How the Accelerated Reader program can become counterproductive for high school students

Gail Thompson, Marga Madhuri, Deborah Taylor

A study of a small group of high school students revealed negative perceptions of the Accelerated Reader program and that, in fact, many were reading less than they had been prior to the program's implementation.

Thompson teaches at Claremont Graduate University, California, USA; e-mail Gail.Thompson@cgu.edu. Madhuri teaches at the University of La Verne, California, USA; e-mail madhurim@ulv.edu. Taylor teaches at Biola University, La Mirada, California, USA; deborah.taylor@biola.edu.

For the past 80 years or so, researchers and educators in the United States have been preoccupied with finding the magic formulas to teach students to read, to improve the skills of struggling readers, and to motivate reluctant readers to read more often. This preoccupation has spawned one of the most notorious and acrimonious academic debates—the great debate over reading methods—which has yet to be resolved (Chall, 1967; Goodman, 1996; Honig, 2000; McQuillan, 1998; Thompson, 2000a, 2000b, 2003, 2004). At the same time, high percentages of elementary and secondary school students, especially low-income, black, or Latino students, continue to underperform on standardized reading tests (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006). The most recent education reform, the controversial No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (2002), which requires elementary school educators to improve students' reading scores, has intensified this ongoing quest to reform reading instruction in schools.

As a result of No Child Left Behind, school districts throughout the United States have adopted various reading programs. For example, the Los Angeles Unified School District "spent nearly $50 million...on the Waterford Early Reading Program...to supplement language arts instruction in kindergarten and first-grade classrooms" (Helfand, 2005, p. A1). Despite the huge financial investment the district made in buying this computer-based program, the program failed to raise students' reading test scores due to problems such as inadequate teacher training, equipment breakdown, and lack of time for implementation (Helfand, 2005).

Another reading program that has been purchased by many school districts and used in both elementary and secondary schools is Accelerated Reader (AR), a computer-assisted program designed for library, school, and classroom use to encourage and measure the frequency and accuracy with which students read. AR is used in over 40,000 schools in the United States and is being considered for use in other countries (Topping & Paul, 1999). The program includes the use of an assessment to determine students' reading levels, books for which reading levels have been determined by a formula accounting for word length and sentence structure, and multiple-choice computerized tests to accompany the books.

To use the program, students take the Standardized Test for Assessment of Reading (STAR) to determine their reading level. Next, they select a book at their reading level, as deter-

mined by Advantage Learning (Renaissance Learning, 2005). Once students have read the book, they take a computerized test (Mathis, 1996). If students receive a score of 60% or better they receive points, which are determined by a formula depending on the length and difficulty of the book and their score on the quiz. Students can then begin reading another book (Paul, 2003). AR is used differently among schools and within classrooms. For example, at some schools, rewards such as pizza parties or prizes for earning a certain number of points are offered to motivate students to read more (Brisco, 2003). At other schools, teachers help students set reading goals based on the number of points they can earn (Greer, 2003). In still other schools, teachers include the points as part of the total class grade (Persinger, 2001).

An examination of the limited studies available shows mixed degrees of success with AR and some contradictory findings. Most of the published research studies focus on AR in the elementary classroom. It is unclear whether this is because AR is primarily used in elementary grades or whether it's because there are limited studies regarding AR use with high school students. McGlinn and Parrish (2002) found that AR positively affected 10 English as a Second Language (ESL) students by improving their attitudes toward reading and increasing their time spent reading. In a study at a private K–8 Catholic school in Brooklyn, the librarian noted increased library circulation when the school began using AR (Everhart & Guastello, 2002). At the end of five years, these students from multiethnic and ESL backgrounds were reading an average of 23 books per year. The seventh- and eighth-grade students whom Goodman (1999) studied showed significant growth from the pretest to posttest in the total score section of the Gates–MacGinitie Reading Test, which combines vocabulary and comprehension. Scott (1999) found that AR had helped middle school students with learning disabilities improve their reading skills. Peak and Dewalt (1993) maintained that ninth-grade college preparation students who used AR for five

consecutive years showed greater increases in their total reading scores in comparison with students who did not use AR. The only disadvantage of using AR that these researchers reported was limited book selections.

