivation, although this was primarily defined as ‘choice’ within the majority of the studies. To this effect, four of the studies specifically provided the opportunity for students to self-select reading material (Cantrell et al., 2014; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013; Mercurio, 2005) and whilst there were restrictions on what material could be selected, it is plausible that a sense of autonomy and a variety of text choice increased interest and reading enjoyment. Cuevas et al. (2012) used a technology-based reading programme with the notion that this format may appeal to students more.

### Value

All of the papers included methods of promoting students’ awareness of the value of reading. For example, within CORI, students were asked about learning sources to create a sense that reading generated knowledge (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013). Other studies promoted value more generally by emphasising the added benefits of what was being taught. For example, students were encouraged to use strategies taught to solve problems whilst reading.
(Cantrell et al., 2014), were advised about the value of the taught strategies (Cuevas et al., 2012) and discussed how effort and strategy can promote reading development (Lau & Chan, 2007). In addition, rewards were provided for reading activity (Mercurio, 2005).

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy was the most recognisable dimension within all of the interventions. Most commonly, feedback was used to promote students’ reading self-efficacy (Cantrell et al., 2014; Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013; Lau & Chan, 2007). Providing readable materials (e.g. accessible at the students’ reading ability) was also highlighted within three papers (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013; Mercurio, 2005) with Mercurio (2005) arguing that providing accessible texts was important in promoting reading enjoyment.

Peer value

Two of the selected papers did not describe components related to peer value (Cantrell et al., 2014; Cuevas et al., 2012). This was particularly interesting in Cantrell et al.’s (2014) study, which concluded that significant improvements in students’ social motivation may have been explained by limited interaction and discussion within the intervention. For the remaining four papers, peer collaboration was embedded within session content. For example, Mercurio’s (2005) self-selection reading programme used a buddy reader to support students who found text difficult, while all four used whole class or small group discussions to enable peers to talk about the text. Group projects were also used to foster peer collaboration in three studies (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie et al., 2013; Lau & Chan, 2007).

Discussion

Given the wealth of literature surrounding adolescent literacy, only a small number of studies explored the impact of interventions on reading motivation and engagement. A total of six studies met inclusion criteria, four of which were high
quality. Five of the six included studies addressed technical aspects of reading, such as comprehension, as their primary focus. Addressing reading motivation and/or engagement was embedded into the interventions as a further focus. Only one study had a primary focus of addressing motivation and engagement using a self-selection reading programme (Mercurio, 2005). This study yielded data predominately with a qualitative emphasis, with the addition of some supplemental statistics relating to reading attitude and behavioural engagement (e.g. time spent reading). To the authors’ knowledge, there are no quantitative data evaluating the impact of a purely affective adolescent reading intervention, although it is debatable whether, in the context of Guthrie et al.’s (2012) model (see Figure 1), such an intervention would be desirable without instructional practice and technical reading support. In addition, follow-up measures were only reported in one paper (Lau & Chan, 2007). Measuring impact and sustainability over time would be useful in identifying any longer-term gains.

Findings indicated that when motivational components were present within technical reading interventions, reading motivation improved, with the exception of one study (Lau & Chan, 2007). Whilst the impact of these interventions are positive, it is difficult to identify the ‘active ingredient’ and establish whether the engagement and motivational components supported an increase in motivation and/or engagement in reading; or whether technical aspects of the programme enhanced performance, leading to a perceived sense of competence and increased self-efficacy and ultimately reading motivation. Guthrie and Klauda (2014) believed that ‘enhanced motivational-engagement support’ was the pivotal factor which mediated positive changes observed in the motivational constructs measured using their CORI intervention. However, in an earlier study, Guthrie et al. (2013) discovered that CORI instruction was related to increased information text comprehension when they controlled for motivational and engagement constructs and that self-efficacy was the most evident connection of CORI to motivation. Cantrell et al.’s. (2014) findings also highlighted a larger estimated impact on self-efficacy compared to intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and social motivation to read. Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2003) proposed that when
competence is increased, it is likely to impact on an individual’s self-efficacy, which as a result can enhance cognitive and behavioural engagement, as well as motivation. Therefore, it could be argued that it is the technical aspect of the interventions that is contributing to the effects reported on motivation and engagement. However, without empirical evidence of the impact of affective reading interventions alone, it will be difficult to establish causal associations.

The studies within this review all broadly acknowledged the four affirming motivations, which are expected to relate positively to reading achievement (Ho & Guthrie, 2013). However, peer value, appeared to have been overlooked in two of the six studies (Cantrell et al., 2014; Cuevas et al., 2012). This motivational dimension refers to reading behaviours that are valued by an individual’s peers (Ho & Guthrie, 2013). Furrer and Skinner (2003) argue the sense of value that one feels from peers triggers behaviours related to engagement, such as effort and persistence. Within the studies examined, peer value was exhibited through different means, including exchanging ideas, discussions, peer feedback and group work. If, as Furrer and Skinner (2003) posited, value from peers results in more engaged behaviours and that engagement relates positively to reading achievement (Guthrie et al., 2013), it would seem important that this dimension was embedded within interventions which address reading achievement. This was reflected in Cantrell et al.’s. (2014) findings which reported that despite an overall gain in reading motivation, social motivation to read did not significantly improve. Cantrell et al. (2014) highlighted that peer interactions and discussions were not a regular component within their intervention, which may be attributed to the results identified.

One potential criticism here is whether the interventions listed under peer value actually addressed the issue of whether or not peers valued reading, or whether they were more about peer connection or peer engagement. It is not disputed that the latter elements are important concepts. For example, in a large scale longitudinal study high school students identified ‘connected with peers’ as one of the most significant factors (McGaha & Igo, 2012). However, the peer value-
devalue dimension is potentially vital to address when engaging readers. For example, Atkinson (2009) reported that a whole class programme designed to promote reading engagement and motivation amongst adolescent boys in a socially disadvantaged neighbourhood had to be terminated due to factors associated with peer devalue, including student disenfranchisement, non-participation and barracking from peers.

Another interesting discussion point regards the affirming (and indeed undermining) motivations. While they have been theoretically derived and empirically investigated (Ho & Guthrie, 2013; Klauda & Guthrie, 2015), they do not take account of the fact that the contributing theoretical positions do not necessarily address a single domain. For example, there is considerable overlap between the four theoretical positions outlined in Table 1, in terms of potential factors which may influence reading engagement and motivation. Indeed, it could be argued that EVT and SDT inform all of the four continua of affirming/undermining motivations, not just value and intrinsic motivation respectively. To illustrate this, the potential contribution of EVT and SDT across all four domains is shown in Table 4. Furthermore, the definition of intrinsic motivation offered by Ryan and Deci (2000) as inherently enjoying or interesting may not apply to many of the adolescent readers involved in the studies or realistically be achievable as an intervention outcome for all students. Instead, it may be more useful for instructors to pay greater attention to Ryan and Deci’s (2000) self-determining continuum, within which behaviours are increasingly valued, regulated and incorporated into a sense of self.
Table 4.  

*Relationship of affirming-undermining dimensions to SDT, EVT and instructional practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational dimension</th>
<th>Relevant SDT elements (Ryan &amp; Deci, 2000)</th>
<th>Relevant EVT elements (Wigfield &amp; Eccles)</th>
<th>Instructional practices (from Guthrie and Wigfield, 2000 and yielded by systematic literature review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Intrinsic motivation – avoidance** | Intrinsic motivation and amotivation lie at opposite ends of the SDT motivational continuum. Intrinsic motivation within SDT is described as undertaking an activity for inherent enjoyment or interest | • Socialiser’s beliefs and behaviours  
• Child’s goals and general self-schemata  
• Self-schemata  
• Short-term goals  
• Long-term goals  
• Ideal self | • Learning and knowledge goals  
• Interesting texts  
• Opportunities for students to self-select reading materials  
• Use of technology-based initiatives  
• Variety of text choice may have increased interest and enjoyment  
• Students have some input into topic areas  
• Opportunities to demonstrate learning |
| **Value – devalue** | Autonomy - the extent to which actions are self-initiated and self-endorsed, rather than being controlled by external forces | • Child’s goals and general self-schemata  
• Self-schemata  
• Short-term goals  
• Long-term goals  
• Subjective task value | • Real-World Interactions  
• Autonomy support  
• Interesting texts  
• Rewards and praise  
• Teacher involvement  
• Promoting student |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Dimension</th>
<th>Relevant SDT Elements (Ryan &amp; Deci, 2000)</th>
<th>Relevant EVT Elements (Wigfield &amp; Eccles)</th>
<th>Instructional Practices (from Guthrie and Wigfield, 2000 and yielded by systematic literature review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value -- devalue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ views on sources of learning solicited to create a sense that reading generated knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added benefits of reading instruction emphasised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reward provided for completing reading task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Competence -- to what extent the individual feels efficacious in relation to a goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing readable materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing accessible texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting with students and jointly monitoring progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational dimension</th>
<th>Relevant SDT elements (Ryan &amp; Deci, 2000)</th>
<th>Relevant EVT elements (Wigfield &amp; Eccles)</th>
<th>Instructional practices (from Guthrie and Wigfield, 2000 and yielded by systematic literature review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peer value – peer devalue | Relatedness - the extent to which significant others, who are genuinely interested in the individual and their well-being, are seen as being related to the behaviour | • Cultural milieu:  
  o gender role stereotypes  
  o cultural stereotypes of subject matter and occupational characteristics  
  • Child’s perception of:  
    o socialiser’s beliefs expectations and attitudes  
    o gender roles  
    o activity stereotypes | • Collaboration  
  • Embedding peer collaboration within intervention content  
  • Use of buddy readers  
  • Whole/small class discussion  
  • Projects used to foster peer collaboration |

*Note. *~From Klauda and Guthrie (2015)*

Also incorporated into Table 4 are the nine instructional classroom practices identified by Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) as relating to students’ reading motivation, engagement and achievement. The studies included within this review appear to provide evidence for the use of multiple instructional practices that could be associated with positive increases in motivation. For example, rewards and praise were plentiful in feedback that students received and gave, and strategy instruction was evident given the emphasis on technical reading interventions that was noted across the studies. Further, autonomy support was provided through promoting choice in texts and, as already highlighted, collaboration was embedded within most of the interventions. Therefore, interventions are embedding some key instructional components within reading interventions to enhance reading
motivation, engagement and reading achievement. Additional elements identified through the literature review are also presented in Table 2.

One particular instruction is perhaps particularly worthy of further attention; interesting texts for instruction. The papers included within this review frequently referred to providing choice and variety of interesting texts. However, where variety and choice were provided, typically the focus remained on providing students with traditional reading materials. Whilst there are significant motivational differences between able and less able readers, this is more marked for books than for other media (Clark, 2014) and none of the studies published evidence of trying to engage students in selecting and prioritising the intervention materials. Atkinson (2009) explored engagement and motivation with adolescent boys and found that they wanted more involvement in selecting their own reading materials, identifying resources such as PlayStation games, comics and computers as preferred media. Steinkeuhler (2010) wrote about the benefits of video games within the classroom in promoting literacy, describing not only technical benefits such as reading manuals and interpreting meaning, but also social benefits that emerged through online communities (e.g. discussion boards). Similar findings were reported by Sanford and Kurki (2014), who found that students engaged more in reading material related to videogames that were played. Stanford, Rogers and Kendrick (2014) highlight the importance of researchers taking a critical look at how new literacy practices, such as technology can be embedded within real contexts.

Alvermann (2002) noted that for struggling adolescent readers, literacy instruction should be inclusive of meeting not only cognitive needs, but also cultural needs. McLean, Rowsell and Lapp (2014) identify that in new times, there are three key features of literacies that adolescents engage with; (1) social/interactive, (2) multiple modal (e.g. audio, video, text), and (3) creative licence and expression (e.g. blogs, fan fiction) (p. 159), and argue that as these are a popular culture for today’s adolescents, educators should use these features
within schooling experiences, thus making school relevant to areas to which students can relate. Gerber, Abrams, Onwuegbuzie and Benge (2014) explored these concepts in their small-scale case study with tenth-grade students with low reading ability using games-based learning. From a social constructionist perspective, the authors highlighted that connections are made through active interactions with peers and texts. They suggested that collaboration, support, interest-driven learning and school or life-based connections promote enhanced engagement and concluded that choice within multiple texts; both digital and traditional, were required to enable ‘connected learning’, facilitating a sense of relatedness to their literacy practices.

The curriculum is prescriptive in determining what young people are required to read in the classroom. However, if providing interest is an important concept of engagement and motivation, then it is important to question how it can be promoted in classrooms more effectively. Perhaps the discourse of the instructional practice known within current models of reading engagement as interesting texts (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000) should be considered in terms of multiple-literacy practices to emphasise that a balance of different forms of literacy, both contemporary and traditional, should be embedded within the support provided to enhance reading motivation and engagement of today’s adolescents. It may be beneficial for future reviews to consider ways in which contemporary reading/literacy materials impact on adolescents’ reading engagement, motivation and achievement.

Limitations and future directions

Despite the studies identified as being medium to high in quality, the robustness of the designs also presents as a limitation in the conclusions that can be drawn from the data. Only one study evaluated the use of an intervention using a Randomized-Control Trial (RCT; Cantrell et al., 2014), described as a ‘central feature of the evidence-based movement’ (Robson, 2011, p. 11). In addition, Guthrie et al. (2012) argued that the majority of studies within this area have
analysed data using structural equation modelling, which limits conclusions regarding causal direction, and in the case of reading engagement, motivation and achievement, therefore what mediates what. Within this review, two of the studies analysed data through structural equation modelling (Guthrie et al., 2013) and hierarchical linear models (Cantrell et al., 2014). More experimental designs, therefore, would be helpful in identifying what promotes reading motivation and engagement within a reading intervention.

The studies within this review demonstrated mostly positive outcomes in relation to reading motivation. With the exception of two studies (Cantrell et al., 2014; Lau & Chan, 2007), the programmes were universal targeting students with a range of high, average and low abilities. Therefore, the question still remains of what interventions promote motivation for struggling readers? As identified within the literature, struggling readers are the most difficult group to engage in reading due to previous reading failure, resulting in disaffection and low self-efficacy. Given the reported impact not having proficient literacy skills in later adulthood, for example unemployment (OECD, 2013b), addressing these issues through school seems critical.

Conclusions

Given the prevalence of reading difficulties amongst adolescents, there is a dearth of literature exploring affective interventions to support reading motivation and engagement - pre-requisites, it would seem, to reading achievement (Guthrie & Wigfield. 2000; Guthrie et al., 2012). Biancarosa and Snow (2006) suggest that there is sufficient knowledge about the engagement and motivational difficulties experienced by struggling adolescent readers, and about the types of interventions required to support them. However, whilst current models of reading engagement provide educators with guidance on what instructional practices relate positively to motivation and engagement, more evidence is required to understand how the models can be applied to the most hard to reach readers and the feasibility of applying them within a high school context.
Furthermore, acknowledgement of the complexity of and interrelationships between the different motivational theories may also be useful in developing interventions, particularly those that address issues relating to peer value. Finding ways to develop motivation and engagement for struggling readers could also be advantageous, especially given that policy makers often support the notion that literacy is a set of linear skills and do not pay due care and attention to the social and cultural contexts of reading instruction (Piazza & Duncan, 2012). Therefore, developing effective literacy practices that account for social and cultural contexts may represent progress in engaging struggling readers.

The current review aimed to establish the contribution of reading interventions that specifically target engagement and motivation for struggling adolescents; however, in doing so it has recognised the need for further questions to be addressed in future research.
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PAPER TWO

“I just find it boring“: Findings from an affective adolescent reading intervention

Abstract

Research suggests reading engagement and motivation are strong predictors of reading performance. Reading motivation may decline as students move toward adolescence, resulting in less time spent with text. To date, there has been no research on how educational psychologists (EPs) might support students to address affective factors in reading. In this exploratory case study, three disengaged, Year 8 readers received five sessions of an affective intervention aimed at helping them explore and challenge their own ambivalence towards reading. Quantitative and qualitative data from pre-, post- and three-month follow-up indicated a range of benefits in relation to reading engagement and motivation, including improved self-efficacy, increased participation and the usefulness of talking about affective factors in reading. Findings are further examined and implications for EPs are discussed.

Key words: adolescent literacy, affective, engagement, motivation, educational psychologist
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3 This paper has been submitted to Educational Psychology in Practice and has therefore been prepared in accordance with author guidelines which can be seen in Appendix N (Retrieved April 15, 2016, from http://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?journalCode=cepp20).
Introduction

While literacy difficulties occur for a range of reasons including special educational needs, disaffection and low aspirations (Dugdale & Clark, 2008), the impact of not developing competent reading skills may be significant. McCoy (2013) proposes that those with low levels of literacy are more likely to earn less money and experience poverty, while Dugdale and Clark (2008) state, “literacy has a significant relationship with a person’s happiness and success” (p. 6). Morrisroe (2014) highlighted that over half of teenage offenders have literacy difficulties and factors associated with crime, including low attainment and negative school experiences, are related to low literacy levels. Figures from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2013) suggest that many adolescents are leaving high school without proficient reading skills; data indicating that 17% of 15 year olds in the UK did not achieve the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) baseline level 2 of proficiency in reading.

