1-1-2013

Measuring the Reader Self-Perceptions of Adolescents: Introducing the RSPS2

Bill Henk
Marquette University, william.henk@marquette.edu

Barbara A. Marinak

Steven A. Melnick
Pennsylvania State University

Accepted version. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy,* Vol. 56, No. 4 (January 2013): 311-320.

Measuring the Reader Self-Perceptions of Adolescents: Introducing the RSPS2

William A. Henk
College of Education, Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI
Barbara A. Marinak
Mount S. Mary's University
Emmitsburg, MD
Steven A. Melnick
Alvernia University
Reading, PA

Abstract: This paper introduces a new affective instrument for assessing the reader self-perceptions of students in grades seven through ten. The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 (RSPS2) builds upon its predecessor, the RSPS, a tool that measures the reading efficacy beliefs of children in grades four through six. New items were created for the RSPS2 to reflect differences in the expectations for adolescent reading. The instrument was piloted on 488 students, revised, and then validates with an additional 2,542 students in the target grades. Factor analytic procedures revealed four factors emerging on the RSPS2. Items for Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback, and Physiological States clustered as expected into scales with reliabilities ranging from .87 to .95. The article includes a description of the instrument, an explanation of its possible uses in assessment, instruction, and research, as well as directions for administration, scoring, and interpretation.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

Keywords: *Assessment*; Self-assessment; To inform instruction, as inquiry; *Motivation/engagement*; Affective influences; Self-efficacy; *Struggling learners*; Self-perception, self-concept; **To learners in which of the following categories does your work apply?**; *Adolescence*

Introduction

> Are adolescents in your classroom engaged or disengaged readers? Do you wonder why some are not interested in reading? The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 (RSPS2) can shed light on factors that influence students' reading attitudes and behaviors and help teachers shape better literacy climates.

Literacy professionals have long believed that affective factors can influence the behavior and achievement of developing readers and writers. Research has borne out these intuitions about attitude, motivation, and self-perception so much so that little doubt remains about whether affect has an impact on literacy learning. As a field, we know that children and adolescents who have made positive associations with literacy will tend to read and write more frequently and with greater engagement (Alvermann, 2008; Strahan, 2008).

The increased involvement that occurs when students feel positively about literacy is important because it contributes to enhanced reading and writing ability (Anderson, Fielding, & Wilson, 1988; Foertsch, 1992). Over time, when students remain focused and determined to succeed with reading and writing texts, their practice will be more purposeful, enduring, and productive. The positive associations they form with literacy will contribute to continued motivation and perseverance.

Conversely, we also know that when students feel less positively about reading and writing, they tend to be inattentive, disengaged, and uncommitted. As a result, their achievement tends to lag (Spaulding, 1992). In fact, some argue that the growing number of disengaged adolescent readers is "a crisis" (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2011; Heller, 2011). Others suggest that it is opportunistic to focus on the long-neglected needs of adolescents (Jacobs, 2008).

Regardless, secondary reading instruction is clearly a priority. For example, the National Governors Association (2009) noted that

occupations requiring college-level and higher level literacy skills will generate about 46% of all job growth between 2004 and 2014. Yet, in 2009, only 31% of eighth graders performed at proficiency on the National Assessment of Education Progress.

Moreover, most secondary schools require that intensive support be provided in regular education to the most at-risk students before a degree of school failure that would result in special-education identification (Juel, 1988; Torgesen, Rashotte, Alexander, Alexander, & MacPhee, 2003). Such an imperative presents challenges for educators and administrators, with perhaps the greatest of these hurdles related to assisting the disengaged reader.

For these reasons, it is extremely useful for teachers to know how their students feel about their own literacy. Unfortunately, few instruments exist that measure affective literacy constructs validly and reliably. This gap exists primarily because affect is extremely difficult to gauge (Henk, 1993; Henk, McKenna, & Conradi, 2011). Without these instruments, teachers have not had a full complement of literacy assessment tools, and this limitation could conceivably compromise the literacy growth of their students.