Although the aforementioned studies suggest that AR can be successful in improving students' reading skills and attitudes about reading, other researchers have reached different conclusions. For example, after measuring the growth in Stanford Achievement Test reading scores of 30 sixth-grade students, Mathis (1996) did not find AR to have a significant effect on students' scores. Pavonetti, Brimmer, and Cipielewski's study (2002) found no significant difference between the amount of reading done by middle school students who had used AR in elementary school and that by those who had not used the program. However, these students read less in middle school if AR was discontinued.

Along with the pressure to increase reading scores, most educators recognize that without increasing students' motivation to read, it is unlikely that they will become better readers (Gambrell, 1996; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Though many schools have implemented Sustained Silent Reading programs to increase motivation and literacy skill development, studies indicate that most adolescents do not choose reading as a recreational activity (Brozo & Hargis, 2003; Guth & Heaney, 1998).

Although the creators of AR claim that the program will "get students excited about books" (Renaissance Learning, 2005), both Persinger (2001) and Brisco (2003) questioned whether AR creates lifelong lovers of reading or students who are merely addicted to earning points and prizes. After interviewing elementary students and teachers, Persinger concluded that requiring a certain number of books to be read during a specified period of time could unintentionally limit the intrinsic value of reading. Persinger also challenged the practice of using AR as part of reading grades, which applies an academic pressure that counters the pleasurable aspects of reading.

Biggers (2001), Brisco (2003), and Krashen (2002) wondered whether or not AR is responsible for increased reading levels. Krashen argued that there is not enough evidence that the AR tests and points are what actually help students improve as readers and suggested that improvements may be attributed to increased access to books at students' reading levels, coupled with more time to read in school. Biggers (2001) and Brisco (2003) maintained that AR does not have an instructional component, does not foster intrinsic motivation, and does not offer extension activities or increased interaction with the text.

Although published material about the use of AR at the middle and high school levels is limited (Kohel, 2003), some graduate students have recently chosen to study AR as part of their research. Kohel's (2003) dissertation study reported that 10th-grade students who chose to participate in the schoolwide use of AR showed improvement from pretest to posttest in their STAR test scores over the course of a school year. These students were compared to a control group who chose not to participate in the AR program (but who still took the STAR test as part of their English class). Implementation included silent reading time during English class, but the study did not explain whether students were also given time to take the AR tests during class. Kohel reported that there were no significant differences between the two groups on the Delaware state tests.

Watts (2004), a middle school librarian, reported on the effects of the use of AR with advanced middle school students in her master's thesis. Seventh-grade students were required to use AR and earn points as part of their English grade. Students who placed at high reading levels on the STAR test indicated that AR had a negative impact on their motivation to read. They complained that they did not like the limited book selection, citing such books as *Little Women*, *Gulliver's Travels*, and *The Hobbit*. Watts noted that *Catcher in the Rye* was also an option, but one parent objected to her seventh grader reading

that book. In the case of this school, administrators modified the program to meet the needs of these advanced readers by allowing them to select books not on the AR list and complete an oral evaluation with the school librarian or English teacher. Watts (2004) stated that this defeated one of the purposes of the program, which was to enable teachers to monitor students' reading through computerized tests.

Finally, Smith (2005) studied 10th-grade students who were reading below grade level. They were put in a reading class that used small class size, AR, and cooperative learning strategies to support them in taking the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Students spent 30 minutes of class time each day reading AR books, and the remainder of the 53-minute period was spent in cooperative learning groups to practice reading comprehension strategies and workbook activities to prepare for the state test. Students' mean scores increased by 7% on the Degrees of Reading Power assessment and also increased 4% on the FCAT. Smith did not mention motivation or attitudes toward reading.