Acknowledging the importance of reading, research has tended to focus primarily on addressing development through technical interventions (Brooks, 2013; Scammacca et al., 2007; Jeffes, 2016). However, Lau (2009) proposes that cognitive processes alone are not sufficient in describing reading behaviours, a view supported by findings from a recent longitudinal study which examined the relationship between intrinsic motivation, perceived competence, classroom engagement, extrinsic motivation and reading achievement (Froiland & Oros, 2014). Data from 8960 fifth- to eighth-grade students revealed that teacher reported classroom engagement, intrinsic motivation and perceived competence

Students proficient at Level 2 are able to recognise “the main idea in a text, understanding relationships, or construing meaning within a limited part of the text when the information is not prominent and the reader must make low-level inferences. Tasks at this level may involve comparisons or contrasts based on a single feature in the text. Typical reflective tasks at this level require readers to make a comparison or several connections between the text and outside knowledge, by drawing on personal experience and attitudes” (p. 79; OECD, 2013). Summary description for all of the seven levels of proficiency in reading can be located in the PISA (2012) Assessment for Analytical Framework (OECD, 2013).
predicted reading achievement in the eighth-grade. Developing the rationale for the current study, this paper will now focus on the importance of reading engagement and motivation, before considering the reading needs of adolescents.

**Reading Engagement and Motivation**

Given the central importance of motivation to learning (Pintrich, 2003), it is logically a crucial factor in learning to read (Verhoeven & Snow, 2001) with evidence indicating that students with lower motivation usually demonstrate poorer performance in reading activities (Chapman, Tunmer & Prochnow, 2000). Guthrie and Davis (2003) noted that struggling readers may have low reading self-efficacy; be extrinsically rather than intrinsically motivated (e.g. driven by grades rather than enjoyment); and demonstrate lessened reading effort. Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) reported reading motivation was a predictor of participation; which may impact on engagement and performance. Clark and De Zoysa’s (2011) large-scale survey of students aged 7-11 years concluded that reading behaviour and enjoyment had a direct relationship with attainment.

The Matthew Effect (Stanovich, 1986) described the impact of poor motivation on reading development. Limited desire to read leads to less time spent reading text, which can impact on literacy acquisition. Additionally, struggling readers can develop low reading self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), which can also impact on an individual’s attitude becoming more negative (Jeffes, 2016).

Mckenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995) suggested that low reading motivation may result from frustration and repeated experience of reading failure, resulting in lowered achievement expectations (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). By contrast, those with positive and successful experiences are likely to perceive themselves as capable readers and expect success to continue (Henk, Marinak & Melnick, 2012). An individual’s reading identity is likely to be shaped by their reading proficiencies (Hall, 2012) and impacts on what they read (Richardson & Eccles, 2007), how they
engage in class discussions about text (Hall, 2012) and how they attend to, commit and persevere with reading (Henk et al., 2012).

**Affective Reading Factors in Adolescence**

While both successful and unsuccessful experiences impact on reading engagement and motivation, research has also identified that attitude toward reading changes as students move towards adolescence (e.g. Unrau & Schlackman, 2006). This was recently reflected in outcomes from a large-scale literacy survey, investigating reading behaviours and attitudes of 30,000 UK students aged 8-16 (Clark, 2014a), which indicated notable differences in reported reading enjoyment across key stages. Only a third of Key Stage 4 students (14 – 16 years) reported enjoying reading, compared to nearly half of Key Stage 3 students (11-14 years) and just under two thirds of Key Stage 2 students (7-11 years). The same report found considerably fewer Key Stage 3 and 4 students reported daily reading outside school (28.4% and 24.6% respectively) compared to their Key Stage 2 peers (40.7%). These findings appear to illustrate a pattern of reading decline into adolescence. Clark (2014a) also found that students reading below their expected reading age reported reading considerably less than same-age peers reading at or above the expected level.

Cassidy, Valadez, Garrett and Barrera (2010) reported that 75% of responding literacy leaders in the United States agreed that addressing adolescent reading motivation ought to be a ‘hot topic’. Additionally, recent Department for Education (DfE) (2015) guidance notes that to develop mature readers requires a need to instil in children “a passion for reading” (p.17). However, advice on how to enable this appears limited to early intervention in primary school, overlooking the needs of the adolescent population.

Atkinson (2009) suggested that reading development of adolescents may not always consider motivational factors, highlighting a potential role for educational psychologists (EPs), to support schools by raising awareness of, and
developing affective methods to facilitate reading engagement. Similarly, Torgesen et al. (2007) stated “evidence-based methods for improving student engagement and motivation should have a high priority in efforts to improve adolescent literacy outcomes” (p. 53). However, to date there has been no published research exploring how EPs might work with students to explore and address affective factors in reading. The present study sought to explore the use of an affective reading intervention with adolescent readers and to investigate some of the factors which potentially inhibit and facilitate reading development.

Method

An exploratory multiple-case study design with embedded units of analysis (Yin, 2009) was used. In the designing of this case-study, several factors were considered which will now be further illuminated in the context of the current study.

Firstly, the research questions were derived from the gap within the literature that has been highlight in the subsequent sections. Two research questions were established as follows:

1. To what extent does an affective reading intervention promote adolescents’ reading engagement and motivation?
2. What elements within the intervention did adolescents report to facilitate reading engagement and motivation?

Further consideration was given to the units of analysis. Units of analysis provide a focus to guide the data collection. For transparency, an illustration of the case-study design with its embedded units of analysis can be seen in Figure 3. As will be seen in following sections, multiple sources of data were collected to allow for the triangulation of data enhancing the rigour of the present research (Robson, 2011). The current research adopts methodological triangulation, which combines both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Denzin, 1988) which enabled the
researchers to explore both the effectiveness of the intervention and student views about its usefulness.

Given that the present study used a multiple-case study design, cross-case analysis could also be facilitated. Cross-case analysis allows for the comparison of commonalities and differences within the data to be identified (Khan & VanWynsberghe, 2008). In light of this, descriptive statistics from quantitative data is provided case-by-case along with examples of student views (see findings).

**Participants**

The study took part within an urban mainstream high school in the West Midlands. The majority of students are White British with a high proportion being eligible for Pupil Premium.

School staff identified three students who would potentially benefit from an affective reading intervention and met inclusion criteria. These were that students were:
• In Year 8. The rationale behind this was students had had time to settle into high school; were early enough in their secondary career for the intervention to have an impact; and were not facing key examinations.
• Had a primary reading difficulty and were reading at National Curriculum Level 3 (The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2010) and/or age equivalent of approximately 9 years. For guidance, teachers were provided with Level 3 literacy criteria taken from Manchester Educational Psychology Service (2004) guidance (see Appendix D). As the intervention was affective as opposed to technical, the researchers felt it best to engage participants who had reached this level of reading proficiency.
• Perceived by school staff to be disengaged or low in motivation toward reading.

Participants were one female (Eva) and two males (Joshua and Tyler). School assessment data indicated that all were below the expected reading age, as illustrated in Table 5. However, the intervention was not specifically focused upon students who would be considered to have difficulty with the functional aspects of literacy (e.g. acquire basic reading skills). Within the context of this study, the term ‘struggling’ relates to affective elements, such as motivation and engagement. All students took part in the Accelerated Reader program as part of a whole school approach, along with daily reading practice. Participation in the current research was voluntary. Parental consent was gained prior to contact and a face-to-face meeting was arranged with the student to gain informed consent.

---

5 Accelerated Reader is a computer-assisted program designed to measure the frequency and accuracy with which students read. Assessments are used to determine students’ reading levels (Clark, 2014).
Table 5.

Participant information at time of recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Chronological age at time of recruitment</th>
<th>Reading age at time of referral⁶</th>
<th>Priority reason for referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 years 4 months</td>
<td>10 years 10 months</td>
<td>Low self-esteem/self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13 years 3 months</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Reading below expected reading level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 years 8 months</td>
<td>9 years 7 months</td>
<td>Reading below expected reading level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention

The intervention was structured around a Motivational Interviewing (MI) based programme (Atkinson, 2013), with resources adapted so that the target behaviour was reading engagement. Questions from the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP) (Pitcher et al., 2007) (see Appendix E) were used prior to the first session so that the programme could be individualised to address student needs and priorities. Five sessions were delivered on a fortnightly basis by the first author, a local authority trainee EP, with each session lasting approximately 50 minutes. The outline of the sessions can be seen in Table 6. Atkinson and Woods (2003) discussed the use of an ‘Intervention Cycle’ illustrating psychological techniques and approaches potentially useful within an MI-based approach. Accordingly, sessions incorporated Solution Focused Brief Therapy (SFBT), Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) and Personal Construct Psychology (PCP) techniques. Specific activities incorporated into each student's intervention are presented in Table 7.

⁶ Pupils were administered the Standardised Test for Assessment of Reading (STAR) to determine their reading level as part of the Accelerated Reading program at school by staff. The reading age is reported.
**Data Collection and Analysis**

For each student, quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the following sources:

- Student responses to the Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ) (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997) (pre- and post-intervention and three-month follow-up) (Appendix F).
- Semi-structured interviews to elicit student views about the intervention, post-intervention and at follow-up (see Appendix G).
- Completed materials from the sessions (example can be seen in Appendix H).
- Researcher diary, incorporating observations and reflections made immediately following each session.

Table 6.

*Activities implemented within the sessions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Opening discussion*</td>
<td>To find out about the student’s lifestyle and context information, as well as a way to build rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Words that describe me* and my skills profile*</td>
<td>An opportunity for the facilitator to find out about the student’s strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. My lessons*</td>
<td>An opportunity for the facilitator to find out about the student’s preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The Ideal Self (PCP)</td>
<td>To help the student explore their view of themselves as a reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Strength cards</td>
<td>To elicit the students perceived strengths and how these strengths may be used as personal skills and resources in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>The good things and less good things [about reading]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Repertory Grids (PCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Scaling – thinking about change*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Weighing it up*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Ready for change cards (adapted to reading)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>The future and the present*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Why read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>CBT – The Magic Circle (Think Good, Feel Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Setting goals*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Identifying barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Looking into the future*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>My strategy*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Indicates resources used from ‘Facilitating Change 2: Motivational Interviewing using the Menu of Strategies’ (Atkinson, 2013).
Table 7.

*Indication of how the activities were used with individual students across sessions*

Activities (see Table 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Denotes session number in which each activity was used.
The focus of the intervention was promoting reading engagement and motivation. Changes in reading efficacy were not expected within project timescales; however, the importance of noting any secondary impacts on reading performance was recognised. For this reason, reading assessments were conducted at all time points using the York Assessment of Reading for Comprehension: Passage Reading (YARC) (Stothard, Hulme, Clarke, Barmby & Snowling, 2010). Although not central to desired intervention outcomes, information about the YARC measures and student outcomes is included in Appendix I.

Semi-structured interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, then analysed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis (see Appendix J). Session data and the researcher diary were used to contextualise findings.

Measures

The MRQ (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997) used in this study measures different aspects of reading motivation for children aged 7-13. Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) illustrated that the motivational constructs can be grouped into four aspects; self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and social motivation. The questionnaire consists of 54 items that are rated on a four-point Likert scale (1 = very different from me, 2 = a little different from me, 3 = a little like me and 4 = a lot like me) (see Appendix F). The measure was chosen due to its established reliability and validity data with most of its scales demonstrating preferable values of reliability over .70 as highlighted in Wigfield and Guthrie (1997). In addition, the breadth of the measure has been well-reported in a wide range of studies to evaluate reading motivation (e.g. Boazack, 2011; McGeown, Goodwin, Henderson & Wright, 2012). For these reasons, the researcher concluded that this measure was a well suited measure for data collection.

Findings

A short vignette for each student will be provided to summarise responses to the intervention. Following this, quantitative findings will be reported, before the qualitative interview data are discussed.
Vignettes

Eva presented as a quiet, shy girl. Activities indicated high motivation, but poor confidence, particularly when reading aloud in class. Sessions focused on identifying strategies for promoting reading self-efficacy and reading engagement. CBT approaches enabled Eva to understand that thoughts and feelings about reading might impact on performance and she valued discussing coping strategies, including breathing techniques and goal setting.

Joshua was a confident young man who did not enjoy school and found reading “boring”. He presented as ambivalent, stating during one session that, “I want to read more but I don’t want to at the same time” and, “it’s interesting but it’s boring”. Activities which encouraged Joshua to consider reasons for and against change enabled him to explore and develop discrepancy between his present and desired behaviours.

Tyler mostly engaged well with the sessions. Eliciting his views on the good and less good things about reading (see Table 6) suggested that he could be embarrassed by his reading difficulties. Other activities enabled understanding of what he enjoyed about reading and the barriers to greater engagement. While facilitator observations and follow-up interviews indicated that Tyler responded positively to the intervention, these views were not supported by self-report MRQ scores.

MRQ Scores

Table 8 provides descriptive statistics from the MRQ at pre- and post-intervention and at three-month follow-up. Scores in bold represent a positive change from pre-intervention scores. Results indicate that Eva and Joshua reported increased intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and total MRQ scores. Eva additionally reported improved self-efficacy and Joshua’s social motivation score increased.
However, Tyler’s data were not indicative of self-reported improvements across the four domains.
Table 8. Pre-, post- and three-month follow-up intervention Motivation to Read (MRQ) scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Intrinsic motivation</th>
<th>Extrinsic motivation</th>
<th>Social motivation</th>
<th>Total MRQ</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Follow-up test</th>
<th>w-up test</th>
<th>test</th>
<th>w-up test</th>
<th>test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figures in bold represent a positive change in scores from the pre-test. Self-efficacy and social motivation scores are out of a possible score of 8 and extrinsic and intrinsic are out of a possible score of 10.
Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted immediately after the intervention and again three months later with each student. Emergent themes and subthemes are shown in Table 9 with those identified by at least two students prioritised for discussion. In the sections below, superordinate themes are presented in bold and subthemes in italics.

Table 9. Themes and subthemes arising from thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in reading engagement and motivation</td>
<td>Extrinsic motivation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness to change*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoyment of reading***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More time reading***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking out reading material***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying strategies and resources**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Self-perceptions of own ability to change *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude/views about reading***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking ownership*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading efficacy**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linking engagement to reading efficacy**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of supportive processes</td>
<td>Solution-focused approach*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified what motivates them***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified personal barriers***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational issues</td>
<td>Facilitators***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barriers***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Indicates subtheme represented in one student’s transcript; **indicates subtheme represented in two students’ transcripts; ***indicates subtheme represented in three students’ transcripts.
All three students reported positive changes in reading engagement and motivation, specifically to their enjoyment of reading. Eva reported that she was able to engage more with what she was reading and that this had contributed to improved understanding. Both Joshua and Tyler initially reported little interest in reading, but post-intervention reported finding it more interesting and enjoyable.

In terms of engagement, all three students said that they had been spending more time reading, specifying that they were now reading most days, both in and out of school. Joshua stated that he was choosing to read when he had opportunities to do so:

Erm...sometimes when I get bored...like I was ill the other day, so I went to my head of house, and I got my book out and started reading then. And then sometimes when I have detentions I read. So I think that, that’s improved.

Tyler reported that the sessions had helped him to find ways of maintaining interest:

The strategies help me to keep reading because like, the other day I said I would practice, but not for too long because it will get boring and then you will just stop after that day, so I just want to take short times each day to read and then I will read each day.

All of the students referred to seeking out reading material. Tyler had been to purchase Diary of a Wimpy Kid books, while Eva reported wanting to read more books by her favourite author, Jacqueline Wilson. Joshua explained that, for the first time, he now visits the library.

Identifying strategies and resources was particularly important for Eva. The intervention enabled her to find helpful methods for managing class situations that required reading aloud, noting, “When we did the bit where we talked about ways to calm myself down [CBT activities] ....and then I tried it when we did the poem [in class] and it worked so I did it again because it was working”. Tyler recognised that if he was not enjoying his reading material, he could locate something different.
The students all reported changes in **self-efficacy** and noticed improved **confidence**. Eva felt the intervention had helped her achieve her goal of becoming a more confident reader, while Tyler was able to specify how the sessions helped:

Erm...because before, I didn’t really like reading out of class but like we did those [strength] cards, like brave, confident, erm...working hard and I don’t know, they have just helped me like read out loud in class...and reading more in class.

This may have been associated with **reading efficacy**, as Joshua reported that his reading age had increased on a recent reading assessment and felt his comprehension skills had developed. Tyler reported he could “read faster and don’t struggle on as many words”. Both Tyler and Joshua recognised that there was a **link between engagement and reading efficacy** and felt greater engagement had contributed to their reading improvements.

Discussions also highlighted a shift in perceptions of reading and its importance. Tyler discussed the impact of reading on future prospects and how this had slightly changed his **attitude toward reading**:

I liked it how I could relate it to the future. If you don’t practice you won’t like, you might not be good at your job, because if you have got a job and you have to read something you might not be good at that so, you don’t do your job properly.

The **usefulness of supportive processes** through having an informal dialogue around reading was highlighted in the interviews. All students **identified personal barriers** which affected their reading engagement and motivation. Eva’s homework demands restricted the amount of time she wanted to spend reading, while Joshua stated, “It takes some time, like family time off me”. Tyler had previously found asking for support difficult: “I put on this sheet that I wasn’t like...I was bit nervous of saying I needed help in lessons, because it’s embarrassing”.
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In comparison, the students also identified what motivates them. It was important to Eva and Tyler that reading material grabbed their attention immediately and both enjoyed books by familiar authors. Tyler reported more interest when “you can watch the movies as well as read the books”. Joshua stated that reading to improve his reading marks and reading level was important to him.