To help address this void, a new instrument has been devised for measuring how adolescents in grades 7 through 10 feel about themselves as readers of print-based texts. Like the original Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS), which has been translated into at least seven languages and used in international research, the new Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 (RSPS2) is a developmentally appropriate extension of the earlier instrument and has been widely used to measure the perceptions children have of themselves as readers in grades 4, 5, and 6 (Henk & Melnick, 1992). The original RSPS and its later-developed counterpart for writing, the Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS; Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997), can be used for the purposes of assessment, instruction, and research. The RSPS2 can be used in these same ways, but, most important, it will make individual and group reading evaluations of adolescent-age students more nearly complete.

In the sections that follow, the relationship between reading and self-efficacy will be explained. The RSPS2 will then be described,

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

including the processes used to validate it. Instructions for administering, scoring, and interpreting the tool will be shared, as will the ways in which the RSPS2 can be used.

Reading and Self-Efficacy

The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2, like the RSPS and WSPS, is based on Bandura's (1977, 1982) theory of perceived self-efficacy. In his model, Bandura defines *self-efficacy* as the judgments individuals make about their ability to perform an activity and the effect of this perception on their ongoing and future engagement with it. Simply put, self-perceptions can either motivate or inhibit learning processes (Schunk, 1982, 1983a, 1983b; Zimmerman & Ringle, 1981). Judgments about one's ability to be successful at an activity influence whether that activity will be sought or avoided, how much effort is put forth on it, and how long the individual will persist at it (Bandura & Schunk, 1981; Schunk, 1984). All these factors affect the amount of high-quality time on-task that individuals will spend on an activity, which will, in turn, have an impact on their achievement.

In a school context, students who regard themselves as capable readers have probably had many positive experiences with reading. They expect to be successful with new texts. By contrast, students who perceive themselves as poor readers often anticipate struggling with new material. They have typically endured a history of failure and rarely experience reading as a source of gratification. In fact, reading is more likely to be a cause of frustration and embarrassment for them. When viewed through this lens, it is not hard to see a causal link between readers' self-perceptions and their reading behaviors, habits, and attitudes. Put differently, how individuals feel about themselves as readers can influence whether they choose to read, the energy they will devote to it, and how long they will work at making sense of text (Henk & Melnick, 1992).

Bandura's self-efficacy model would suggest that students consider four basic factors when appraising their reading ability: (1) Performance, (2) Observational Comparison, (3) Social Feedback, and (4) Physiological States. Performance, as he defines it, is a broad category that includes past success, amount of effort necessary, the need for assistance, patterns of progress, task difficulty, task

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

persistence, and belief in the effectiveness of instruction. In the model, observational comparison refers to how students think their reading ability compares to the abilities of classmates. Social feedback includes the direct and indirect input that students receive from teachers, peers, and family members. And physiological states represent the internal feelings that students experience while reading.

Our previous research with children in the intermediate grades indicates that these four factors do validly and reliably explain how reader self-perceptions are made (Henk & Melnick, 1992, 1993) with one major qualification. As it turns out, as originally defined, the scales for Observational Comparison (OC), Social Feedback (SF), and Physiological States (PS) hold up extremely well. However, for measurement purposes, the Performance category needed to be defined more narrowly as perceptions of growth or improvement. We now refer to this scale as Progress (PR) and limit it to items that measure how one's sense of *present* reading performance compares with *past* performance. Interestingly, the construct of progress turns out to be inclusive of nearly all the aspects under Bandura's original Performance category.

The four sources of information represented in the RSPS2 naturally interact with one another (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984). For example, students' perceptions of their progress (PR) will be influenced by how well their progress compares with that of classmates (OC), the social feedback (SF) they receive for their progress, and how the progress they are making causes them to feel inside (PS). Likewise, their internal feelings about reading (i.e., physiological states) will be related to the personal progress in reading that they sense is being made, how their reading ability compares with other that of students, and the amount and type of social commentary they receive from teachers, parents, and classmates for their reading efforts. These types of interactions are inevitable when categories overlap so fluidly.