Because AR is used in thousands of schools throughout the United States and the number continues to grow—despite the fact that research on AR is contradictory—there is clearly a need for more studies to be conducted about this program. This seems especially true at the high school level, where AR's use is increasing, yet there is still very little published research. Moreover, because U.S. President George W. Bush recently vowed to reform the nation's high schools (Olson, 2005) and many high school students are struggling readers, read below grade level (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006), or have difficulty with reading comprehension (Block, Gambrell, & Pressley, 2002), additional research on the benefits of AR at the high school level is timely and needed.

Therefore, in this article, we present feedback about AR that we collected from students at an underperforming high school that had recently purchased the program. We specifically answer

the question, What were the students' views about the Accelerated Reader program's efficacy? Given President Bush's goal to expand the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 to specifically target high schools (Samuels, 2005), we believe that this study, which adds the candid voices of students (Kruse, 2000) to the discussion about high schools and reading reform, can be extremely beneficial to educators and policymakers.

Method

In late 2002, the lead author of this article (Thompson) was invited by the principal of an underperforming high school in southern California to conduct a study to ascertain the reasons why many students, particularly students of color, were underperforming on the required standardized tests. At the time, approximately 3,294 students—of whom 40% were Hispanic, 37% were Caucasian, and 18% were African American—were enrolled at the school.

The study entailed the collection of questionnaires and focus-group data designed to investigate whether factors contributing to student underachievement existed. After the necessary approvals were granted, the principal explained the purposes of the study to students during an assembly and encouraged them to participate. Students who were interested in participating were required to submit signed Parent Consent and Student Assent forms, and all participants were told they would receive a free lunch pass and a coupon to participate in a drawing for a school yearbook.

The lead author spent four days at the school site in May 2003. The first step of the study was to collect questionnaires from students who returned signed Parent Consent forms. Two-hundred-sixty-eight questionnaires were collected, and 144 of these students volunteered to participate in the focus groups. By design, most groups were homogeneous by race, ethnicity, and gender, for the following reasons. The first is because the lead author's personal experience as a woman of color (Thompson, 2003) and prior research regarding

unintentional racism (Sue, 2003) indicate that people are often uncomfortable discussing issues pertaining to race in a mixed group setting. Second, previous research with adolescents (Thompson, 2002, 2004) revealed that they are likely to speak candidly about racial undercurrents and institutional discrimination in racially and ethnically homogeneous groups. Third, because one of the original intents of the study was to uncover any latent racism, this approach produced a less intimidating discussion environment.

Although the study was commissioned in an attempt to uncover reasons why students of color might be underperforming, we were surprised when group after group of students described their frustrations with the implementation of the AR program. Because students' fervent dissatisfaction with the school's use of the AR program consistently emerged as a primary topic of concern, we felt that this provided an ideal opportunity to allow student voices to inform school policy and practices. Based on prior studies that highlighted the value of student voices as a tool for transforming school environments (Mullinix, 2001; Smith & Park, 2003; Smith, Petralia, & Hewitt, 2005), a significant portion of this article is dedicated to reporting the students' concerns about AR as a vehicle for reading improvement.

Focus groups

At the beginning of each focus-group discussion, the lead author told students that the discussion would allow them to elaborate on topics included on the questionnaire, that participation was optional, that their names would not be used, and that the group discussion would be recorded on audiocassette and would last for approximately 30 minutes. However, most of the discussions lasted nearly one hour.

The lead author met with eight different focus groups, ranging from 13 to 29 participants, who represented all high school grade levels and all academic tracks. Both genders were almost equally represented, in that 49% of the focus-group

participants were females. Although the three major racial and ethnic groups at the school (19% white, 38% Latino, and 43% African American) were well represented in the study, African American students were overrepresented in the focus groups and among the questionnaire respondents.

The lead author used several guiding questions about standardized tests, teacher–student relations, the curriculum, and school improvement to structure each discussion. However, during each of the focus-group discussions, the students made it clear that they wanted to discuss an aspect of the curriculum about which they had strong feelings: the Accelerated Reader program.