Discussion

The present study sought to explore to what extent an affective reading intervention could support adolescents’ reading engagement and motivation. Findings suggest that students reported a range of benefits including increased self-efficacy and positive changes in reading engagement and motivation. In two cases, reports were supported by quantitative MRQ data.

The research helped elicit the views of three reluctant readers and provide an understanding of the mechanisms affecting their reading engagement and motivation. This is potentially important, given the link between these factors and reading performance (Clark & De Zoysa, 2011; Froiland & Oros, 2014). Conradi, Jang, Bryant, Craft and McKenna (2013) stated that, “understanding begins with learning how students truly feel about reading” (p. 566). In this instance, the intervention enabled discussions about the students’ reading self-perceptions and beliefs. Self-beliefs combine to form the achievement-related self-system (Chapman & Tumner, 2003) which includes a variety of related factors, including self-concept and self-efficacy, which were prevalent within the current findings. The intervention provided an opportunity for the students to explore personal constructs about reading and findings suggest that their identities as readers appeared to shift and views about reading became more positive.

Qualitative data indicated that students’ self-efficacy improved, with self-reported improvements in confidence in activities including reading aloud in class and reading more complex words. Self-efficacy is influenced by personal performance and achievement observations (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007) and
learning competence requires not only having the skills to complete the task, but also the self-efficacy beliefs to use these skills effectively (Bandura, 1997). When competence is increased, positive impacts on self-efficacy typically occur, resulting in enhanced cognitive and behavioural engagement, as well as motivation (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). In Eva’s case, setting goals and discussing experiences of success may have contributed to increased levels of self-efficacy and engagement (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007). Other studies targeting reading engagement and motivation with adolescents have also incorporated goal setting. For example, the Concept-Orientated Reading Instruction (CORI) programme used goal setting to build perceived competence and self-efficacy (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie, Klauda & Ho, 2013); while Lee (2011) reported positive outcomes when students set goals during a silent-reading programme.

Qualitative and quantitative data also indicated positive changes in students’ reading engagement and motivation, which could be linked to improved self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, to be engaged and motivated, a student needs to perceive reading as important and of future benefit (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014). All three students had the opportunity to explore current reading engagement and its potential impact on future goals, each acknowledging that greater engagement could lead to improved outcomes in reading acquisition, school grades and job prospects. If a task holds value for an individual, it can influence achievement choices, and in turn task effort and persistence (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Within expectancy-value theory, Eccles et al. (1983) propose four components for task-value: attainment value (importance of doing well on a task), intrinsic value (task enjoyment), utility value (relationship to future goals) and cost (negative factors occurring through engagement, such as failure). For Joshua, the cost component was identifiable, in that reading took time away from other activities and was perceived as boring. These negative factors acted as a barrier to reading. However, allowing Joshua opportunity to identify aspects of reading which were personally valued appeared to enhance engagement.
From a practitioner perspective, one important outcome was an improved understanding of factors inhibiting reading engagement and motivation. Tyler spoke about how being bored during the early stages of a book would deter him from continuing. Through discussing what typical readers do, for example, abandoning a book they do not find interesting and selecting something new (Lee, 2011), Tyler was able to find strategies that encouraged him to read more. Conradi et al. (2013) contended that to enable change, teachers need to understand reasons why reading fails to be important to some students. In a busy high school context, motivation is difficult to monitor, given that the construct is a “private, subjective and difficult-to-directly-observe experience” (Lee & Reeve, 2012, p.727). Nevertheless, when students were given opportunity to explore affective factors in reading, they readily shared their perspectives, gave examples of preferred reading choices and identified potentially supportive strategies, thus identifying what intrinsically motivates them to read and participate for personal fulfilment, enjoyment and interest (Mouratidis & Michou, 2011). A recent large-scale study has indicated that intrinsic motivation is positively associated with both engagement and achievement (Froiland & Worrell, 2016) and when students are intrinsically motivated and engaged with learning, they are more likely to achieve positive academic outcomes as well as being emotionally healthy (Mercurio, 2003). Increases in engagement and motivation were reported when intrinsic motivation was addressed by allowing adolescents to choose their own reading material (Guthrie & Klauda, 2014; Guthrie, Klauda & Ho, 2013).

Limitations
Despite qualitative data indicating increased reading confidence and engagement, Tyler’s MRQ scores indicated a decrease in overall motivation at post- and three-month follow-up, with the greatest decrease in self-efficacy. Tyler recorded the lowest reading scores of the three students, although given that he was reading at National Curriculum Level 3 he might not experience severe and persistent reading difficulties (dyslexia). Melekoglu (2011) contended that addressing the needs of those with more marked difficulties appears to be more
challenging, whilst Quirk and Schwanenflugel (2004) noted: “Merely having interesting books available, an appealing place to read, and discussions around reading may not be enough for struggling readers who probably cannot read such books or participate in these discussions” (p. 2).

None of the students within this study were receiving a targeted technical reading intervention. For students like Tyler, a solely affective intervention may be insufficient to promote reading performance, which in turn may limit engagement. Increasing self-efficacy and engagement is critical, through providing varied and accessible texts to promote interest, alongside targeted reading instruction to address cognitive components of reading (Alvermann, 2002; Quirk & Schwanenflugel, 2004). As mentioned, although technical reading interventions for adolescents are dearth (Brooks, 2013), there is some evidence to suggest the efficacy of targeting primary reading skills such as phonic decoding in improving reading proficiency amongst this population (Jeffes, 2016).

Methodological limitations of the present study included its reliance on self-report measures. Ho and Guthrie (2013) noted that students may feel obliged to answer questions about reading behaviours favourably. As Tyler’s interview and self-report responses were not consistent, additional data would have been helpful in ascertaining whether he offered positive verbal feedback merely to please the facilitator. A methodological improvement would be to include other proximal measures of motivation (e.g. teacher report, observation). However, there are inherent difficulties in motivation as a construct due to its subjectivity and lack of stability (Lee & Reeve, 2012).

The intervention was individualised to reflect the needs of the students involved. Durlak and DuPre (2008) argue that school-based programmes are often adapted to meet individual needs, and while this may be perceived as ‘implementation failure’ in terms of not achieving fidelity (Durlak & DuPre, 2008), adaption of interventions can often contribute to positive outcomes as it modifies procedures to match individuals’ needs. However, as delivery was not consistent
across cases, inferences in causality of positive outcomes are limited and replication potentially difficult. For this reason, session details have been explicitly provided (see Table 6 & 7). Nevertheless, it could be argued that the quality and appropriateness of the interventions varied, and as a consequence, outcomes differed.

The present study was exploratory and involved only a small number of students. To measure impacts further, it may be beneficial to consider implementing the intervention with a larger sample and ensuring greater consistency of delivery across samples.

Conclusion

This research explored the impact of an affective reading intervention in supporting adolescents’ reading engagement and motivation. A range of benefits and positive outcomes have been highlighted. In light of these outcomes, the following implications may be relevant for EPs working with adolescents in educational settings in moving towards embedding motivational constructs within the reading domain.

• In supporting adolescent literacy development through consultation and training, EPs can support schools in the development of adolescent literacy practices to embed components which raise awareness of the role of affective factors on reading engagement, motivation and performance. This may support schools in understanding the contextual complexities of literacy learning (Atkinson, 2009) particularly with adolescents, given adverse outcomes of poor literacy and the difficulties associated with measuring and monitoring motivational and affective factors.

• EPs should empower educators to think more about the literacy curriculum and support staff in ways to enable change for a population of reluctant readers within our secondary schools.

• EPs should continue to disseminate psychological knowledge and promote understanding through sharing evidence-based and practice-based
evidence in supporting change, either systemically or working directly with students.

• Within the assessment and identification of reading difficulties it is important to examine both cognitive difficulties and factors which promote or inhibit reading engagement and motivation. This could be achieved by eliciting student views about the purpose and value of reading, enabling exploration of the importance of reading.

• Adolescents should be provided with experiences where they can monitor progress towards self-set goals.
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The current paper provides an overview of the dissemination of evidence to professional practice. The author (hereafter referred to as researcher) presents four sections. Firstly, there will be an overview of concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based research, with reference to how this applies to educational psychology. The second section will further explore how research is disseminated along with notions of research impact. The systematic literature review (hereafter referred to as T1) and empirical study (hereafter referred to as T2) will be drawn upon in the final two sections where the implications of this research will be discussed along with the researcher’s dissemination strategy.
Section One: An Overview of Concepts of Evidence-Based Practice and Practice-Based Evidence

1.1. Evidence-Based Practice

First emerging in the field of medicine, Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) is now of great significance to applied psychologists (Gulliford, 2015). This is highlighted within the most recent Standards of Proficiency (SoPs) formulated by the Health, Care Professions Council (HCPC) stating that professionals regulated by the body should “engage in evidence-based practice, evaluate practice systemically and participate in audit procedures” (p. 11). The American Psychological Association (APA) (2006) defines Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology (EBPP) as, “the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences” (p. 273). Gulliford (2015) explains that EBP aims to provide systematic and reliable insights into what interventions are likely to work, for whom and why they are effective. More specifically, this provides predictable outcomes within academic, social and behavioural aspects of education (Blase, Dyke, Fixsen & Bailey, 2012).

Lilienfold, Ammirati and David (2012) argued that some educational practices are pseudoscientific, meaning that they appear to be grounded in science, yet they are not. They argue that such interventions can not only be ineffective for school children, but can also be harmful, postulating that educational psychologists (EPs) should embrace ‘scientific thinking tools’ within their everyday practice. Fox (2011) describes that the “psychological world [is] increasingly dominated by EBP” (p. 325), highlighting that the rationale underpinning EBP is research-based evidence supporting the professional practice decisions, rather than decisions driven by personal preference or local cultures of practice. EBP does not aim to replace professional expertise, yet intends to integrate external evidence from systematic research (Fredrickson, 2002). EBP accepts that evidence can take several forms ranging from the rigorous scientific research through to less rigorous methods, including professional experience and opinions (Bower & Gilbody, 2010).
This was illustrated by Scott, Shaw and Joughin (2001) who presented a hierarchy of evidence (see Figure 3). EBP denotes that methods that are lower within the hierarchy should only be used when methods that are higher within the hierarchy are not available (Bower & Gilbody, 2010).

![Figure 4. Traditional hierarchy of evidence (Scott et al., 2001)](image)

| 1. Several systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials |
| 2. Systematic review of randomised controlled trials |
| 3. Randomised controlled trials |
| 4. Quasi-experimental trials |
| 5. Case control and cohort studies |
| 6. Expert consensus opinion |
| 7. Individual opinion |

1.2. The Challenges of Evidence-Based Practice

Figure 3 implies that systematic reviews of Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs) are the favoured method within EBP, with Fox (2003) reporting that these are seen as the ‘gold standard’, not just within medicine but across all health fields. Recently, the Department for Education (DfE) (2013) stated that, “RCTs will raise the bar in education and children’s services by increasing the use of quantitative evidence” (p.1). However, Fredrickson (2002) argued that whilst RCTs provide intervention efficacy, its effectiveness within real-world practice may be limited. This is because RCTs are so tightly controlled that they consist mainly of homogenous groups and therefore, do not accurately represent the complexities of the populations that EPs work with (Robson, 2011).

As such, the traditional hierarchy of evidence cannot always apply and RCTs may not be appropriate in addressing research questions. For example, RCTs are not appropriate when attempting to understand the process of change, in which qualitative research lends itself more appropriately (Bower & Gilbody, 2010). Fredrickson (2002) argued that the evidence hierarchy is best described as, “the best available evidence of the most appropriate type that is needed” (p. 99). To
conceptualise this further, Salkovskis’ (1995) hourglass model can be drawn upon as a more appropriate means of approaching EBP within educational psychology (Figure 4). This model highlights the role for different methodological approaches and their contribution to an evidence-base, positing that first, small-scale research is required to develop theory and practice and then tested through single case-study designs. More rigorous methods are then used to inform evidence further and finally, research can focus on the validity and generalisability of such practices.

Figure 5. The hourglass model (Salkovskis, 1995)

Nevertheless, practitioners are often unable to replicate and implement interventions in line with favourable conditions and therefore, fail to achieve the internal validity that the intervention may have originally received during the efficacy stage due to the aforementioned complexities (e.g. context, individual differences) (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Lendrum & Humphrey, 2012).

Biesta (2007) argued that while there has been a drive for education to become more evidence-based, this has posed challenges. For example, Biesta (2007) postulated that EBP may limit the opportunities for educational practitioners, such as EPs, to make professional context-specific judgements. Biesta (2007) further argued that EBP focuses on the effectiveness of interventions and practice, or ‘what works?’ making process questions harder to answer and understand.
1.3. Practice-Based Evidence

Practice-based evidence may offer some solutions to these challenges. Practice-based evidence differs from EBP in that the ‘filters’ that are prescribed within more rigorous methods of EBP are reduced to reflect more of the routine, day-to-day practice (Barkham, Stiles, Lambert & Mellor-Clark, 2010). Barkham et al. (2010) presented key contrasting features of rigorous RCT methods against practice-based research (Appendix K), stating that practice-based research places “near-zero limitations on included data” (p. 39). Given the individualised nature and the diversity of contexts in which an EP works, analysis of practice-based research is likely to be more relevant to EPs in comparison with EBP (Nuttall & Woods, 2013).

1.4. Case Studies

One way in which EPs are engaging with research is through case study approaches. A number of papers have reported case study findings in a range of areas, including behavioural and therapeutic interventions (e.g. Burrows, 2013; Kittles & Atkinson, 2009; Nuttall & Woods, 2013.). Case studies provide rich evidence as they are conducted in real world contexts, enabling the researcher to understand how and why the approach may work within the context in which it is applied. This provides the first phase of evidence which Salkovskis (1995) discusses within the hourglass model (Section 1.2; Figure 4).

1.5. The Need for Scientific Thinking Amongst Educational Psychologists

Whether research is evidence-based or practice-based, EPs need to have scientific thinking skills that can enable them to confidently “navigate the often bewildering mix of well-supported, poorly-supported, and equivocally-supported practices that comprise their fields” (Lilienfield et al., 2012, p. 12). Ramchandi, Joughin and Zwi (2001) illustrated a set of competencies that are required including the ability to:

- formulate an answerable question from a clinical or service issue;
• search using bibliographical databases (such as PsychInfo, ERIC), and find short cuts to good quality evidence;
• be confident in critically appraising research findings;
• interpret and apply results for use in a particular clinical situation, or in developing service provision;
• evaluate one’s own clinical practice (p.60).

Further, Reynolds (2011) argued that to be effective when implementing interventions, EPs need to reflect upon and critically analyse research that they are basing practice on, stating that:

  It is not enough to read the literature or to attend in-service or continuing education seminars. We must read and listen carefully. Just because a paper is published in a peer-reviewed journal does not mean the science is accurate or necessarily strong (p. 5).
Section Two: Effective Dissemination of Research: Outcomes and Impact

2.1. Effective Dissemination

Recent years have seen a shift towards ‘evidence-based education’ (Topping, 2012). As discussed in section one, most interventions are first evaluated by the developers under tightly controlled and optimal conditions, using rigorous research methods. These are known as efficacy trials (Flay, Biglan & Boruch, 2005). However, to be ‘worthy’ of dissemination, an intervention also needs to demonstrate its effectiveness within real-world contexts (Flay et al., 2005). This can be established through effectiveness trials, which evaluate the impact of an intervention within real-world contexts (Flay et al., 2005). The focus here is on the implementation of the intervention, for example, if and what adaptations were required and to what extent these caused variations with the outcomes (Flay et al., 2005). Here, implementation science can further enhance our understanding of such processes. Implementation science refers to “the study of the processes and methods involved in the systematic transfer and uptake of EBP into routine, everyday practice” (Kelly, 2012, p.4). Kelly (2012) noted that implementation science explores the contextual processes that may be relevant as to improve the quality of the intervention delivery within contexts such as schools. This information needs to be obtained prior to dissemination.

Kelly (2012) posits that there are a range of factors that can affect the impact and outcomes of interventions within real-world contexts. She argues that the main factors that contribute to this are characteristics related to the practitioners who are looking to implement the intervention including:

• the practitioners’ understanding of the theory underlying the intervention;
• the practitioners’ knowledge of how an intervention should be implemented and why; and,
• the practitioner’s own beliefs about the programme’s potential to bring about change (Kelly, 2012, p.4).
It would be no surprise that in addition to these are external constraints such as time and cost.

Typically, following successful efficacy and effectiveness trials, an intervention is deemed ready for dissemination (Lendrum & Humphrey, 2012). Dissemination of research is believed to be a key step in the research process (Trainor & Graue, 2014). Also referred to as diffusion, knowledge transfer, knowledge exchange, linkage and exchange, and research into practice (Kerner, Rimer & Emmons, 2005; Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan & Nazareth, 2010), dissemination can be defined as:

a planned process that involves consideration of target audiences and the settings in which research findings are to be received and, where appropriate, communicating and interacting with wider policy and health service audiences in ways that will facilitate research uptake in decision-making processes and practice (Wilson et al., 2010, p.2).

Therefore, dissemination provides the target audience with information about the potential impact of the intervention, and how it may be applied within different contexts.