For that matter, these interactions highlight the idea that literacy learning is both complex and socially situated (Alvermann & Guthrie, 1993). Observational Comparison and Social Feedback are, by their very nature, socially situated, and even the physiological states category has an overt social dimension when public oral reading is

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

required (Filby & Barnett, 1982). We know, for instance, that the prospect of oral reading to any size of audience can be terrifying to some students yet might not bother other readers, particularly competent ones, much if at all. Confident readers might in fact welcome the opportunity and the challenge. The key point here is that students learn about themselves as readers in the classroom, the home, and anywhere else that reading takes on a social dimension.

So, although personal or private perceptions of progress and physiological states are important determinants of reader self-perceptions, much of students' self-efficacy beliefs will be tied to the social contexts in which literacy activity happens. Understanding how the four sources of information for reader self-perceptions work can help teachers to shape learning environments for literacy that are more conducive for their students. Properly managed, the classroom context can motivate students to choose reading and to engage both more intensely and for longer periods, all of which stands to increase ability levels.

The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 is reproduced in Figure 1, with items coded by scale for ease of interpretation. Respectively, the two-letter codes for Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback, and Physiological States are PR, OC, SF, and PS. Please note that when the RSPS2 is copied for administration, the codes should probably be removed so that they are not a distraction for the students.

Figure 1 indicates that Progress (PR) items require students to compare past and present performance (e.g., I can understand difficult reading materials better than before), whereas Observational Comparison (OC) items ask students to think about how their performances match with those of classmates (e.g., I read faster than other students). Items representing Social Feedback (SF) address students' perceptions of the input they receive about their reading from teachers, parents, and peers (e.g., My classmates think that I read pretty well; My teachers think that I do a good job of interpreting what I read). Finally, Physiological States (PS) items inquire about how reading makes students feel internally (e.g., Reading tends to make me feel calm).

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

Description of the Instrument

The RSPS2 includes one general item and 46 specific items that relate to the four scales (Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback, and Physiological States). The general item (no. 25) simply states, "I think I am a good reader." The remaining items incorporate elements of reading, such as word recognition, word analysis, fluency, and comprehension as well as some new elements that were not part of the original RSPS.

These new items were added based on the results of individual structured interviews (Henk & Melnick, 2004) with a total of 60 seventh- and eighth-grade students, split evenly between the grades. The students represented readers of low, average, and high ability levels. The interview protocol used with these students was nearly identical to one used to further explore the RSPS (Henk & Melnick, 2004).

The interviews indicated new items should be piloted that dealt with the following more specific secondary factors: vocabulary/word meanings, text and task difficulty, focus and concentration, volunteering to read and answer questions, interest/desire to read, confidence, and expressive reading as an indicator of understanding. These aspects of school-based literacy had not been mentioned by younger children in the intermediate grades during their interviews. Accordingly, new items were devised to address them, again stated positively and in straightforward terms. As a result, all items being considered for the RSPS2 qualified as clear, developmentally appropriate even for older learners, and not likely to confound the scales as negative items have been shown to do (Melnick & Gable, 1990).

When responding to the RSPS2, students are instructed to read each statement and rate how much they agree or disagree with it. Ratings are made using a 5-point Likert scale (in which 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree). Because the number of items changes according to the scale (PR = 16; OC = 9; SF = 9; PS = 12), the maximum possible scores differ for each scale, respectively (PR = 80; OC = 45; SF = 45; PS =

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

60). See Figures 2 and 3 for directions for administration, scoring, and interpretation.

Validation

The initial item pool consisted of all the appropriate items from the original RSPS as well as several that had been generated based on the student interviews. In all, some 66 items were used for the content review of items. The list of statements, as well as the conceptual definitions for each of the four categories, was presented to 56 graduate students in reading. An additional category called "Other" was available for the graduate students to use when undecided. In the content review, they were asked to place each item in the category in which it seemed to fit best and to indicate how well they thought it fit. The feedback received in this judgmental process resulted in five items being dropped.