After the questionnaires had been completed and the eight focus-group discussions ended, the lead author had the audiotapes of the focus-group discussions transcribed. She conducted an intertextual analysis to identify the recurring themes (Creswell, 2002) between the focus-group results and the questionnaire data. Then, she summarized the main findings and related recommendations and mailed this report to the school principal.

Due to the unexpected and passionate feelings that students expressed about their experience with the implementation of the AR program, we analyzed students' comments in greater depth and discovered several dominant themes. Because researchers are recognizing that student voices can be a valuable, albeit underused resource for institutional reform (Mullinix, 2001; Smith et al., 2005), the results section that follows is a powerful recounting of students' experiences and perceptions.

Recurring themes about the Accelerated Reader program

When the study took place, the high school had recently purchased the AR program. All English teachers not only were required to use the program but also had to tie it to the students' course grade. Consequently, 15–20% of students' overall English

grade was based on the number of AR points they had earned.

Although several of the focus-group questions pertained to the school's curriculum, one group after another independently raised the issue of the AR program and how they disliked the way it was implemented. Some students even claimed that their English teachers disliked the program or gave mixed messages about it. The following two prevailing issues emerged:

1. The way that the program was being used had been counterproductive and had actually made some students who had previously loved reading develop an aversion to recreational reading.
2. The program had led to widespread cheating on the required tests.

Although a few students said that AR had motivated them to do more recreational reading, there were several reasons why most focus-group participants did not like the AR program. The following were the main reasons most commonly cited:

- The amount of reading required was unrealistic and too time consuming.
- Students did not like being "forced" to read.
- They did not enjoy the book selections.
- They resented their course grade being tied to earning points for reading.
- They disliked having to pass tests to earn points.

Student comments that best reflected the themes that emerged in the intertextual analysis are presented in the sections that follow.

Too time consuming

Students who complained that AR was too time consuming tended to do so because they were not

given time in class to read. Thus, they believed it conflicted with their other obligations at home, after school extracurricular activities, part-time employment, and other homework assignments. One focus-group participant stated,

> Other people have sports to do and family activities, and you can't sit there and have to read every day for a certain amount of time. Some juniors and seniors have jobs on weekends and during the week, and they have homework to go home and do. Plus, you have chores to do; you have little brothers and sisters running around. My house isn't quiet, not even one day a week. It's not at all.

Students were frustrated not only by the lack of time to read but also by the fact that they were often required to take the AR tests during their free time. For example, one girl said,

> Some teachers don't even give you time to take the test. You have to take it on your own time. I was, like, "This is my lunch time. I don't want to go back to class and take a test."

Being "forced" to read

One of the most common complaints from the focus-group participants was that the way AR was being used at the school made students feel pressured and forced to read. One student said that being forced to read decreased her motivation. She admitted, "I haven't even checked out a book yet, but it's because I hate reading when they tell me to." Another girl agreed that for her the program had been counterproductive: "Before we started AR, I had two books in my backpack all the time. I always read, and then AR started. I was, like, 'Forget it! I don't want to do this.'" Another girl made a similar remark, stating,

> I like to read, but I don't read anymore, and I have time to read.... Before, you would actually sit in your room and read a book and finish it in two days. Now, I'm, like, after I finish the book, I have to go to school and take a test on it.

A male focus-group participant said,

> I dislike it because it's kind of like they're forcing you to read when you don't want to. You want to read when you want to. The higher you get on the test, the more books you have to read. I got a college reading level, so I have to get 71 points. Somebody next to me that gets a first-grade reading level only had to read two books.

One male student exclaimed,

> How are they gonna *make us* read books, like *make us*? It's not a choice. It brings us down a whole letter grade...in some classes, it's two letter grades. I don't mind reading, but having them *make you* read? If I want to read, I'll read, and if I don't, I won't, but don't be making me read!