Despite this, Wilson, Armoutliev, Yakunina and Werth (2009) interviewed clinical and counselling psychologists about their attitudes towards EBP in psychology and found that one issue was the lack of easily accessible research to their field. Within the field of educational psychology Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford and Hall (2002) conducted a survey to assess the roles of the EP and found that out of 370 EP respondents, less than half used journal articles to aid the implementation and development of interventions. One factor that may contribute to this is that individual journals require a subscription fee which can provide an unfeasible expense for services and/or individual EPs to gain access to each relevant journal.
Some solution may be found in the fact that the Association for Educational Psychologists (AEP)\(^7\) offers EP practitioners (qualified and in training) a peer-reviewed journal as part of their membership – *Educational Psychology in Practice*. Further, membership with the Division of Educational and Child Psychology (DECP) of the British Psychological Society (BPS) gives members access to *Educational and Child Psychology* – also a peer-reviewed journal. These particular journals aim to represent theory, research and practice relevant to the EP primarily within UK contexts. Papers submitted undergo rigorous peer-review processes which safeguard readers against poor quality research (Lilienfeld, Ammirati & David, 2012). *Educational Psychology in Practice* and *Educational and Child Psychology* publish a range of research in accordance with the hierarchy of evidence (Scott et al, 2001; Figure 3). Considering that one of the core functions of the EP is to undertake research (Farrell et al., 2006), dissemination fits well to the EP role. Nevertheless, Boyle and Lauchlan (2009) argued that to promote the EP profession, it would be beneficial if EPs were to disseminate their research in a range of psychology journals – not just ones which target educational psychology.

However, Bramlett et al’s. (2002) survey suggested that merely disseminating research within peer-reviewed journals may be insufficient to reach the target audience. Wilson et al. (2009) proposed that consideration should be given to other methods of disseminating evidence such as professional websites. Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) identified a range of dissemination methods including newsletters, conferences and workshops. Riley et al. (2007) suggested that web-based applications (e.g. interactive technology, video streaming and audio narration) may also be an effective method to disseminate and provide information about current research. Within educational psychology, disseminating research on EPNET, a professional EP forum for sharing ideas and professional expertise, may be beneficial.

---

\(^7\) The AEP is the trade union and professional association for EPs in the UK.
2.2. Dissemination Frameworks

Recent syntheses within the literature have identified that many dissemination frameworks are available for researchers in a range of domains looking for guidance on how to disseminate their findings effectively. For example, Wilson et al. (2010) identified a total of 33 dissemination frameworks, 20 of which were designed specifically for the use by researchers. Further, Tabak, Khoong, Chambers and Brownson (2012) identified 61 frameworks which fell into categories of dissemination, implementation or both. However, it was interesting to note that none of the frameworks within both reviews was bespoke to educational research. Instead, frameworks are primarily rooted within the health and medical domain.

Nevertheless, both of the mentioned reviews offered a range of frameworks for researchers to consider. One framework which appeared to be particularly helpful was developed by Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) and located within Wilson et al.’s. (2010) review. This appeared to be particularly helpful as it offered a conceptually simple workbook to plan dissemination activity, including ready to use templates and ideas of how best to disseminate research findings. Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) engage researchers in a set of ten questions along with guidance at each stage to aid in the planning of dissemination. Questions can be seen in Figure 5. The researcher will consider these as part of their own dissemination strategy in section four.
2.3. Evaluation of Outcomes

Whilst disseminating research is essential, it is also as important to evaluate the outcomes of the dissemination efforts. To measure impact, two well-known strategies can be used. The first is known as benchmarking. Benchmarking refers to “seeking quality improvement by examining the processes of more successful interventions that are superior in outcomes and efficiency” (Lueger & Barkham, 2010, pg. 9). In other words, this process enables learning from the best practice of others (Bayney, 2005). Camp (1989) identified four types of benchmarking for quality improvement, differing in the resources and time needed for each method, as illustrated in Table 10.
Table 10.
A summary of the four types of benchmarking (Lueger & Barkham, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Benchmarking</th>
<th>Summary/description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td>The collection and comparison of outcomes data within a unit of service delivery (e.g. identifying effective therapies between multiple therapists within one clinic). This may consequently lead to the exploration of the processes involved in effective practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive</strong></td>
<td>The comparison with units or individuals outside the system, however remaining in a similar delivery industry (e.g. a Local Authority Educational Psychology Service comparing data with a private Educational Psychology Service). This provides a greater data base for comparison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional</strong></td>
<td>Comparisons are made between the service industries that are different, but share some similar functions (e.g. EPs and clinical psychologists share similar functions but are within different domains). A basis of comparison may be identified between the domains to add to best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Process</strong></td>
<td>The identification of specific processes which are similar within different domains (e.g. consultation processes). This enables the researcher to identify what activities of parts of the process may be facilitating its effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another way to measure impact and outcomes is through case tracking. Case tracking involves collecting intervention data outcomes to formulate a database, which effectively then provides a baseline measure to compare following outcomes when using the same intervention (Leach & Lutz, 2010). Benchmarking and case tracking provide the user with the evidence to demonstrate how and if an intervention has been effective.
Section Three: The implications of the Current Research

3.1. Implications of the Research

This section will primarily focus on the implications of the current research that is presented within two papers that contribute to this thesis; T1 and T2. The first (T1), provides a systematic synthesis of research which has measured outcomes relating to motivation and/or engagement as part of a reading intervention. This provided the researcher with a deeper theoretical understanding of motivational components which have been found to facilitate motivation and engagement toward reading. T2 reports findings from an exploratory case study which implemented an affective reading intervention aimed at enabling adolescents to explore and challenge their own ambivalence towards reading.

Table 11 illustrates the main implications of the research within the two papers at three different levels; the research site, the organisational level and the professional level. These will be discussed independently of one another.

Table 11.
The implications of the current research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Site (participants hereafter referred to as students)</td>
<td>• Students experienced a range of benefits including increased self-efficacy and confidence in their reading abilities and a more positive attitude toward reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students valued reading more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ reading motivation and engagement had improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students identified strategies and approaches that enabled further and continued reading engagement and motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Level</td>
<td>• Raised awareness for of the role of affective factors on reading engagement and motivation, and reading performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(school and educational</td>
<td>• Potential methods and approaches to embed within the literacy curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Level</td>
<td>• Potential implications for the role of the educational psychologist within the five core functions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EPs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Consultation; awareness raising and problem solving with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Assessment; eliciting student views to support the identification of reading difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Intervention; contribution to what works for reluctant adolescent readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Training; factors that promote reading engagement and motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Research; encouraging others to partake in research activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Implications of the Research at the Research Site

Findings from T2 suggested the three Year 8 students involved experienced a range of benefits from the intervention. One was an increase in perceived self-efficacy; important considering its impact on cognitive and behavioural engagement (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). All three students reported improved confidence and a more positive attitude toward reading. Student reports and researcher observations also indicated that the students valued reading more and could identify its longer term benefits. A further finding indicated that students’
reading motivation and engagement increased, perhaps as a combination of increased self-efficacy and perceived reading value. Students reported reading more text on more occasions, both in and out of school and also reported greater reading enjoyment than pre-intervention data suggested.

On a practical level, the intervention encouraged the students to identify strategies to facilitate further reading engagement to use post-intervention. It was important to the researcher that students felt able to use available resources to them to support them after the direct support had finished. Students were debriefed (British Psychological Society; BPS, 2009) following each session through a written letter and provided with a folder of activities completed post-intervention, offering them a permanent record of their participation (see Appendix H).

Despite reported benefits, the researcher highlighted that for one student (Tyler), quantitative and qualitative findings were inconsistent, suggesting that for him, the impact of the intervention may have been less beneficial. In fact, for this student, quantitative results suggested a decrease in reading engagement and motivation. The researcher argued that this may be as a result of more significant reading difficulties in comparison to the two other students. This was consistent with previous research findings which postulated that addressing the needs of students with more complex needs is more challenging (Melekoglu, 2011).

This may be a potential limitation of the T2 intervention. Interestingly, one of the main findings from T1 was that when motivational components were present within technical reading interventions, reading engagement and motivation improved. However, due to time limitations T1 and T2 were run concurrently which meant that T2 was not fully informed by T1 outcomes and did not include a technical component. In this case, had the researcher known about the potential benefits of combining both affective and technical components, they would have run a technical intervention in parallel with an affective intervention.
3.3. Implications of the Research at the Organisational Level

At an organisational level, it is hoped that the research has had an impact on school practice. The researcher consulted with the school, specifically the literacy department and library services, regarding T1 and T2 findings.

It was important to raise an awareness of the role of affective factors on reading engagement, motivation and performance. Both T1 and T2 offered an overview of the role and impact of affective factors within reading, with T1 specifically providing a comprehensive summary of previous research within this area. From this, the researcher was able to discuss the motivational constructs which are involved within the domain and highlight the complexities of literacy learning, particularly for adolescent readers. It was hoped that this would empower school literacy leaders and staff within the Special Educational Needs (SEN) department to consider ways of embedding key motivational constructs highlighted within both papers within the literacy curriculum.

Supporting adolescent literacy development was highlighted as an area lacking research. For this reason, the aim of T2 was to explore to what extent an affective intervention could promote reading engagement and motivation. In light of the positive outcomes (see Section 3.2.) strategies that seemed to have been effective were discussed with school staff to enable them to consider ways of supporting change for reluctant readers. Staff were encouraged to reflect on whether strategies used within the intervention could be implemented in school. For example, findings presented in T2 highlighted that monitoring progress towards self-set goals was helpful and thinking about the importance of developing reading skills for long-term future outcomes with the students. For one student, thinking about what ‘typical readers’ do when they are not enjoying a book was also found to be helpful. Discussions were important to identify how similar approaches might be ‘mainstreamed’.

The researcher also hopes that the current research will have a wider impact when disseminated to the Educational Psychology Service (EPS) (see Section
3.4). Firstly, it is hoped it will provide EPs with a deeper theoretical understanding of models of reading engagement and how instructional practices within school can facilitate positive outcomes. With this in mind, EPs should consider that whilst technical reading interventions are important, particularly for adolescents who struggle the most, embedding motivational constructs is as equally significant. The researcher hopes that T1 and T2 findings along with highlighting adverse outcomes of poor literacy will stimulate EP discussions about the value of finding effective literacy practices for supporting adolescent readers.

3.4. Implications of the Research at the Professional Level

It is anticipated that the dissemination of the current research will continue to shape and facilitate professionals’ understanding of this important issue. However, the researcher contends that there are also potential implications in regards to the core roles of the EP; consultation, assessment, intervention, training and research (Farrell et al., 2006).

Firstly, within consultation, EPs can highlight and promote the key points raised within the present research. They can then support and work collaboratively with stakeholders in creatively drawing upon strategies that may be effective in supporting change, either systemically or in direct work with students. In regard to assessment, the current paper offers EPs methods of further identifying and assessing reading difficulties, paying particular attention to the affective factors. This is important considering the challenges in affective assessment, given that motivational constructs are subjective and complex (Lee & Reeve, 2012). However, the researcher found that eliciting student views can provide insight into factors which inhibit or enable reading engagement.

EPs often facilitate interventions within educational contexts, or provide stakeholders with interventions that may be effective for supporting students. Whilst this thesis does not report outcomes of an evidence-based intervention (see Section 1.1), it aims to provide an understanding of what may work based on their research (T2) and other evidence within the domain (T1). Moreover, providing
training to stakeholders around the importance of reading engagement and motivation, effective strategies to facilitate reading engagement and motivation, along with ways to measure motivational constructs would also be valuable on a professional level.

Given that EPs are viewed as scientist-practitioners engaging and participating in research as one of the core functions (Farrell et al., 2006), they should continue to disseminate psychological knowledge and promote understanding through the sharing of and contribution to EBP and practice-based evidence. The researcher aims to disseminate to target audiences (see Section 4), including EPs, the added value of the current research. It is hoped that EPs would consider partaking in future research alike to develop this area, particularly given that current research clearly highlights a lack of ‘robust’ and high-quality research investigating the impact of reading interventions on motivational constructs. T1 and T2 findings also illustrate that more research would be beneficial in identifying what features of an intervention promote reading motivation and engagement.

Findings from T2 add to the limited evidence-base available within the area. Salkovskis’ (1995) hourglass model (Figure 4) illustrated the value of smaller scale research, such as case-study designs in developing theory and practice. T2 research enabled the researcher to identify how a purely affective intervention facilitated reading engagement and motivation (Yin, 2003). In line with research available, the researcher found it challenging to motivate and engage adolescents struggling with reading. It is hoped that dissemination on a wider professional level (see Section 4) will again increase awareness of the complexities of effective adolescent literacy interventions and the need for policy makers to promote wider investigation into researching how best to support both technical and affective components of reading. Although there were limitations to the current study (cf. T1 and T2), particularly around methodology and replicability, the findings should hopefully facilitate understanding into adolescent reading needs and preferences and encourage policy makers and professionals alike to consider the benefits of further research.
Section Four: A Strategy for Promoting and Evaluating the Dissemination and Impact of the Current Research

In Section 2.2, the researcher highlighted a dissemination framework developed by Harmsworth and Turpin (2000). As illustrated in Figure 5, Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) provide researchers with a set of ten questions when planning their dissemination activity. All of the questions were considered during the planning stages of dissemination and will be discussed to provide a detailed strategy for how the research within T1 and T2 will be disseminated within four areas; goal, audience, medium and timeline for dissemination. This section will conclude with a reflection on how the impact of the dissemination effort may be measured.

4.1. Goal

The goal of the thesis research was to firstly examine what interventions were currently available to support adolescents’ reading engagement and motivation (T1), then explore how a purely affective reading intervention may benefit a small number of disaffected adolescent readers (T2). The main objective for disseminating research findings was to raise awareness and advocate for those working with adolescents, to consider the importance of affective factors in reading; particularly for those who have become disaffected. T1 and T2 findings provide valuable information for educational practitioners in considering ways to develop and deliver the literacy curriculum within a high school context and potentially, within post-16 provision.

4.2. Audience

In disseminating the current research, the target audience would be those who specifically work with children and young people, particularly adolescents. More specifically, the researcher aims to engage literacy leaders and staff within the SEN department within high school contexts who are more likely to encounter adolescents who have become disaffected with reading. Those who support staff in advising and delivering their literacy education (for example, EPs, special advisory
teachers) would also benefit from the findings. Further, academics who are engaged in, or considering research into reading engagement and motivation may be interested in study outcomes. Finally, for researchers working in associated areas (e.g. primarily education), the methodological approaches used within the current research may be interesting, while findings may have wider relevance.

Table 12 below illustrates all of those that would be considered to be the target audience within the current dissemination strategy, along with effective methods to reach these audiences’ (medium), which will be discussed further in the following sub-section (see Section 4.3).

Table 12.

*Desired target audience and possible mediums of dissemination*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPs</td>
<td>• Publication within practitioner journals that are read by EPs (e.g. Educational Psychology in Practice, School Psychology International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publication within books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuing Professional Development (CPD)/service days within the EPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional fora (e.g. EPNET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Educational Psychologists (TEPs)</td>
<td>• Publication within academic journals that are read by EPs (e.g. Educational Psychology in Practice, School Psychology International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publication within books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conferences (e.g. BPS TEP conference)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Educational Practitioners (within schools and post-16 provision) | • Publication within academic journals that are read by educational practitioners (e.g. Support for Learning)  
• Workshops and presentations delivered to schools and further, and higher education providers  
• Consultation  
• Further research  
• Training and supervision  
• A leaflet for young people highlighting the benefits of reading, along with the strategies that may be beneficial |
| Researchers engaged, or considering to be engaged in research within the area | • Publication within academic journals interested in this area (e.g. Literacy Research and Instruction, Journal of Adolescent and Adult literacy)  
• Publications within books  
• Conferences (e.g. SEED conference\(^8\))  
• Publication within academic journals within educational domain |

4.3. Medium

Table 12 illustrates potential methods in which the researcher has considered as part of the dissemination strategy. Whilst the researcher intends to disseminate widely, not all of media illustrated in Table 12 may be feasible.

---

\(^8\) The Annual School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED) PGR conference takes place at the University of Manchester bringing together researchers within the SEED giving PGR students an opportunity to present their research to a multi-disciplinary audience.
However, media to be prioritised will now be considered separately. In Section 4.4 a timeline of when dissemination will be carried out will be described.

4.3.1 Academic and professional practice journals

Researchers often disseminate findings through academic and professional practice journal publication – more specifically peer-reviewed journals. As EBP has evolved, submissions to journals have increased, resulting in editors of journals being much more selective about what is published (Voigt & Hoogenboom, 2012). Therefore, when considering publishing within a journal, the researcher needs to be clear about who the target audience is and appropriate outlets. One consideration to be made here is academic versus professional practice journals. The primary audience of the former being other academics, with the emphasis on developing new knowledge and providing a significant contribution to the literature. The latter, professional practice journals, are aimed at practitioners and provide information which may guide practice.

The researcher initially considered disseminating the research findings within two separate peer-reviewed journals. It was thought that T1 would be best placed within a journal specifically aimed at publishing research within the literacy domain; therefore, more academic in nature. To reach a wide audience, the researcher submitted the paper to an international academic journal; Literacy Research and Instruction. Whilst the researcher acknowledged that this may have been ambitious, scoping of journals which accepted systematic literature reviews revealed that choice was somewhat limited within this domain. Though the referees provided many positive comments, the paper was rejected. From the comments, it appeared that the paper may have been insufficient in terms of the scope that they were looking for. Interestingly, in a recent systematic literature review published within this journal, a team of four researchers participated in data analysis.