The remaining 61 items were piloted with 488 students in grades 7 and 8. A factor analysis was performed on the data to see how well the predicted scales emerged for each category. Overall, the fit of the model was promising, but it indicated the existence of five factors instead of four. The scales for Progress (PR), Observational Comparison (OC), and Physiological States (PS) performed largely as expected, but the Social Feedback items clustered into two scales: one for teacher feedback and one that included feedback from parents and classmates. An inspection of the item characteristics indicated that fully 14 items did not contribute much to the instrument. Dropping these items made the scales cluster better and caused their corresponding reliabilities to remain constant or increase.

At this point, we anticipated that Social Feedback would hold together as a scale both conceptually and empirically when we expanded our data collection. For the final instrument, the reliabilities measured as follows: Progress (0.93), Observational Comparison (0.91), Social Feedback (0.84), and Physiological States (0.95). These results were welcome, because each coefficient exceeded the 0.70 threshold desired for an affective scale while reflecting the expected categories.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

After the revisions indicated by the first pilot (n = 488) had been made, an additional 2,542 students in grades 7 through 10 in several urban, suburban, and rural school districts responded to the final instrument (total n = 3,030). Further reliability analyses indicated scale alphas ranging from 0.87 to 0.95, with all items contributing to the overall scale reliability. Table 1 displays the internal consistency reliabilities for each scale. The subsequent factor analysis indicated the existence of each of the expected categories.

Moreover, as Table 2 indicates, the mean scores and standard deviations for each scale were similar across grades, and the corresponding standard errors were desirably low. Students reported the highest relative reader self-perceptions on the Progress scale (61.2 of the maximum possible 80, mean = 3.83) followed by Physiological States (31.0 of 45, mean = 3.44), Social Feedback (29.7 of 45, mean = 3.30), and Observational Comparison (39.7 of 60, mean = 3.31). Stated another way, the students' average response of nearly 3.51 per item indicated their overall tendency to think of themselves as capable readers.

Administration and Scoring

It takes about 20 to 25 minutes for students to complete the RSPS2. The teacher should begin by explaining the purpose of the instrument and then work through the example (See Figure 2). Additional examples should be used if necessary so that all students understand what to do. The teacher should emphasize to the students that they should be as honest as possible and that there are no *right* answers. They should also be encouraged to ask questions about any aspect of the instrument they do not understand.

To score the RSPS2, the evaluator should sum the raw scores for each of the four scales. A scoring sheet is provided in Figure 3 to assist with the calculations. For each student, the completed RSPS2 form should be placed alongside the scoring sheet, and the evaluator then transfers the student's responses to each item from the RSPS2 using the numerical scoring key (e.g., SA = 5; *SD* = 1). When all responses have been recorded, the evaluator totals the number in each column to get a raw score for each of the four scales.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

Teachers who want more precise norming data than provided in the bottom section of Figure 3 should refer to Table 3. Table 3 provides the percentile rankings for scores on each scale for intervals of every five percentile points.

The bottom section of Figure 3 provides a snapshot of norming data that can be used for interpreting students' scores. The normal range for each scale is indicated by any score within the average range. Scores that fall within the low percentile range are cause for concern. By contrast, scores that fall within the above-average or high percentile ranges would indicate uncommonly high reader self-perceptions.

An Example From the Classroom

Soon after the school year began, Ms. Heath, an eighth-grade language arts teacher, administered the RSPS2 to her English class. She knew very little about this group of students except that their reading-ability levels were mixed. From past experience, she suspected that their beliefs about themselves as readers could affect their motivation to read in her class.

Consequently, she wanted to identify those students who might be at risk affectively and to make classroom adjustments that would benefit them individually and the group as a whole. Using the RSPS2, she could gain a general sense of how the group felt about themselves as readers and become aware of particular students whose scores on the four scales were noticeably poorer. She also planned to administer the RSPS2 at the end of year to determine if stronger reader self-perceptions occurred in light of the climate for literacy learning in her classroom.