Book selections

Most students also complained about the limited book selection at the school—particularly the lack of multicultural books and of books with a high readability level. This limited selection increased their displeasure with the AR program. For example, a female student said, "They should find out what kind of books people our age like to read." Another female remarked,

> If you're at a higher reading level, the higher you go, the less books are available to you. If you look on the list, there's not very many books for a college reading level. And when you read at this level, they require you to have more points. It's impossible to have more points when there's not enough books available.

A female focus-group participant made a similar comment, stating,

> The school library has many choices, but I know a lot of people that have a college reading level and they don't have many books in our library at that level. They say, "Well, go to the public library." But I don't have time to go to the public library, pick out books, and make sure it's my right reading level.

An African American female student added,

> With the AR books, when they do have a book with African Americans in it, it's always about slavery. Like

in my English class, when we did read about it, it was about slavery. It doesn't show like any of our creative side or anything like that.

Another African American female said,

I might not want to read books that's on the list. They don't have a lot of black authors on the list. If I want to read a book by a black author, I could read it, but I couldn't get credit for it in class.

AR tests

Many focus-group participants were also very vocal in expressing their dislike of the AR testing component. Students complained about the unfairness of being required to take tests, the quality of the tests themselves, and the fact that some individuals are not good test takers. One girl said,

I think it is hard when they give you a time limit. You have to have this many points by a certain time, and then, like, some books are 500 pages and worth 5 points. So after you read this huge long book you have to take a test, and you don't remember anything from the beginning, so it is hard. Some people don't read that fast, so they can't get the points in time, and then it hurts your grade because it is 15% of your grade.

Another girl expressed this concern: "Some people don't do good when they take tests. Maybe they can read well, but the test doesn't show that." A female participant stated,

When you take the reading-level test on the computer, if you take too long to answer you get penalized. That sucks, because when I first took it I didn't know what to press to actually get the answer. So it took me a while at first, and that lowers your level. I don't think it's fair.

A girl complained,

For me, the test takes the fun away because I'm, like, "Oh, my gosh! You have to write so many notes so you won't forget because it might be on the test." You're, like, so worried. Instead of being inspired or

whatever and liking the book, you're worried, "What did I forget? What did I forget?" I have, like, 10 pages of notes. Reading is not fun no more.

A similar comment was made by a girl who read multiple books but stated she couldn't pass the tests and consequently didn't get credit for reading.

Most of the focus-group participants admitted that cheating on the AR tests was not only widespread and easy to do but also an open secret at their school. For example, a male remarked, "The people who do take the tests seriously, they get their little points, but then people who don't want to take it just get the answers from other people." Another male stated, "There's always a way to cheat on the test." One girl said matter-of-factly, "I'll bet you, probably 90% of this school probably cheated on AR testing."

A student who said that she was the victim of cheating explained, "[Because] your password is your ID number, someone under my name purposely failed a test on a book that we were currently reading in the class so that I could not pass my class."

Grades and points

As indicated by some of the previous statements, most focus-group participants believed that it was unfair for teachers to tie their English course grades to the AR program. A female who questioned this practice asked, "You get good grades and you do your work and everything, but then, when it comes down to the reading, it brings you down just because of that?" One girl complained about the pressure stemming from tying the program to students' grades:

Basically, it's too much pressure. It's, like, "Oh, wow! If you don't earn a certain number of points, your grade's gonna go down." And if you don't earn a certain number of points, you're not going to pass this class.

A detailed explanation of why she felt the program was too time consuming and why the grade component was unfair was offered by a student who said,

> I have to take care of my mom and grandma. I have pets to take care of. I'm trying to get a job.... I don't live in a family of parents who have a full-time job. I have to help with the bills, too.... I don't have time to go home to read after school and it really damages my English grade, and I don't think that's fair.

Even one of the few focus-group participants who liked the AR program complained about the grade component. She stated,

> AR is a good program, and I like it because I know high school kids that can't read "My dog Spot." But I don't think it should be part of the English grade. It should be, like, this thing that you can get extra points for to add to your total credits, and the test should be more comprehensive. They don't really have anything about the book. It is, like, "Where did they send so-and-so in such and such chapter?"