---

9 Literacy Research and Instruction is an international professional journal which publishes articles dealing with research and instruction in the literacy domain.
collection and analysis (Hall, Simpson, Guo & Wang, 2015), allowing the capacity for a larger scope. This however, was not feasible for a lone researcher.

The peer-review process was beneficial as the comments provided by the referees enabled the researcher to enhance the paper with the view of submitting to a journal with similar aims. However, few literacy journals publish systematic literature reviews. Nevertheless, the researcher considered the following which matched the aim and scope of T1;

- *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*
- *Journal of Literacy Research*

Both offer a peer-review process; beneficial to readers as it offers some protection against poor quality research (Lilienfeld et al., 2012), and accept international research, which is useful to disseminate to a wider audience.

The second paper (T2) was deemed to be of most relevance to practising EPs. For this reason, the researcher has targeted *Educational Psychology in Practice (EPiP)*. This journal is the major publication of the AEP with its aim being research, theory and practice of relevance to EPs. Personal correspondence with the AEP indicated that at present, there are 3350 members (personal communication, April 6, 2016). The majority of EPs within the UK are members and it is a widely held view amongst practitioners that its publications are most influential on UK EP practice.

### 4.3.2. Publication with books

The affective intervention described within T2 was based on Motivational Interviewing (MI) techniques and strategies. There is growing interest within the literature in the application of school based MI (Snape & Atkinson, 2016) and whilst MI was not the primary focus of the present thesis, the findings, along with session transcripts and researcher observations, provide evidence for MI strategies in other contexts and domains. Eddie McNamara, a seminal figure within MI, has published a range of material within this area, with two books specifically illustrating the theory, practice and applications of MI with children and young people
(McNamara, 2009; 2014). With a further book publication anticipated in the near future, the researcher has been asked by Eddie McNamara to contribute to the latest edition. With many EPs using reference books as sources of information (Bramlett et al., 2002), it is hoped that this will be an effective way to disseminate some of the findings from the current thesis. It is therefore intended that the researcher will produce a chapter, provisionally titled ‘Motivational Interviewing as an Affective Intervention for Adolescent Reading’. It is hoped that this will be of interest to EPs and others interested in the MI approach.

4.3.3. Service Days

To inform EPs, the research is to be disseminated during an upcoming service day within the researcher’s practice placement EPS. The theoretical background of reading engagement and motivation will be presented, along with the findings from both T1 and T2. Implications of the findings for EPs will be the main focus of the presentation. Whilst this will be delivered to EPs only, it is hoped they will disseminate this knowledge to other educational practitioners to raise awareness of the importance of affective factors within literacy practices.

4.3.4. Conferences

Both the AEP and BPS advertise Winter conferences, requesting key speakers to discuss areas of research and specialisms. It would be beneficial to present the findings of the current research at a conference to reach the EP community, however details of forthcoming AEP and BPS conferences have yet to be published. This will however be revisited at a later date.

In addition to EPs, the researcher has sought the opportunity to present findings to a multi-disciplinary audience of postgraduate (PGR) students. The Annual School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED) PGR conference will provide those who attend not only the findings of the current research, but also information regarding the research methods and data analysis.

4.3.5. Workshops
As discussed in Section 3.4, one of the core functions of the EP is to deliver training (Farrell et al., 2006). It has already been agreed with the research school site that training and workshops will be provided to staff within the literacy department, SEN department (including teaching assistants and Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator; SENCo) and library services. The workshop will provide staff with an understanding of reading engagement and motivation and consult with them regarding effective methods and strategies to adolescents who have become disaffected with reading. The head teacher will also be attending as to further implement any changes that come as a result of the workshop. It is also hoped that similar training and workshops will be offered to other schools at a later date.

4.4 Timeline for Dissemination

A timeline is presented in Table 13 detailing when each planned strategy of dissemination will be taking place.

Table 13

Anticipated timeline for the dissemination of research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination strategy</th>
<th>Date by which dissemination strategy will be complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and professional practice journals:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational Psychology in Practice</td>
<td>20th March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Journal of Literacy Research</td>
<td>30th June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication within a book regarding the application of MI.</td>
<td>31st December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution at EPS service day</td>
<td>22nd July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEED PGR Conference (Appendix L)</td>
<td>16th May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop delivered to participating school</td>
<td>30th September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS and AEP conferences</td>
<td>Forthcoming and to be arranged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5. Evaluating the Impact of the Current Research

The likely outcomes of the dissemination strategy are an increased awareness of the key messages within T1 and T2, which highlight the importance of
affective factors within adolescent reading. It is hoped that as a consequence of raised awareness, EPs and educational practitioners will use the evidence-base to inform their practice (Evans, Connell, Barkham, Marshall & Mellor-Clark, 2003). Considering what will be important to move the outcomes of the research to impact has been considered within the dissemination plan. The evaluation of the impact of such dissemination efforts would be best met through internal benchmarking (see section 2.2). This is seen as a logical starting point for benchmarking (Lueger & Barkham, 2010) and would allow for the collection and comparison of outcomes data within the research school site, for example, identifying effective methods to increase reading engagement and motivation. Further, following publication of research, citations offer the researcher with information about how their research is being used. The researcher intends to track their citations via databases such as EBSCOhost Database, ResearchGate, JSTOR and Google Scholar.
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# Appendix A: PRISMA 27-item checklist (Moher et al., 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Topic</th>
<th>Checklist Item</th>
<th>Reported on page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABSTRACT</strong></td>
<td>1. Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background, objectives, study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td>3. Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHODS</strong></td>
<td>5. Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOES) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOES, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESULTS**

15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias; selective reporting within studies).

16 Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.

**Study selection**

17 Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.

18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.

**Study characteristics**

19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).

20 For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.

**Risk of bias within studies**

21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals, and measures of consistency.

22 Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15).

23 Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see item 16]).

**DISCUSSION**

24 Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).

25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).

26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.

27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.
**Appendix B: Quality ratings for included quantitative studies**

Methodological quality (quantitative evaluation research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use of a randomized group design</th>
<th>Focus on a specific, well-defined disorder or problem</th>
<th>Comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo or less preferably, standard control</th>
<th>Use of manuals and procedures for monitoring fidelity checks</th>
<th>Sample large enough to detect effect at .05 (from Cohen, 1992)</th>
<th>Use of outcome measure(s) that has demonstrated good reliability and validity*</th>
<th>Total (/7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantrell et al. (2014)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuevas et al. (2012)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie and Klauda (2014)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie et al. (2013)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau and Chan (2007)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(2 points if more than one measure used, 1 point deducted if measures lack reliability and validity)*

*Note: low = 0-2; medium = 3-4; high = 5-7*
## Appendix C: Quality ratings for included qualitative studies

### Methodological quality (qualitative evaluation research)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriateness of the research design</th>
<th>Clear sampling rationale</th>
<th>Well executed data collection &amp; execution</th>
<th>Analysis close to the data</th>
<th>Emergence of explicit reflexivity</th>
<th>Comprehensiveness of documentation</th>
<th>Negativity of case analysis</th>
<th>Evidences of explicit reflexivity</th>
<th>Clarity and coherence of the reporting</th>
<th>Evidences of researcher-participant negotiation</th>
<th>Transferable conclusions</th>
<th>Evidences of attention to ethical issues</th>
<th>Total (/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lau and Chan (2007)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercuri o (2005)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: low = 0–4; medium = 5–8, high = 9–12.*
## Appendix D: Diagnostic assessment of National Curriculum Level 3 Literacy
*(Manchester Educational Psychology Service, 2004)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION (Text and sentence level)</th>
<th>PRINT (Word level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Phonological awareness and phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Reading and spelling of many monosyllabic words is accurate, with phonetically plausible attempts at longer polysyllabic words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a beginning, middle and end.</td>
<td>Can read and spell a large number of high frequency words (approx. 150) with ease in and out of context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to use story frames to support independent writing.</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses opinions about events and actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NC Level 3 Developing fluency** *(approximately 7-8 years of age)*

| Stories                                | Reading and spelling of many monosyllabic words is accurate, with phonetically plausible attempts at longer polysyllabic words. |
| have a beginning, middle and end.     | Reading |
| Able to use story frames to support independent writing. | |
| Expresses opinions about events and actions. | |

**NC Level 3 Basic competences achieved** *(Approximately equivalent 7-9 years of age)*

| Context and phonological cues are used automatically in combination. | Can read and write words with silent letters, longer word endings and polysyllabic words |
| Can link understanding of text to own experience | Child can read: sliding, cloudburst, investigate, |
| Can read and write all commonly used words with ease. | Confident and independent their own writing. |

---

10 Criteria taken from *Manchester Educational Psychology Service (2004)* *The Manchester Resource File. Manchester: Manchester City Council.* The diagnostic assessment is linked to the National Curriculum attainment levels informed by and consistent with the values and principles of the National Curriculum, the National Literacy Strategy and National Primary Strategy.
and can go beyond the text. Child selects books suitable to their interests and needs.

unbearable, prehistoric
Child can spell: window, coldframe, begging, marked, playground, wetter, delighted.
Appendix E: Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP): conversational questions (Pitcher et al., 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: _________________________________________________</th>
<th>Date: _________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Figure 1 (continued)**

**Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile reading survey**

10. 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

11. I worry about what other kids think about my reading ____________.
    - every day
    - almost every day
    - once in a while
    - never

12. Knowing how to read well is ____________.
    - not very important
    - sort of important
    - important
    - very important

13. 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

14. 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

15. Reading is ____________.
    - very easy for me
    - kind of easy for me
    - kind of hard for me
    - very hard for me

16. 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

17. 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

18. I would like for my teachers to read out loud in my classes ____________.
    - every day
    - almost every day
    - once in a while
    - never

19. When I read out loud I am a ____________.
    - poor reader
    - OK reader
    - good reader
    - very good reader

20. When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel ____________.
    - very happy
    - sort of happy
    - sort of unhappy
    - unhappy

*Note. Adapted with permission from the Motivation to Read Profile (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996)*
Figure 2
Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile

A. Emphasis: Narrative text
Suggested prompt (designed to engage student in a natural conversation): I have been reading a good book. I was talking with...about it last night. I enjoy talking about what I am reading with my friends and family. Today, I would like to hear about what you have been reading and if you share it.

1. Tell me about the most interesting story or book you have read recently. Take a few minutes to think about it (wait time). Now, tell me about the book.

   Probe: What else can you tell me? Is there anything else?

2. How did you know or find out about this book?

   (Some possible responses: assigned, chosen, in school, out of school)

3. Why was this story interesting to you?

B. Emphasis: Informational text
Suggested prompt (designed to engage student in a natural conversation): Often we read to find out or learn about something that interests us. For example, a student I recently worked with enjoyed reading about his favorite sports teams on the Internet. I am going to ask you some questions about what you like to read to learn about.

1. Think about something important that you learned recently, not from your teacher and not from television, but from something you have read. What did you read about? (Wait time.) Tell me about what you learned.

   Probe: What else could you tell me? Is there anything else?

2. How did you know or find out about reading material on this?

   (Some possible responses: assigned, chosen, in school, out of school)
3. Why was reading this important to you?

C. Emphasis: General reading

1. Did you read anything at home yesterday? What?

2. Do you have anything at school (in your desk, locker, or book bag) today that you are reading? Tell me about them.

3. Tell me about your favorite author.

4. What do you think you have to learn to be a better reader?

5. Do you know about any books right now that you’d like to read? Tell me about them.

6. How did you find out about these books?

7. What are some things that get you really excited about reading? Tell me about....
Figure 2 (continued)
Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile
conversational interview

8. Who gets you really interested and excited about reading?
Tell me more about what they do.

9. Do you have a computer in your home?

*If they answer yes, ask the following questions:*

How much time do you spend on the computer a day?

What do you usually do?

What do you like to read when you are on the Internet?

*If they answer no, ask the following questions:*

If you did have a computer in your home, what would you like to do with it?

Is there anything on the Internet that you would like to be able to read?

D. Emphasis: School reading in comparison to home reading

1. In what class do you most like to read?

Why?

2. In what class do you feel the reading is the most difficult?

Why?
Figure 2 (continued)
Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile

3. Have any of your teachers done something with reading that you really enjoyed?

Could you explain some of what was done?

4. Do you share and discuss books, magazines, or other reading materials with your friends outside of school?

What?

How often?

Where?

5. Do you write letters or email to friends or family?

How often?

6. Do you share any of the following reading materials with members of your family: newspapers, magazines, religious materials, games?

With whom?

How often?

7. Do you belong to any clubs or organizations for which you read and write?

Could you explain what kind of reading it is?

Note. Adapted with permission from the Motivation to Read Profile (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Marzoni, 1996)
Appendix F: Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997)

**MOTIVATION FOR READING QUESTIONNAIRE (MRQ)**

Name ........................................................................ Date ..................................................

Instructions: We are interested in your reading. The statements below tell how some students feel about reading. Read each statement and decide whether it talks about a person who is like you or different from you. There are no right or wrong answers. We only want to know how you feel about reading.

If the statement is very different from you, circle 1.
If the statement is a little different from you, circle 2.
If the statement is a little like you, circle 3.
If the statement is a lot like you, circle 4.

**Examples**

The following three questions have been provided as an example. Please answer them by circling the number which best describes how you feel. If you have any questions, just ask. When you are all happy about what you have to do, we will start the questionnaire.

1. I like ice cream.
2. I like to swim.
3. I like spinach.
Circle one answer for each question

1. I visit the library often with my family.
2. I like hard, challenging books.
3. I know that I will do well in reading next year.
4. I do as little school work as possible in reading.
5. If the teacher discusses something interesting I might read more about it.
6. I read because I have to.
7. I like it when the questions in books make me think.
8. I read about my hobbies to learn more about them.
9. I am a good reader.
10. I read stories about fantasy and make believe.
11. I often read to my brother or my sister.
12. I like being the only one who knows an answer in something we read.
13. I read to learn new information about topics that interest me.
14. My friends sometimes tell me I’m a good reader.
15. I learn more from reading than most students in my class.
16. I like to read about new things.
17. I like hearing the teacher say I read well.
18. I like being the best at reading.
19. I look forward to finding out my reading mark.
20. I sometimes read to my parents.
21. My friends and I like to swap things to read.
22. It is important for me to see my name on a list of good readers.

23. I don't like reading something when the words are too difficult.

24. I make pictures in my mind when I read.

25. I always do my reading work exactly as the teacher wants it.

26. I usually learn difficult things by reading.

27. I don't like vocabulary questions.

28. Complicated stories are no fun to read.

29. I am happy when someone recognises my reading.

30. I feel like I make friends with people in good books.

31. My parents often tell me what a good job I'm doing in reading.

32. Finishing every reading assignment is very important to me.

33. I like mysteries.

34. I talk to my friends about what I am reading.

35. If I am reading about an interesting topic, I sometimes lose track of time.

36. I like to get compliments for my reading.

37. Marks or grades are a good way to see how I'm doing in reading.

38. I like to help my friends with their school work in reading.

39. I read to improve my marks.

40. My parents ask me about my reading marks.
41. I enjoy a long, involved story or fiction book.
42. I like to tell my family about what I'm reading.
43. I try to get more answers right than my friends.
44. If the project is interesting, I can read difficult material.
45. I enjoy reading books about people living in different countries.
46. I read a lot of adventure stories.
47. I always try to finish my reading on time.
48. If a book is interesting, I don't care how hard it is to read.
49. I like to finish my reading before other students.
50. In comparison to my other school subjects, I am best at reading.
51. I am willing to work hard to read better than my friends.
52. I don't like it when there are too many people in the story.
53. It is very important to me to be a good reader.
54. In comparison to other activities I do, it is very important for me to be good at reading.
Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ)  
Scoring Sheet

Name ........................................... Date ...........................................

Directions: Add the ratings for each item (for items 4* and 6* the scores are reversed, i.e. 1=4, 2=3, 3=2, 4=1). Divide each total by the number of items in each scale to obtain the Scale Score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No. of items in scale</th>
<th>SCALE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading efficacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading curiosity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of reading</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>□ □</td>
<td>+2 □ = □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading recognition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for marks</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social reasons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading competition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading work avoidance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total MRQ Score (exclude reading work avoidance scale score) □

This scoring sheet is part of the Psychology in Education Portfolio edited by Norah Fredericksen and R. J. (Jim) Cameron. Once the invoice has been paid, it may be photocopied for use within the purchasing institution only. Published by The NFER-NELSON Publishing Company Ltd, Ewell House, 2 Oxford Road East, Windsor, Berkshire SL4 1DP, UK. Code 09000 7301
Appendix G: Semi-structured interview schedules

Post-intervention:
1. Which parts of the sessions that we did, did you enjoy the most?

2. Is there anything that you think could have been improved within the sessions?

3. Are there any strategies that you have found most helpful?

4. What ways do you think that the sessions are useful in helping other young people with reading difficulties?

Three-month follow-up:
1. Can you tell me about how you have been getting on at school since the sessions with myself ended?

2. When I last spoke to you, you told me that you... (e.g. we had set some goals to practice reading 40 minutes a day...) How has this been going?