As a group, her students' mean scores on the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback scales fell in the average range, but the mean scores for Progress and Physiological States were low. It pleased Ms. Heath that her students felt they were performing on a par with classmates and that the input they received from teachers, parents, and peers was affirming. The low scores suggested that students were not encouraged by the improvements they were making in reading and that students derived limited internal gratification from

reading. For students to benefit from her reading class, she knew that they would need to see evidence of their progress and come to view reading as an inherently satisfying activity.

Responding to the results, Ms. Heath began by creating a classroom context that honored all forms of print and offered choice in a wide variety of text genres. She also planned to provide her students with more explicit literacy feedback, initially using students' reading logs to offer specific statements of progress and arranging a schedule of one-on-one conferences with each student every two weeks. These conferences allowed her to support her students' independent reading growth while learning what topics they were passionate about. Her hope was to search out and recommend reading materials based on individual interests.

The profiles of two of her students, Sarah and George, were worrisome. Sarah's RSPS2 profile showed an average score for Progress and slightly below average score for Physiological States. Her scores were well below average for Observational Comparison and Social Feedback, and because Sarah was hesitant to respond during comprehension discussions, Ms. Heath wondered if she felt uncomfortable offering ideas in front of peers.

She continued observing Sarah and also planned actions to increase her confidence. First, she would quietly provide her with a question or two prior to a large group discussion to allow Sarah extra time to think about her responses. In addition, Ms. Heath planned to begin Literature Circle based on student choice and hoped that the smaller group and appealing genre would bolster Sarah's confidence with peers.

Unlike Sarah, all of George's RSPS2 scores were low, and his achievement data indicated a serious reading problem. He was new to the building, and Ms. Heath knew that he had previously received reading intervention. When Ms. Heath asked him to support his answers to comprehension questions by reading aloud relevant portions of the text, he struggled to do so. His classmates then became impatient, because they were clearly more proficient and confident in their reading. Soon he started exhibiting discomfort with almost every reading task. As a struggling reader, his low reader self-

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

image had been shaped over a long period, and his recent experiences made matters worse.

Based on George's records, the RSPS2 data, and her early observations, Ms. Heath took several actions. First, she requested that he receive a formal reading evaluation. She wanted to collaborate with the school's reading specialist on ways to increase George's reading proficiency. From an interview, she learned that he was a sports fan and enjoyed reading the newspaper. She suggested that he participate in the current events Literature Circle where the newspaper, magazine, and Web articles would be decided by the group and where she could make sure George's interests were honored. Lastly, she set aside a weekly meeting time to help him select independent reading materials.

In effect, the RSPS2 provided Ms. Heath with valuable insights regarding the reading self-efficacy of her students. She learned about the class as a whole and quickly identified several students who needed her immediate attention. But most important, Ms. Heath used the tool to begin conversations with her less-engaged readers at a time when nurturing competence and confidence was critical.

Beyond these conversations, she knew that adjustments needed to be made to the classroom climate and in the way individual students engaged in literacy events. Because specific institutional strategies do not match up with the RSPS2 scales per se, Ms. Heath knew her role would be to shape the literacy environment in general terms, creating a healthy classroom atmosphere in which students' reading self-perceptions could become more positive. With that goal in mind, she provided students with concrete evidence of their personal progress in reading and made efforts to demonstrate that their performances compared favorably with those of classmates. She also worked to ensure that students received affirming feedback, and she strove to make their engagements with text pleasurable enough to derive gratification from them.

As a secondary educator, she saw value in devising more meaningful and considerate ways to communicate reading progress to her students, and she modified public classroom practices involving oral reading and comprehension checks. She paid closer attention not

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

only to grouping students for success, peer support, and enjoyment but also to the complexity of reading materials she assigned. In addition, she became more sensitive to indirect signals about students' reading performance and counseled the class and even parents about the importance of providing constructive feedback. Overall, she tried to make students more comfortable during the act of reading.