Finally, in summarizing how many students felt about the program, a girl said,

> I just think high school kids have better things to worry about than AR reading. [Because] it's 15% of the English grade, it makes it so much more stressful to have just one more thing to worry about, along with five more classes and other things going on at home.

Discussion

In this article, we have explained what students at an underperforming high school believed about the efficacy of the Accelerated Reader program. Although many of the students had previously loved to read, the overwhelming majority said that the way AR was being used at their school was counterproductive. Most students complained that the program was too time consuming, the book selections were too limited, it was unfair to tie their English course grade to the number of AR points they had earned, and the testing component of AR was problematic. One

of their main complaints was that they disliked being forced to read. This widespread displeasure with the AR program led to cheating.

It appears that the way that the program was being used at the school not only was counterproductive—given the passive-aggressive resistance campaign that many students were waging—but also had a negative impact on students' intrinsic motivation to read, as Biggers (2001), Brisco (2003), Persinger (2001), Watts (2004), and others have argued. Because the students in this study attended an underperforming school where low reading scores on standardized tests were common, these results are disturbing. However, the results contain some profound messages for educators and policymakers.

One message emanating from the students' feedback is that reading programs that may have worked effectively in one setting may fail in another setting if they are used incorrectly. The Waterford Early Reading Program's failure to improve Los Angeles Unified School District students' reading scores on a widespread level is a good example. In that case, teachers weren't properly trained to use the program and technical problems led to the program's inefficacy (Helfand, 2005). In the current study, the students' complaints about AR revealed that part of the problem with the program was its implementation, which caused it to be ineffective in the students' eyes. This study suggests that despite the intent to increase reading motivation, tying AR points to students' English grades had the opposite effect. The students in this study clearly believed that this was an unfair practice.

Unfortunately, there is not enough information in the research literature to make clear comparisons regarding implementation practices in other settings. In Kohel's (2003) study, students who used AR in their 10th-grade English classes were compared with the control group of students who chose not to participate. However, she did not explain why these students didn't participate or the consequences of their choice. Smith (2005) described weak readers using AR as part of

their daily reading and reported gains in their reading scores. Yet she did not inform readers about how the program was implemented or whether there was any effect on students' motivation to read. As Krashen (2002) postulated, gains could have been produced by increased daily reading time, not just from the AR program. Clearly this is an area where more research is needed.

A second message pertains to testing. Many of the focus-group participants complained about the testing component of AR. In the United States, high school students are already required to take many tests, including ongoing quizzes and tests for their academic courses, district-level benchmark tests, state-mandated standardized tests, and high school exit exams. Moreover, many high school students take college placement and college admission exams. When students are required to take additional tests on each AR book that they read, another testing burden is added.

A third message that emerged is that reading reform cannot occur in racially and ethnically diverse schools without the availability of a plethora of appealing reading material. The students in the current study, particularly African Americans, were emphatic in expressing their desire for more books about their culture, history, and heritage, instead of a limited selection of books about slavery (Thompson, 2003, 2004). This is a logical request especially because, throughout the United States, African Americans and Latinos are more likely to underperform on standardized reading tests (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006). Providing high school students with a more diverse selection of multicultural and high-interest books for which they can earn course credit is crucial if true reading reform is going to occur.

A fourth message relates to reading purposes. In order to become good readers, students should be required to read for a variety of purposes, including for recreation. However, recreational reading should be pleasurable (Pilgreen, 2000). A disheartening message contained in the current

study is that the way that AR was being used at the students' school had actually turned some former book lovers into discouraged readers. One of the original goals of the AR program was to "get students excited about books...(and to help them develop) an intrinsic love of reading" (Renaissance Learning, 2005, parentheses in original). The current study suggests that a reading program will not successfully develop students' intrinsic reading motivation (Biggers, 2001; Brisco, 2003) if it has the following characteristics:

- It makes young adults feel that they are being forced to read.
- It is too time consuming.
- It lacks an adequate selection of appealing books (Krashen, 2002; Peak & Dewalt, 1993).
- It involves passing tests that determine a sizeable percentage of their course grade (Persinger, 2001).