3. Have you noticed anything different about your reading since the sessions have ended? Has anything changed?

4. How do you currently feel about reading?

5. How often would you say you read at the moment?

6. Have the sessions that we have had together helped you with your reading?

7. In what ways have they helped you with your reading recently?
Appendix H: Completed session materials from one student (Eva)

Session one

Activity sheet 1b(i)

Opening discussion

In my spare time I

Like going to the park and then have some cheese

At school I also like dancing lessons

My family

I live with my 2 brothers and my mum and dad also my 2 dogs. I enjoy helping him with my younger brother with his homework

My friends

I have a group of friends that are always with and us like to do the same things

When I was younger

My nan looked after me in hospital for a year and I like going swimming with my mum

When I'm older

I want to be a nurse as you must be kind and sometimes smart

I don't like

Football when was livinghistory and ge

I like ... down to the beach and I like taking my dogs for a walk at night with my father

Activity sheet 1b(i) © Atkinson 2013
Session one continued.

Activity sheet 1a(i)

Words that describe me

From the list below, circle the 10 words or phrases that describe you best

- Writer
- Caring
- Environmentally friendly
- Aware of my feelings
- Outdoors Person
- Practical
- Planner
- Musical
- Singer
- Good sense of direction
- Learn by trying things out
- In Control
- Friendly
- Adventurous
- Good with words
- Mathematical
- Sporty
- Enjoy reading
- Notice sounds around me
- Problem Solver
- Creative
- Like things in order
- Remember things in pictures
- Thoughtful
- Like to be part of a group
- Enjoy being by myself
- Good with animals

Activity sheet 1a(i) © Atkinson 2013
Session one continued.

Name ........................................

Activity sheet 1a(ii)

My Skills Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you tick?</th>
<th>Then you are</th>
<th>Which means you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Picture Smart</td>
<td>See things clearly in your mind. Use pictures to get ideas across. Can imagine what something would look like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good sense of direction</td>
<td>Logic Smart</td>
<td>Like to put things in order. Have a logical mind. Plan things carefully. Need things to make sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembers things in pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like things in order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical</td>
<td>Sound Smart</td>
<td>Work out patterns in sounds. Play with sounds, compose songs, sing or play instruments. Listen to music when working and to feel good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice sounds around me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of rhythm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>Nature Smart</td>
<td>Enjoy being outdoors and feel comfortable there. Interested in animals, plants and trees. Think about issues that affect the planet, such as pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good with animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>People Smart</td>
<td>Enjoy contact with people. Good with others. Understand and notice other people’s feelings. Good communicator and team member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to be part of a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team player</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of my feelings</td>
<td>Self Smart</td>
<td>Enjoy quiet thinking time alone. Understand your own reasons for doing things. Like to daydream about new ideas. Think about your own feelings and thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good with my hands</td>
<td>Body Smart</td>
<td>Learn best by doing. Like to use your hands. Good balance while running, walking and doing sport. Hobbies involve being active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn by trying things out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy reading</td>
<td>Word Smart</td>
<td>Good at explaining things. Like writing and reading. Like word games and new words. Speak or write well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at explaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good with words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity sheet 1a(ii) ©Atkinson 2013

Adapted from materials from Manchester City Council (2002) Reducing the Barriers to Learning: Raising Attainment and Achievement Through the Inclusive School and Cheshire County Council (2005) Multiple Intelligence Theory.
Session one continued.
Session two

She doesn't get on with her work. She does 'in R.E.'

She thinks she's better than everybody else.

Bully

She doesn't like learning so she interrupts.

She wears short skirts.

She's good at R.E. because she likes done. She has no friends knowing about the other countries.

Her mom and dad rowed a lot and broke up and she never sees her dad.

She's lived out of school.

Nice so that if she asks for something they will get it for her.

Bobby, horrible, nasty.

Mirror, perfume, pencil case, make-up.

Lots of make-up and a party so that she will show off how much her family has.

Pass them around so that they will do what she says.

highness
Session two continued.

She's kind to everyone.

- She likes school.
- She likes going out with her friends.
- Hates bullies.
- Wears leggings and a T-shirt.
- She's always nice to her friends.

Kind
Hardworking
Nice

Big bag so that she can fit all her things into it.

Books and toys to have a day out with her family.

Jacqueline Wilson
Cinema - comedy

Spiders and snakes

She lives with her best friend and she has a job - nurse.

She always spent time with her family and friends.

She's always nice and they always go out - park.

She likes working and completing her work on time.
Session two continued.
# Session three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B C D E F G H</td>
<td>lazy hardworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>shy confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quiet loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>care for reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shy in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading out loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don't like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don't like reading at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doesn't try to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tries to read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session three *continued*.

Activity sheet 3a

**The good things and the less good things**

- When you are reading quietly and people can't hear you.
- Bring your confidence up a bit more.
- Reading out loud.
- Getting things wrong and people laughing at you when you do get something wrong.
- Everyone looking at you creates pressure.
- Better at reading.

**Key**

- Green: good things
- Orange: less good things
**Scaling - thinking about change**

**Behaviour:** Reading out loud

**Wanting to change** - Being truthful, on a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 representing you not wanting to change and 10 representing you really wanting to change, where are you today?

- Rating: 5

**Being able to change** - On a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 representing it being very hard to change and 10 representing it being very easy, how difficult would change be?

- Rating: 5

Activity sheet 3c © Atkinson 2013
Session four

The magic circle

Think about something you have done recently which you really enjoyed. Write or draw in the circles below:

- what you DID
- how you FELT
- what you were THINKING

What were you THINKING?
That it was going to be good. What we were going to do.

What were you DOING?
At a friend’s house.
Her mum, step-dad and brother.
We went to her auntie’s house to see her pugs.

How did you FEEL?
Happy.
Tired.
Session four continued.

Activity sheet 7b
Setting goals

- Not to have negative feelings when reading out loud.
- Reading in front of a small amount of people.
- Ways of how to calm down.

Name: ____________________________
Session four continued.

Activity sheet 5a
The future and the present

Text
Behaviour stays the same

Reading out loud.

Behaviour changes

Relaxed
Happy
Calm.

Shy;
worried;
panicking.

Effect your grades; mixed up on what you actually said.

You won't get a good job because you would have got a bad grade.

Effect your happiness.

Helps you get through school like exams and speaking in front of a group of people.

Helps you get a job.

Having a good background in the past.

Activity sheet 5a © Atkinson 2013
Session 5

Activity sheet 7c
My strategy
Sheet 1

Goal: Not to have negative feelings when reading out loud

Strategy (for achieving my goal): Finding ways to calm down before reading out loud.
- Breathing
- Tapping foot on floor { helps me calm down.}

Rating for this strategy:

Strategy: Try reading in front of groups - practice.
What happens when I use it?
Remember the things you need to read.
Stops from saying the words wrong

Rating for this strategy:

Strategy: Focus, stay up the room.
What happens when I use it?
- Focus goes away from other people.
- Only hear myself; everything else goes blurry.

Rating for this strategy:
Session five continued.

A bit worried on no delay. Tummy turning, you.

Once you were calm, you wanted to do it.

The friend that you were meant to be doing it was also doing it with a group.

I didn't want to do it. I thought it would be perfect.

The group from before.

I thought I wouldn't.

Once it went on.

Happy.

Betsy felt anew. Right.

I thought I had.

It would've been great.

You should've gone.

Confidence.

No one would've called me.
The YARC Passage Reading was also administered to students to measure secondary changes in reading efficacy. This is a reading test which assesses accuracy, rate and comprehension of reading in secondary aged students. The assessment has two parallel forms of passages (form A and B) with thirteen comprehension questions. The YARC Passage Reading is suitable for students aged 11 to 16 and is standardised on a representative UK sample. Good reliability and content validity have been established (Stothard et al., 2010).

Results are shown below and were variable for all three students, although this may have been partly due to the use of alternative assessment forms. No particular trends were evident regarding improvements, although this is perhaps not unexpected given the timescale of the intervention and follow up; and that reading performance was not the primary focus of the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading Rate</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Reading Fluency</th>
<th>Single word reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figures in bold represent a positive change in scores from the pre-test. At pre- and follow-up, Eva and Joshua completed form A and form B at post-test. At pre- and follow-up, Tyler completed form B and form A at post-test.
Appendix J: Thematic analysis process from start to finish (Braun & Clarke, 2006)

Braun & Clarke's (2006) six phase thematic analysis guide was used to analyse the qualitative data gained through the semi-structured interviews with the students. The six phases will be described in this appendix.

1. Familiarizing yourself with your data
The semi-structured interviews were recorded using a Dictaphone and were transcribed by the researcher using Microsoft Word. Transcribing the data and re-reading enabled the researcher to become accustomed to the data before beginning the coding process.
2. Generating initial codes

*NVivo for Mac* was used for generating initial codes (or nodes in NVivo). Using NVivo enable each code to contain references within the transcription. Each code, along with its data was then exported in separate files into a word document.
3. **Searching for themes**

After exporting all of the codes into word, the researcher considered each code for the second time. At this point, some codes were seen to be too similar to other codes to be coded separately, therefore, some codes merged into one. Swapping to this
manual process allowed for a more thorough analysis and enabled the researcher to begin to identify themes.

4. Reviewing the themes
A thematic map was created using post-it notes (as above). The themes and sub-themes created arms connected to the centre, which was labelled ‘Research Question’. Codes were sorted and located under the themes. Using post-it notes allowed for any amendments to be made through the process if deemed necessary, for example, changing the names of codes.

5 & 6. Defining and naming themes and producing the report
Table 5 was created to illustrate the themes and highlight the frequency in which a code appeared within the interviews.
Appendix K: Hallmarks of randomized controlled trials and practice-based studies
(pg. 38-39; Barkham et al., 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial/study feature</th>
<th>Randomized controlled trials</th>
<th>Practice-based studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Design              | • Formal: design provides the overarching rationale and framework for the trial/research  
                      • Control and/or contrast components of design are crucial  | • Informal: design is placed ‘over’ already existing routinely collected data collection  
                      • Focus can be on translational work (i.e. testing efficacy findings in practice settings), investigation of quality or safety components, or process issues |
| Philosophy and policy | • Top-down approach: Invariably initiated by policy makers, funding agencies and researchers | • Bottom-up approach: Driven and owned by practitioners in service of quality agenda |
| Hypotheses          | • Usually focused on a single ‘main’ scientific question | • Can focus on single or complex questions |
| Investigator allegiance | • Research usually an expert in candidate treatment being investigated | • More focused on delivery and service issues |
| Sample              | • Highly selected: targeted according to specific hypotheses  
                      • Stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria applied to protect internal validity construct | • Unselected: initial sampling frame comprises of all clients or practitioners  
                      • Study sample can comprise total pool of data or a selected subsample to focus on specific group issues or subgroup |
| Treatment(s)        | • Single/specific treatment(s)  
                      • Manualised | • All treatments delivered in practice  
                      • Not manualised |
| Location | Additional training for therapists usual prior to study  
| Adherence rating/checks | No additional training other than would occur in fulfilment of continuing professional development  
| Adherence checks only as naturally adopted procedures within the service (i.e. not imposed by the study requirements) |
| Measurement | Not usually associated with specific service/delivery locations because focus is ‘science’ rather than ‘practice’  
| Increasingly multisite implementation in order to yield required number of clients | Often associated with local service(s) in order for feedback to be utilized  
| Can be single or multiple services depending on common methodology |
| Ethics | Ethics approval always required incorporating informed consent | Ethics approval is usually best secured but use of routinely collected aggregated data should not raise concerns for review boards |
| Relation of measurement to sample | Rich data on focused (small?) number of clients | Rich data on large number of clients and practitioners although any study can be selective about what data to include |
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Structure of thesis

The structure of this thesis was split into three sections:

- **T1** - Systematic literature review: aims to provide a literature review which provides the broad basis and rationale for the empirical paper

- **T2** - Empirical study: informed by the systematic literature review, filling a research ‘gap’ within the area

- **T3** - Dissemination of evidence to professional practice: exploring concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence, dissemination and lessons learned.
The Effectiveness of Literacy Interventions in Promoting Adolescent Reading Engagement and Motivation: A Review of the Literature

Background: Adolescent literacy skills

- Learning to read is regarded as the most fundamental goal of education and begins during early schooling (1)

- Figures from the OECD in 2013 illustrated that 17% of 15 year olds in the UK did not leave school with proficient reading skills (2)

- Given the relationship between poor literacy skills with health and social outcomes, this is an important area for policy makers to attend to (3)

- Yet, toward adolescence, direct reading instruction diminishes and the specialised needs of adolescents may be overlooked (4, 5)
Background: Motivation and engagement in adolescent reading

- Typically, attitudes toward reading decrease through adolescence (6)

- Reading behaviour and reading enjoyment have direct relationships with reading attainment (7)

- There are clear links between reading engagement and motivation with reading attainment (8)

- Yet, research has primarily focused on technical/remedial reading interventions, paying little attention to affective factors which can influence reading attainment for our adolescent population

- **Aim**: a synthesis of research that has measured outcomes relating to motivation and/or engagement as part of a reading intervention
Method

Selection of studies
• *Inclusion criteria* (published between 2000-2014; aimed at increasing reading motivation and/or engagement; and, conducted in a high school)
• *Electronic databases searched* (PsycINFO, ERIC and Web of Science)

Screening and study quality assessment
• Titles and abstracts screened for inclusion criteria
• *Quality assessment* frameworks were used to assess quantitative and qualitative methodology and awarded quality ratings of low, medium or high

Data extraction
• The aims of the study
• The study design and content
• The participants
• The pre- and post-intervention measures and outcomes

Identification
664 records identified through database searching and reference harvesting

Screening
664 records screened

Eligibility
36 full texts assessed for eligibility
30 full text articles excluded
5 studies included in quantitative synthesis
1 study included in qualitative synthesis

628 records excluded (not meeting inclusion criteria or duplicates)
Findings

- A total of six studies met the inclusion criteria set (five of which
- The researcher focused on identifying whether the following motivational constructs were present within interventions:
  - Intrinsic motivation (interest and enjoyment)
  - Value (belief that reading is important)
  - Self-efficacy (beliefs about one's own capabilities to complete a reading task)
  - Peer value (belief that one's own viewpoints are valued by peers)
- The main findings were:
  - When motivational components were present within technical reading interventions, reading motivation improved
  - Research has not focused on a primarily affective reading reading intervention
  - As a result, it is difficult to assess the active ingredient to improvements—technical vs. affective factors

T2:
“I Just Find it Boring”: Findings From an Affective Adolescent Reading Intervention
Rationale and aims of current research

- To date, there has been no research on how educational psychologists (EPs) might support students to address affective factors in reading

- The present study sought to:
  - explore the use of an affective reading intervention (focusing on engagement and motivation) with adolescent readers;
  - to investigate some of the factors which potentially inhibit and facilitate reading development.

Method

- Design:
  - Exploratory, multiple-case study design with embedded units of analysis
  - Quantitative and qualitative data collection

- Participants:
  - School staff were asked to select three pupils who met the following criteria:
    - In Year 8
    - Had a primary reading difficulty
    - Low in motivation toward reading
Method: Continued

Stage 1
- Pre-test measures
- Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ)
- York Assessment of Reading Comprehension (YARC)
- Reading frequency questionnaire

Stage 2
- 5 sessions of MI based intervention delivered to participants

Stage 3
- Post-test measures
- Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ)
- York Assessment of Reading Comprehension (YARC)
- Reading frequency questionnaire
- Semi-structured interview with the young people

Stage 4
- Follow-up measures
- Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ)
- York Assessment of Reading Comprehension (YARC)
- Reading frequency questionnaire

Data analysis

- Descriptive statistics for the MRQ and YARC scores at the three time points (pre-, post- and three-month follow-up)

- Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis was used for the semi-structured interviews:

1. Familiarizing yourself with the data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Producing the report
### Findings: Quantitative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Intrinsic motivation</th>
<th>Extrinsic motivation</th>
<th>Social motivation</th>
<th>Total MRQ Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figures in bold represent a positive change in scores from the pre-test. Self-efficacy and social motivation scores are out of a possible score of 8 and extrinsic and intrinsic are out of a possible score of 10.

### Findings: Qualitative

#### Self-efficacy
- Self-perceptions of own ability to change
- Attitude toward reading
- Taking ownership
- Confidence
- Reading efficacy
- Linking engagement to reading efficacy

#### Changes in reading engagement and motivation
- Extrinsic motivation
- Readiness to change
- Enjoyment of reading
- More time reading
- Seeking out reading material
- Identifying strategies and resources

Semi-structured interviews

#### Usefulness of supportive processes
- Solution-focused approach
- Identified what motivates them
- Identified personal barriers

#### Operational issues
- Facilitators
- Barriers
Summary of key findings

- Students reported a range of benefits including increased self-efficacy and positive changes in reading engagement and motivation.

- Helped to elicit the views of three reluctant readers and provide an understanding of the mechanisms affecting their reading engagement and motivation.

- Enabled an understanding of factors inhibiting reading engagement and motivation.

Limitations

- Negative case - MRQ scores decreased in overall motivation at post- and three-month follow-up, with the greatest decrease in self-efficacy.

- Reliance on self-report measures.

- Individualised intervention - difficult to replicate and make inferences in causality of positive outcomes.