Listen to students when choosing a reading program

The current study has several limitations. The study was based on a purposive (self-selected) sample, and only a small fraction of the total student body at the school participated in the focus groups. Students reported several reasons for this. First, information about participating in the study was poorly communicated by the school administration. Second, lack of school pride and widespread apathy discouraged students from voluntary participation. Finally, some students stated that they did not believe the study would help them in the long run.

Another limitation is that African Americans were overrepresented among the participants and whites were underrepresented. Additionally, the study took place at one school in California, and the school had not used the AR program for an extended period of time. One of the delimitations of the study was the choice to

use homogeneous focus discussion groups in an attempt to put students at ease. These limitations make the generalizability of the findings questionable and suggest that larger, more comprehensive studies using both qualitative and quantitative data are needed.

In spite of these limitations, the study outlined five important messages for teachers, librarians, administrators, and policymakers who are committed to reading reform and to improving high schools. Clearly, reform ventures must involve more than the mere investment of huge sums of money. As this study and other reports have shown (Helfand, 2005; Watts, 2004), teachers can inadvertently derail reforms if they don't receive proper training, support, and time to feel comfortable with the program. Moreover, as the current study suggests, high school students can derail reading programs if their unique needs, circumstances, and views are ignored, even if programs such as AR have previously demonstrated success (Cuddeback & Ceprano, 2002; Everhart & Guastello, 2002; McGlinn & Parrish, 2002; Peak & Dewalt, 1993; Renaissance Learning, 2005).

Based on the aforementioned goal of increasing student reading motivation, this study has specific implications for administrators, teachers, and librarians. Matching books to a student's reading level is only one factor when considering independent reading programs. The findings in this study imply that providing book choice, relevancy, and time within the school day are significant components that must also be addressed (Pilgreen, 2000).

Therefore, we encourage educators, policymakers, and researchers not only to solicit but also to give more credence to the voices of students in discussions about reading and high school reform. Until this occurs, it appears that the reform debates will continue.

REFERENCES

Biggers, D. (2001). The argument against Accelerated Reader. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *45*(1), 72–75.

Block, C.C., Gambrell, L.B., & Pressley, M. (2002). *Improving comprehension instruction: Rethinking research, theory, and classroom practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Brisco, S. (2003). AR: What are motives behind the motives? *Teacher Librarian*, *30*(4), 33–62.

Brozo, W.G., & Hargis, C. (2003). Taking seriously the idea of reform: One high school's efforts to make reading more responsive to all students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *47*(1), 14–23.

Chall, J.S. (1967). *Learning to read: The great debate.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Creswell, J.W. (2002). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cuddeback, M., & Ceprano, M. (2002). The use of Accelerated Reader with emergent readers. *Reading Improvement*, *39*(2), 89–96.

Everhart, N., & Guastello, F. (2002). Accelerated Reader. *Knowledge Quest*, *30*(3), 53–55.

Gambrell, L. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher*, *50*(1), 14–25.

Goodman, G. (1999). *The Reading Renaissance/Accelerated Reader program: Pinal County school-to-work evaluation report.* Tuscon, AZ: Creative Research Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 427299)

Goodman, K. (1996). *On reading: A common-sense look at the nature of language and the science of reading.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Greer, J. (2003). A positive experience with Accelerated Reader. *Teacher Librarian*, *30*(4), 32–33.

Guth, N., & Heaney, P. (1998). A challenge for school administrators: Motivating adolescents to read. *NASSP Bulletin*, *82*(600), 34–40.

Guthrie, J.T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403–422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Helfand, D. (2005, February 7). Reading program didn't boost skills: L.A. Unified's $50-million Waterford computer system comes into question. *Los Angeles Times*, A1.