- Small sample size.
Implications for Educational Psychologists (EPs)

- Raise awareness of the role of affective factors on reading engagement, motivation and performance - contextual complexities
- Empower educators to think more about the literacy curriculum
- Disseminate psychological knowledge by sharing evidence-based and practice-based evidence
- Assessment of reading difficulties by eliciting views of reluctant readers
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Research has suggested increasing motivation to read holds vital promise for improving the effectiveness of school-based interventions. The efficacy for using Motivational Interviewing (MI) with young people is increasing within educational settings and it has been suggested that it could have gains with academic performance and reading engagement and motivation. To the researcher’s knowledge, there has been no research, which has explored the impact that MI has on individuals with reading difficulties. The research proposes that using MI as an intervention could increase adolescents’ motivation to read and have an impact on reading efficacy. The researcher also notes that to date there has been a ‘notable lack’ of research which has elicited the views of young people’s experiences of MI. Therefore, in addition to the focus already discussed, the researcher proposes to contribute to this area, gaining the views of adolescents about their experience of MI.

B2. The principal research methods and methodologies are (250 words max):

Project Design:
Exploratory multiple-case study with embedded units of analysis.

Data Collection Methods:
Both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected. Pre- and post-intervention measurements will be taken on three occasions; prior to MI sessions, upon completion of the MI sessions and during a three month follow up:
The York Assessment of Reading Comprehension: Secondary Passages (YARC) will provide a standardised score for participants reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension.
The Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ; Wigfield and Guthrie, 1997), which consists of 53 items measuring 11 motivation constructs.
As part of the intervention as a way of making MI bespoke for each young person, the conversational questions illustrated in the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP; Pitcher et al., 2007) will be conducted in advance of the first MI session (appended).

Reading frequency questionnaire measuring types of reading material that the young people may read.
A semi-structured interview to elicit their views and perceptions on how useful they found MI to be.

Sampling:
During professional placement, the researcher will locate a mainstream high-school willing to participate in the research. The participating school will identify five Year 8 participants identified as having a reading difficulty (working at National Curriculum Level 3 in literacy) as their primary difficulty.

Method(s) of Analysis:
Descriptive statistics will be reported for the YARC and MRQ illustrating any effects of reading efficacy and reading motivation respectively. Responses from the ARMP will be used to create a narrative account for each young person. Audio-recordings from the semi-structured interviews eliciting the young people’s views will be transcribed by the researcher and member checked. An inductive approach of thematic analysis will be used. To strengthen the reliability of the findings another TEP will examine and analyse a section of the transcription.

NB: If your research methods include collection of image or video data, you must complete the VASTRE document (regardless of research risk).
B3. Please indicate which of the following groups are expected to participate in this research:

- [x] Children under 16, other than those in school, youth club, or other accredited organisations.
- Adults with learning difficulties, other than those in familiar, supportive environments.
- Adults who are unable to self-consent
- Adults with mental illness/terminal illness/dementia/residential care home
- Adults or children in emergency situations
- Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the researcher
- Prisoners
- Young Offenders
- Other vulnerable groups (please detail)

OR

- None of the above groups are involved in this study

B4. Number of expected research participants. 5

B5. Will you conduct fieldwork visits?

- [X] Yes
  - Complete either the Declaration in Section D1 or the Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form if indicated in your RREA by criteria marked by an asterisk.

- [ ] No
  - Complete the Declaration in Section D2

B6. The research will take place (tick all that apply):

- [X] within the UK

---

11 The person with learning difficulties has appropriate support within the setting from accredited support workers or family members.
I/we confirm that this research:

- is primary research involving children or other vulnerable groups which involves direct contact with participants\(^{13}\).
- study is on a subject that a reasonable person would agree addresses issues of legitimate interest, where there is a possibility that the topic may result in distress or upset in rare instances.
- is primary research which involves substantial direct contact\(^{14}\) with adults in non-professional roles\(^*\).
- is primary research which focuses on data collection from professionals responding to questions outside of their professional concerns.
- is primary research involving data collection from participants outside of the EU or the researcher’s home country via direct telephone, video, or other linked communications.
- is practice review/evaluation involving topics of a sensitive nature which are not personal to the participants.
- involves visits to site(s) where a specific risk to participants and/or the researcher has been identified, and the researcher may not be closely supervised throughout\(^*\).
- requires specific training and this is scheduled to be completed before fieldwork starts, or, training will not be undertaken but the research will be closely supervised by an academic advisor with appropriate qualifications and skills.
- requires vaccinations which have been received, or are scheduled to be received in a timely fashion\(^*\).

---

\(^{12}\) The researcher’s ‘home country’ is defined as one in which (1) the researcher holds a current passport through birthright or foreign birth registration, (2) a country where the researcher has resident status, or (3) where the researcher holds a permit or visa to work, has a contract of employment, and is not a UK tax-payer.

\(^{13}\) This does not include research in locations where children are present if they are not the focus of the research.

\(^{14}\) For example, in focus group or one to one interview in private locations, and not ‘market research’ which is characterised by brief interaction with randomly selected individuals in public locations.
requires face to face contact with research participants partly outside normal working hours\textsuperscript{15} that may be seen as inconvenient* 

takes place in, or involves transport to and from, locations where the researcher’s lack of familiarity may put them at personal risk* 

may require the operation of machinery, electrical equipment, or workplace vehicles, or handling or working with animals at the research location(s), for which they are not qualified, but such operation or handling will be undertaken under close supervision from a qualified operative or handler* 

* IF YOU HAVE TICKED these MEDIUM risk criteria you must also complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form

* IF YOU HAVE ONLY TICKED MEDIUM risk criteria NOT marked (*) you MUST also complete the LOW Fieldwork Risk Declaration on page 9 of this form

If ONE OR MORE of the MEDIUM risk criteria have been selected, ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Research Integrity Committee (RIC) and so you should complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the Manchester Institute of Education Ethics Intranet).

The supervisor and student should agree this RREA assessment and submit:

Completed RREA form
Completed Manchester Institute of Education Ethical Approval Application form\textsuperscript{16}
Completed Fieldwork Risk Assessment form where indicated
Supporting documents.

NB: ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.

Document should be submitted for review as indicated below:

PGR Thesis - Mrs. Debbie Kubiena, Room B3.10 along with your PhD Research Plan for consideration at the PhD/Prof Doctorate Review Panel.

All other cases - to the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) via Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk by your supervisor. In doing so, supervisors

\textsuperscript{15} In the UK normal working hours are between 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri inclusive.

\textsuperscript{16} This document and guidance for completion can downloaded from http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics
confirm that they have agreed the assessed risk level and that the documents are complete and correct. The AEF will forward your completed documents to a member of the MIE RIC committee for approval.

*If none of the HIGH or MEDIUM risk criteria have been ticked, supervisors and students should continue to section C3 on the next page*
D. LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration

Students not directed to complete the separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment in Section C should tick the items in D.1 or D.2 to confirm the LOW risk nature of their fieldwork visits. Then sign the Declaration in D.3

D.1 Fieldwork visits (If you will not make any fieldwork visits, tick the alternative items in D.2 below.)

I/we confirm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the researcher will not travel outside the UK or their home nation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the fieldwork does not require overnight stays in hotels or other types of public temporary accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public and private travel to and from the research location(s) are familiar to the researcher and offer no discernible risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher will not travel through, or work in research locations which may have unlit areas, derelict areas, cliffs, or local endemic diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher will carry only necessary personal items when travelling to, and within, research locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no specific vaccinations are required to undertake this research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first aid provision and a trained first aider are available where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher will only operate machinery, electrical equipment, or workplace vehicles, or handle or work with animals at the research location(s) if they are qualified to do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the fieldwork will be carried out within normal working hours(^{17}) at a time convenient to participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher will not give out personal telephone information to participants, or owners of secondary data resources, in relation to the research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher is fully aware of and sensitive to cultural and religious practices of participant groups, and will act accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primary or practice research will not involve fieldwork visits to private homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher will provide a regularly updated fieldwork visit schedule to a nominated University contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the researcher will carry a Manchester Institute of Education Emergency Contact Information Card during all fieldwork visits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are unable to tick all items above, you must complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form.

\(^{17}\) For example, in the UK normal working hours are between 8am and 6pm Mon-Fri inclusive.
D.2 No Fieldwork visits
I/we confirm:

[ ] this research does not involve fieldwork visits of any kind
[ ] the researcher will not give out personal telephone information to participants, or owners of secondary data resources, in relation to the research project

D.3 Researcher Declaration:
By signing this completed document, I declare that the information in it is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I will complete any actions that I have indicated I will complete.

[Signature]

Date
Manchester Institute of Education

Ethical Approval Application Form

This ethical approval application form has been revised to incorporate changes made to the new University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) Form. It has been designed to incorporate prompts for information needed to ascertain whether the proposed research matches MIE’s research template pre-approved by UREC and to facilitate completion of the form to a standard that will allow speedier review, and approvals, by RIC members. Please follow all directions contained in this document.

SECTION 1: Student Details /Identification of the person responsible for the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student:</th>
<th>Charlotte Brearley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID (quoted on library/swipe card):</td>
<td>9265618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:charlottebrearley@hotmail.com">charlottebrearley@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisor:</td>
<td>Cathy Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cathy.Atkinson@manchester.ac.uk">Cathy.Atkinson@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme (PhD, Prof Doc, MEd, PGCE, MSc, BA etc):</td>
<td>ProfDoc Educational and Child Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full/Part-time</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Research Project:</td>
<td>A case-study investigation into the impact of motivational interview on adolescents’ reading efficacy, engagement and motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Data Collection</td>
<td>Start Date: On receipt of confirmation of ethical approval End Date: 2015/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s) where the project will be carried out:</td>
<td>Trainees fieldwork placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Signature:</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** Supervisor signature confirms that the student has the relevant experience, knowledge and skills to carry out the study in an appropriate manner
SECTION 2: PROJECT DETAILS
(Please write your answers in the boxes provided. Boxes will expand to fit answers as necessary)

Aims and Objectives of the Project

1.1 Research Question

State the principal research question(s).

**Principle Research Question(s):**

| RQ1 | How does MI impact on adolescents’ reading engagement, motivation and efficacy? |
| RQ2 | What were the young people’s perceptions of the usefulness of MI? |
| RQ3 | In what ways can MI be adapted in order to support young people with reading difficulties? |

1.2. Academic justification

Briefly describe the academic justification for the research. (Why is it an area of importance/has any similar research been done?)

Research has suggested increasing motivation to read holds vital promise for improving the effectiveness of school-based interventions. The efficacy for using Motivational Interviewing (MI) with young people is increasing within educational settings and it has been suggested that it could have gains with academic performance and motivation. To the researcher’s knowledge, there has been no research, which has explored the impact that MI has on individuals with reading difficulties. The research proposes that using MI as an intervention could increase adolescents’ motivation to read and engagement with reading and potentially have an impact on reading efficacy. The researcher also notes that to date there has been a ‘notable lack’ of research which has elicited the views of young people’s experiences of MI. Therefore, in addition to the focus already discussed, the researcher proposes to contribute to...

2. Methodology

2.1 Project Design:

Please briefly outline the design and methodological approach of the project, including the theoretical framework that informs it.

It is anticipated that a case study design will be used which will involve the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data and would implement an exploratory multiple-case study with embedded units of analysis (Yin, 2009). Using both qualitative and quantitative data enables researchers to explore a wider range of research questions (Bryman, 2006).

2.2 Data Collection Methods:

Describe the research procedures/activities as they affect the study participant and any other parties involved. Which of the following will your research involve and what will you be asking your participants to do.

2.2.1. *Interviews*  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]
2.2.2. Questionnaires

If Yes, describe how these are to be conducted (Append your interview guide):
On completion of the MI sessions, the researcher will conduct semi-structured interviews with each young person to elicit their views and perceptions on how useful they found MI to be. The interviews should last no longer than half an hour. The interviews will be audio-recorded, transcribed and sent to the participant for member checking. Prior to data collection, participants will be asked to choose a pseudonym under which all data will be stored.

2.2.2. Questionnaires

If Yes, how will these be delivered to and collected from participants? (Append your draft questionnaire(s)):
Pre- and post-intervention measurements will be taken on three occasions; prior to MI sessions, upon completion of the MI sessions (12 weeks later) and during a three month follow up.

1. The Motivation to Read Questionnaire (MRQ; Wigfield and Guthrie, 1997), which consists of 53 items measuring 11 motivation constructs. Participants will be given the questionnaires individually during a pre/post/follow-up intervention session. Participants will have a choice of reading the questionnaire themselves or having it read to them by the researcher. These will be collected in after the session. Prior to data collection, participants will be asked to choose a pseudonym of which all data collection will be stored under.

2. Reading frequency questionnaire, which consists of different types of reading material that the young people may read outside of school and how frequently they do so.

2.2.3. Observations

If Yes, describe the context for the observation and what participants will be engaged in. (Append copy of any observation framework or other data collection guide to be used):

2.2.4. Diary

If Yes, describe the context for use of the diary and what participants will be asked to do. (Append copy of the Diary instructions and format):

2.2.5. Intervention

If Yes, describe how these are to be conducted (Append your interview guide):

If Yes, how will these be delivered to and collected from participants? (Append your draft questionnaire(s)):
If Yes, describe the intervention and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a detailed description and any images necessary to support the description):
It is anticipated that a contribution of five sessions of individualised MI for each young person using ‘Facilitating Change 2: Motivational Interviewing using the Menu of Strategies’ (Atkinson, 2013) resources. These resources were designed for practitioners to use within school and education-based settings to help young people explore and challenge their behaviour. Adaptations may be required to personalise and address reading motivation. Each young person will have approximately one hour (per session) of MI delivered fortnightly over a period of 10 weeks. It was decided to deliver the sessions fortnightly as opposed to weekly to allow participants to reflect on the process of MI. School staff may be required to be involved in some elements of the sessions to assist the young person with strategies formulated from the process. In addition, as part of the intervention as a way of making MI bespoke for each young person, the conversational questions illustrated in the Adolescent Motivation to Read Profile (AMRP; Pitcher et al., 2007) will be conducted in advance of the first MI session (appended). This will provide the researcher with contextual information about the young person’s current reading behaviours, aiding in an opening strategy as part of the intervention and will be reported as a narrative account.

2.2.6. Assessments

If Yes, give full details of the assessment(s) and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a copy of the assessment schedules to be used):
The York Assessment of Reading Comprehension: Secondary Passages (YARC) will provide a standardised score for participants reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension. This standardised assessment also provides alternative forms, which can help minimise practice effects, so is appropriate for use pre- and post-intervention. The standard scores will be presented.

2.2.7. Other

If Yes, give full details and what participants will be asked to do. (Append supporting documentation as appropriate):

2.2.8. Does data collection use video or still image? Yes □ No □
If Yes, complete the VASTRE documentation - Available from: http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/stillimageresearch/

2.2.9 Research Experience

Please state your experience in conducting these research interventions or assessments (where applicable) and methodologies outlined above - provide supporting evidence (e.g. course unit code).

As a trainee educational psychologist, I have conducted research as part of my training using questionnaires and case-study research. During my previous placement, I used the Motivational Interviewing intervention and anticipate using the intervention prior to data collection as part of my continuing training. In addition, I use reading assessments as part of my training. During undergraduate research, I designed and conducted semi-structured interviews.

2.3 Sampling

What type of sampling method do you propose to use?

2.3.1. Statistical

   | Yes | No |
---|-----|----|
   |     |    |

If Yes, describe the type, your justification for taking this approach and proposed sample size:

2.3.2. Other

   | Yes | No |
---|-----|----|
   |     |    |

If Yes, describe the type, your justification for taking this approach and proposed sample size:

It is proposed that the researcher will use opportunistic sampling based on the researcher looking to recruit participants within a high-school during second year placement. It is anticipated that the researcher will recruit five participants (one of whom will be recruited for the pilot study). Four participants were chosen as this allows for contingency if participants drop out of the study.

2.4 Analysis method

What type of analyses do you propose to use to explore this data?
2.4.1. Quantitative analyses

If Yes, please give details:
Descriptive statistics will be reported for the YARC (reading assessment) and MRQ (motivation of reading questionnaire), plus a measure of reading engagement illustrating any effects of reading efficacy and reading motivation respectively.

2.4.2. Qualitative analyses

If Yes, please give details:
Audio-recordings from the semi-structured interviews eliciting the young people’s views will be transcribed by the researcher and member checked. The framework set out by Braun and Clarke (2006) will be used following their six phases of analysis: familiarizing yourself with the data; generating initial codes; searching for themes; reviewing themes; defining and naming themes and; producing the report. An inductive approach will allow the researcher to generate themes in relation to the proposed research questions. To strengthen the reliability of the findings, an inter-rater reliability approach will be used whereby another TEP will examine and analyse a section of the transcription. A researcher diary will be kept which will include session outlines. This will enable the researcher to explore research question three (‘In what ways can MI be adapted in order to support young people with reading difficulties?’) along with the semi-structured interviews.

2.5 Ethical Issues

**Briefly state the main ethical issues raised by the methodology outlined above.**

1. Due to the nature of the research using qualitative analysis, it is essential that the researcher ensure integrity and quality within the design and interpretation as not to misrepresent any findings. For this reason, the researcher will provide a transcript of the semi-structured interview to the young person to member check. The researcher will arrange to go to the school and verbally read this to the young person if they choose.

2. Confidentiality will be maintained by providing participants with pseudonyms of which all data collection will be stored under. Data and consent forms will be kept in a secure location.