Honig, B. (2000). *Teaching our children to read: The components of an effective, comprehensive reading program* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kohel, P. (2003). Using Accelerated Reader: Its impact on the reading levels and Delaware state testing scores of 10th grade students in Delaware's Milford High School. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(10), 3507. (UMI No. 3067785)

Krashen, S. (2002). Accelerated Reader: Does it work? If so, why? *School Libraries in Canada*, *22*(2), 24–26.

Kruse, S. (2000). Student voices: A report from focus group data. *NASSP Bulletin*, *84*(617), 77–85.

Mathis, D. (1996). *The effect of the Accelerated Reader program on reading comprehension.* La Salle, IL: Stanford Achievement Tests. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398555)

McGlinn, J., & Parrish, A. (2002). Accelerating ESL students' reading progress with Accelerated Reader. *Reading Horizons, 42*(3),175–189.

McQuillan, J. (1998). *The literacy crisis: False claims, real solutions.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Mullinix, B. (2001). Learning, connections, assessment, and testing: Voices from the inside. *Educational Horizons, 79,* 177–181.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *The nation's report card: Reading 2005.* Retrieved November 27, 2007, from nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main 2005/2006451.pdf

Olson, L. (2005, January 26). Calls for revamping high schools intensify. *Education Week, 24*(20), 1, 18–19.

Paul, T.D. (2003). *Guided independent reading: An examination of the reading practice database and the scientific research supporting guided independent reading as implemented in Reading Renaissance.* Madison, WI: Renaissance Learning. Retrieved September 25, 2007, from research.renlearn.com/research/pdfs/165.pdf

Pavonetti, L.M., Brimmer, K.M., & Cipielewski, J.F. (2002). Accelerated Reader: What are the lasting effects on the reading habits of middle school students exposed to Accelerated Reader in elementary grades? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 46*(4), 300–311.

Peak, J., & Dewalt, M.W. (1993, February). *Effects of the computerized Accelerated Reader program on reading achievement.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Education Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363269)

Persinger, J. (2001). What are the characteristics of a successful implementation of Accelerated Reader? *Knowledge Quest, 29*(5), 30–35.

Pilgreen, J. (2000). *The SSR handbook: How to organize and manage a sustained silent reading program.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Renaissance Learning. (2005). Retrieved March 19, 2005, from www.renlearn.com/ar/overview.aspx

Samuels, C.A. (2005, January 19). Bush promotes plan for high school tests. *Education Week, 24*(19), 21, 23.

Scott, L.S. (1999). *The Accelerated Reader program, reading achievement, and attitudes of students with learning disabilities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 434431)

Smith, I. (2005). Can Accelerated Reader and cooperative learning enhance the reading achievement of level 1 high school students on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test? *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(04), 1274. (UMI No. 3214446)

Smith, P., & Park, J. (2003). Turn up the volume. *Principal Leadership, 3*(6), 37–41.

Smith, P., Petralia, J., & Hewitt, K. (2005). Tuned in: Listening to student voices. *Principal Leadership, 6*(3), 28–33.

Sue, D.W. (2003). *Overcoming our racism: The journey to liberation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, G. (2000a). California educators discuss the reading crisis. *The Educational Forum, 64*(3), 229–234.

Thompson, G. (2000b). Stories from the field: What prospective and beginning secondary teachers learned from working with struggling third- and fourth-grade readers. *Educational Horizons, 79*(1), 19–26.

Thompson, G. (2002). *African American teens discuss their schooling experiences.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Thompson, G. (2003). *What African American parents want educators to know.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Thompson, G. (2004). *Through ebony eyes: What teachers need to know but are afraid to ask about African American students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Topping, K., & Paul, T. (1999). Computer-assisted assessment of practice at reading: A large scale survey using Accelerated Reader data. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 15*(3), 213–231.

Watts, B. (2004). Accelerated Reader: Its motivational effects on advanced adolescent readers. *Masters Abstracts International, 43*(02), 386. (UMI No. 1423331)