3. Participant Details

3.1 Characteristics of participants
Please specify the characteristics of the participants you wish to recruit.

| number | 5 |
3.2 **Vulnerable groups**

3.2.1. Will your project include participants from either of the following groups? (Tick as appropriate)

- [ ] Children under 16 in school, youth club or other accredited organisation.
- [ ] Adults with learning difficulties in familiar, supportive environments
- [ ] NONE OF THE ABOVE (go to item 4.)

3.2.2. Inclusion of vulnerable groups

*Please describe measures you will undertake to avoid coercion during the recruitment stage.*

Potential participants will be given participant information sheets detailing the purpose of the study and what will be involved. Participants will be informed that they can withdraw from the study at any time. Participants will be asked to give both verbal and written assent.

3.2.3. Research in UK with vulnerable groups

Please confirm you have relevant clearance for working with vulnerable groups from DBS and/or other relevant sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBS*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB: You will need a DBS application through the University. Any work related DBS clearance is not valid for your University research.*

3.2.4. Please confirm that you will notify the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork (AEF) immediately if your DBS status changes.

- [ ] I will immediately notify the AEF if my DBS status changes
- [ ] NA

4. **Recruitment**

Permissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age group(s)</td>
<td>12-13 (Year 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Practice placement – Mainstream high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have permission to collect data from an organisational fieldwork site from...

4.1.1. The organisation where the research will take place

(e.g. School head etc)?

Yes □ NA □

4.1.2. Sub-settings within the organisation (e.g. class teacher etc)?

□ NA □

If Yes, append letter/email confirming access to this application

*If NA, please explain why permission is not applicable.
Permission has not yet been sought as the school and participants have not been identified.*

Participant recruitment

4.2.1. How will your pool of potential participants be identified? (tick all that apply)

- Letters/emails and follow up phone calls to organisations
- Posters/Advertisements
- Website/Internet (including Facebook/other social media)
- X Known or named client groups (students, etc).
- Networks and recommendations
- Person in a position of authority in organisation
- Directory/database/register in public domain

Describe the nature of these routes to identify your pool of potential participants.
Potential school and participants may be identified during practice placement.

4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

Year 8 students at one mainstream high school

□ Persons unknown to the researcher
- X Client groups (students, etc) within an organisation known by the researcher
□ Persons accessed through networks and recommendations
□ Persons nominated by a position of authority
□ Other (describe here):

Indicate whether there is any existing relationship between yourself and the source/group of potential participants.
The source (highschool) may be identified through practice placement (eg. at a planning meeting).
4.2.3. How will you approach potential participants? (tick all that apply)

- Letter
- Email
- Website/internet (including Facebook/other social media site)
- Presentation at meeting or similar
- Other (describe here):

Indicate how information about your study will be delivered to potential participants and how they will (directly or indirectly) let you know they would like to take part in your research.
A participant information sheet will be given to the school to provide to students identified as being potential participants which will outline the study and consent form. School will collect these in and the researcher will collect these from the school prior to any data collection.

Append text of letters / emails/ posters / advertisements / presentation etc

Information giving will be undertaken by:

- the researcher
- someone in a position of authority
- a neutral third party to known or named client groups
- Other (describe here):

Provide details on how you will fully inform potential participants about your study:
Participant information sheets will be given to participants detailing the study and what they will be asked to do. Details of how the data will be used and withdrawal from the study will also be provided.

4.2.5 Information accessibility
What arrangements have you made to ensure information is accessible to those unable to read standard English? (low literacy level, non-English speaker, persons with learning disabilities)
The researcher or member of school staff will verbally read information regarding participation and consent to the young person. Questionnaire items may be read to the young person on request. All young people will be debriefed verbally following the research.

Please confirm:
- [x] I have supplied information relevant to each participating group
- [x] The information provided follows the guidance provided in the University of Manchester Participant Information Sheet Template

4.2.6 Decision period
How long will the participant have to decide whether to take part in the study? *If you are proposing a decision period of less than 2 weeks, full justification for this approach should be given.*
Three weeks

4.2.7 Incentives
State any payment or any other incentive that is being made to any study participant. *Specify and state the level of payment to be made and/or the source of the funds/gift/free service to be used and the justification for it.*
None

4.2.8 Avoiding coercion
How will your recruitment methods avoid putting any overt or covert pressure on vulnerable individuals to consent (children, junior colleagues, adults with learning disabilities)?

Participants will be fully briefed and debriefed regarding the study. The researcher will ‘check in’ with the participants before and after each session/meeting to check that they still wish to continue with the study. Participants will be advised that they can withdraw at any point. A key person at school will be identified for participants to approach if they do wish to talk to someone else regarding any problems with the study or wishing to withdraw if they do not want to address these concerns with the researcher. Finally, participants will be given the details of the ‘Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator’ located at the University of Manchester if they do not wish to address concerns with the researcher. These details are located in the participant information sheet.

4.3. Consent

4.3.1 How will participants’ consent to take part be recorded?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Implied consent - return/submission of completed questionnaire
- X Written consent form matching University template
- X Verbally (give details of how this will be recorded)
- Other method (give details here):

Append text of consent forms/consent taking procedure to this application.

Please confirm:

- X My consent taking procedures are relevant to each participating group
- X The consent taking procedures follow the guidance provided in the University of Manchester Consent Form Template

4.3.2 Special arrangements

Please outline any special consent taking arrangements relevant to your research study.

NA

5. Participation in the research

Duration

How long will each participant be expected to take part in activities?

It is anticipated that a contribution of five sessions of individualised Motivational Interviewing sessions will be given for each young person. Each young person will have approximately one hour (per session) of MI delivered fortnightly over a period of 10 weeks. The pre-, post- and follow-up-intervention measures will be conducted on a session lasting no more than 90 minutes.
Benefits to participation

Are there any benefits to participation for participants (beyond incentive noted above)?
Participants’ reading ability and motivation to read may increase.

Deficits to participation

Will any benefit or service otherwise received by participants be withheld (e.g. pupil misses lesson, or part thereof) as a consequence of taking part in this study?
Participants will miss one lesson per fortnight.

6. Risks and Safeguards

Please outline any adverse effects or risks for participants in respect of the methods you have indicated in Section 2B [Interview; Questionnaire; Interventions; Assessments; Observation; Diary keeping; Other activity]

Physical risks
6.1.1 Potential

What is the potential for adverse effects of a physical nature; risks or hazards, pain, discomfort, distress, inconvenience, or change in lifestyle / normal routine for participants?
Assessments – Educational assessments can sometimes evoke test stress/anxiety

6.1.2 Safeguards

What precautions or measures have been taken to minimise or mitigate the risks identified above?
Participants will be reassured to try their best on the reading assessment and given positive reinforcement throughout.
Participants will be reassured that all procedures are supportive and designed to help them.
Participants will be given rest breaks (if needed) during appropriate times of the assessment.
Care will be taken to ensure that the participant is starting the assessment at the relevant starting point (for example, not at a reading level that they cannot access).
Participants will be reassured that the information will be collected under a pseudonym

6.2 Psychological risks
6.2.1 Potential
6.2.2 Safeguards

What precautions or measures have been taken to minimise or mitigate the risks identified above?
Topics around participant’s difficulties will be handled sensitively. Participants will be informed that they can take a break when they require it and a key person will be identified within the school for the young person if they need to talk to someone regarding the study/difficulties that they are experiencing.

6.3 Risks for you as researcher

It is important that the potential for adverse effects, risks or hazards, pain, discomfort, distress, or inconvenience, of a physical or psychological nature to you as the researcher have been assessed. This is a requirement by law. Risks to you are identified as part of the RREA/FRA process. Ensure this assessment has been completed by either:
a completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA), or
a signed Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration in Section D of RREA form.

Briefly state here the conclusions of your assessment and append a copy of your approved FRA form (if required), in addition to your RREA, to this application:

6.4 Early termination of the research

6.4.1 Criteria

What are the criteria for electively stopping the research prematurely?
If the researcher is unable to obtain participants required for the study.

6.4.2 Please confirm, by ticking here, that:
[ ] any adverse event requiring radical change of method/design or abandonment will be reported in the first instance to your research supervisor and then to the MIE RIC Chair

7. Data Protection and confidentiality

7.1 Data activities and storage of personal data

Will the study use any of the following activities at any stage?
7.2 Confidentiality of personal data

What measures have been put in place to ensure confidentiality of personal data? *Give details of whether any encryption or other anonymisation procedures have been used and at what stage?:*

The young people will be provided with pseudonyms prior to conducting the research, which any research notes and data collection will be filed under and kept in a secure location. The participating local authority and school will also be provided with a pseudonym.

7.3 Research monitoring and auditing Please confirm:

The student researcher’s supervisor(s) will monitor the research

If other arrangements apply please specify:

7.4 Data Protection

Please provide confirmation that you will employ measures that comply with the Data Protection Act and the University Data Protection Policy (UDPP)?

Data Protection Act:  I confirm that all Data collected will be:

- [x] Fairly and lawfully processed
- [x] Processed for limited purposes as outlined in this application
| X | Adequate for the purpose, relevant and not excessive |
| X | Accurate |
| X | Not kept longer than necessary |
| X | Processed in accordance with the participant’s rights |
| X | Secure – on an encrypted storage device |
| X | Only transferred to other settings with appropriate protection. |

University Data Protection Policy (UDPP): I confirm

| X | My data and its storage will comply with the UDPP |
| X | Paper copies of data and encrypted storage devices will be stored in a locked draw or cupboard |

*For UG research:* On completion of my research, the data will be kept until the study has been completed and will then be shredded/destroyed

*For PGT/PGR research:* On completion of my research, the data will be passed to my supervisor for archiving at the University for a period of 5 years after which it will be shredded/destroyed

7.5 Privacy during data analysis Please confirm:

- Analysis will be undertaken by the student researcher
- Analysis will take place in a private study area

*If other arrangements apply please describe:*

7.6 Custody and control of the data Please confirm:

- The student researcher’s supervisor will have custody of the data
- The student researcher will have control of the data

*If other arrangements apply please describe:*

7.7 Access to the data

- The student researcher will have access to the data
- The student’s supervisor(s) will have access to anonymised data
7.8 Use of data in future studies

Will the data be stored for use in future studies?  
Yes [ ]  No [x]  
If Yes, confirm this is addressed in the information giving/consent taking process by ticking here. [ ]

8. Reporting Arrangements

8.1 Dissemination

How do you intend to report and disseminate the results of the study?  
(Tick all that apply)

- [x] Peer reviewed scientific journals
- Book / Chapter contribution
- Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
- Internal report
- Conference presentation
- [x] Thesis/dissertation
- Other e.g. Creative works (describe here):

8.2 Participant and community feedback

How will the results of research be made available to research participants and communities from which they are drawn?  
(Tick all that apply)

- [x] Written feedback to research participants
- Presentation to participants or relevant community groups
- Other e.g. Video/Website (describe here):

9. Research Sponsorship

9.1 External funding

Are you in receipt of any external funding for your study?  
(tick one)

- [ ] External Funding  
- [x] No external funding

If you have funding please provide details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Sponsoring organisation
Who will be responsible for governance and insuring the study? (tick one)

The University of Manchester

Other organisation

If not UoM, provide details of who will act as sponsor of the research and their insurance details

10. Conflict of Interest
Have any conflicts of interest been identified in relation to this project? (tick at least one option)

□ Payment for doing this research?

If so, how much and on what basis?

□ Direct personal involvement in the research of a spouse/funder?

If so, please provide details:

□ Does your department/the University receive payment (apart from costs)?

If so, please provide details:

x NONE of the ABOVE APPLY

Thank you
This is the end of the form

Please use the checklist below to ensure that you append all necessary supporting documents
CHECKLIST

Please tick to indicate whether the document is APPENDED OR NOT APPLICABLE for this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Appended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection instruments</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft copy of each data collection instrument named in Q2.2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Questionnaire, Interview guide, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and Still Image Recording Declaration (VASTRE)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant recruitment</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of permission to conduct research within each organisation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertisement(s) specified in Q4.2.1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poster/email/letter/presentation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information giving – one for each participant type specified in Q3.1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information sheet/letter/email/script)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent taking – one for each participant type specified in Q3.1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Consent form or alternative procedure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork risk assessment</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Risk Assessment Form (approved)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RREA form Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section D) completed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: MINOR AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH PROJECT

Application for Approval of Minor Amendment\textsuperscript{18} to a Research Study

\textit{Details of proposed amendment (please give as much detail as possible)}

Upon completion of the pilot study of the research stated, I would like to propose the following amendment:

I would like to use audio recording during all of the Motivational Interviewing sessions with the young people. I do not intend on transcribing this data, but intend to use the data as a way of completing an evaluation of my own therapeutic practice. The recordings will be listened to following the session if more information is required to complete self-evaluation forms (attached at the end of this document) and to gather statements/information required for my researcher diary. In addition, a colleague (trainee educational psychologist) has agreed to listen to a selected number of the recordings and complete the self-evaluation form to increase the validity of my self-report approach of using the ‘principles’ and ‘spirit’ of Motivational Interviewing that I am reporting.

Supervisor Declaration

I agree that the amendment proposed does not change the character of this research or the participant groups.

I confirm that the research risk assessment for the study as MEDIUM remains.

Please send applications for amendment to ethical approval for MEDIUM risk research to the Manchester Institute Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork at ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk who will pass on the request to the RIC member who authorised the original application wherever possible.

\textsuperscript{18} Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups.
Reading frequency questionnaire:

How often do you read?

How often do you read the following when you are not in school?

Please circle the number that applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of reading materials</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>At least once a week</th>
<th>From time to time</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text messages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant messages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of reading materials are taken from the National Literacy Trust’s annual survey (2011). The full report can be accessed at: [http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/assets/0001/4543/Young_people_s_reading_FINAL_REPORT.pdf](http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/assets/0001/4543/Young_people_s_reading_FINAL_REPORT.pdf)
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Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of a thesis for a Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the research?
Charlotte Brearley (Trainee Educational Psychologist)

Title of the Research
A case-study investigation into the impact of motivational interviewing on adolescents’ motivation to read and reading efficacy.

What is the aim of the research?
The aim of this research is to see if motivational interviewing (an approach for helping young people explore their behaviour) has an impact on the motivation to read and reading efficacy on young people with reading difficulties.

Why have I been chosen?
Your child has been identified by school as somebody who might be involved in the study because he or she may have known reading difficulties and may benefit from some help with looking at their reading through an approach which aims to improve motivation and help them read more.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?
If you decide to take part, your child would receive five sessions of motivational interviewing. Sessions would help your child to explore their current reading behaviour and think of ways they could read more and feel more comfortable about reading. The motivational interviewing sessions would be carried out for up to one hour per week in school (during the school day). The sessions will be audio recorded so that the researcher can evaluate on the process. The audio-recordings from the session will therefore not by transcribed and data will be erased following an evaluation of the session. Before and after the sessions, your child will be asked to complete a questionnaire about their reading and also complete an assessment which will provide information about where they are up to with their reading. These will be repeated three months after the final session to see if there are any long-lasting impacts. In addition, your child will be asked to take part in an interview to give their views on their experience of the motivational interviewing sessions after the last session is provided.
**What happens to the data collected and how is confidentiality maintained?**

Information that your child tells the researcher will remain confidential unless:
- Your child gives permission for the information to be shared with school staff e.g. a strategy which may help with their reading in school or a particular reading interest that they have
- Your child says something that suggests a safeguarding concern e.g. that they are at risk of being hurt or are hurting someone else

The interview to gain your child’s views will be audio-recorded. This will then be typed up with any names or information, which can identify your child changed. I will then send your child a copy of the interview to check of the transcription. The recorded information will be erased with an anonymised paper copy of the interview being kept by the researcher. The questionnaires will be collected and the information will be used to look at how effective the motivational interviewing is.

**What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?**

It is up to you to decide whether or not you would like your child to take part. If you do decide this is OK you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. I will also ask your child in person whether s/he wants to take part. If you decide your child should take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without this causing any problems.

**What is the duration of the research?**

Five x one-hour motivational interviewing sessions, completion of the questionnaire and reading assessment on three separate occasions (prior to the sessions, after the final session and three months after the final session) and one thirty-minute interview at the end of the final session of motivational interviewing.

**Where will the research be conducted?**

The research will be carried out in school (within school hours).

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?**

The research will be assessed as part of the researcher’s professional doctorate qualification. It is possible that the overall outcomes of the research (involving all the children taking part) may be published in a scientific journal.

**Criminal Records Check**

The researcher has a fully enhanced DBS disclosure which allows research to be conducted on school premises.

Contact for further information
Charlotte Brearley,

Email: charlotte.brearley@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to 'The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL', by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093
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CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below

I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

Please Initial Box

I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

I understand that the interviews will be audio-recorded

I agree to the use of anonymous quotes

I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers in anonymous form

I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers

I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant ___________________________ Date ___________________________ Signature ___________________________

Name of researcher ___________________________ Date ___________________________ Signature ___________________________
**PUPIL CONSENT FORM**

I understand why I am being asked to take part in this study and I have had the chance to ask questions

I understand that taking part is my decision and I can change my mind at any time without giving a reason

I understand that my name won’t be used when the results of the project come out

I understand that the information that I provide will not be shared unless I give my permission or if something very serious has happened that other adults need to know about me to keep me safe

I agree to take part in the project

My name: .........................................................................................................................