A Final Word

Our expectation is that the Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 will be useful across a wide array of literacy situations. Extensive norming of the instrument has occurred, providing evidence of validity and reliability. Consequently, the tool can provide meaningful affective literacy data for teachers, administrators, parents, and possibly even the students themselves. One note of caution is that the RSPS2 should be used only in grades 7 through 10, not in previous or subsequent levels where it has not been normed.

It will be up to RSPS2 users to decide how the instrument might be ideally applied and interpreted for their purposes. Although the instrument provides a general indication of a student's self-perceptions as a reader, it does not yield specific self-evaluations of reading skills and strategies that students might make as part of regular classroom instruction. Neither does the scale address specific word-analysis techniques or comprehension abilities such as prediction, imagery, self-regulated learning, retelling proficiency, and critical reflection. Despite its limitations, and regardless of whether the RSPS2 comes to be regarded primarily as an assessment, instructional, or research tool, the instrument has the potential to become a widespread measure of an important affective index for literacy.

Take Action

Steps for Immediate Implementation

- Use the RSPS2 to gain insights into instructional adjustments that might benefit the whole class and individual students.
- Consider students' results in tandem with reading achievement and attitude measures for more complete, richer, and tailored literacy profiles.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

- Note the changes in RSPS2 scores over time to track how students' perceptions are changing. Compare student scores with norming criteria to get a specific sense of how individual students regard themselves in terms of the four scales.
- Ask students how they would prefer to receive feedback on their progress in reading.
- Try using the RSPS2 as a way to begin conversations with your less-engaged readers to determine how you can work together to reignite their interest in reading.
- Discuss with students the importance of giving classmates affirming, constructive feedback.

References

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2011). *Engineering solutions to the national crisis in literacy: How to make good on the promise of the Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved April 19, 2012, from www.all4ed.org/files/EngineeringSolutionsLiteracy.pdf

Alvermann, D. (2008). Why bother theorizing adolescents' online literacies for classroom practice and research? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(1), 8–19. doi:10.1598/JAAL.52.1.2.

Alvermann, D.E., & Guthrie, J.T. (1993). *Themes and directions of the National Reading Research Center. Perspectives in Reading Research (No. 1)*. College Park, MD: National Reading Research Center.

Anderson, R.C., Fielding, L.G., & Wilson, P.T. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 285–303. doi:10.1598/RRQ.23.3.2.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. Medline doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism and human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122.

Bandura, A., & Schunk, D.H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(3), 586–598. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.41.3.586.

Bottomley, D.M., Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (1997). Assessing children's views about themselves as writers using the writer self-perception scale. *The Reading Teacher*, 51(4), 286–296.

Filby, N.N., & Barnett, B.G. (1982). Student perceptions of "better readers" in elementary classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 82(5), 435–449. doi:10.1086/461280.

Foertsch, M.A. (1992). *Reading in and out of school: Factors influencing the literacy achievement of American students in grades 4, 8, and 12 in*

1988 and 1990 (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Heller, R. (2011). The scope of the adolescent literacy crisis. Retrieved June 25, 2012, from www.adlit.org/adlit_101/scope_of_the_adolescent_literacy_crisis

Henk, W.A. (1993). New directions in reading assessment. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 9(1), 103–120. doi:10.1080/1057356930090106.

Henk, W.A., McKenna, M.C., & Conradi, K. (2011). Developing affective instrumentation. In N.K. Duke & M.H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 197–226). New York: Guilford.

Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (1992). The initial development of a scale to measure perception of self as reader. In C.K. Kinzer & D.J. Leu (Eds.), *Literacy research, theory, and practice: Views from many perspectives* (pp. 111–117), Forty-first Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (1993, December). Quantitative and qualitative validation of the reader self-perception scale, Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC.

Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (December 1–4, 2004). The initial development of a reading self-perception scale for use in secondary grades. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Jacobs, J. (2008). Adolescent literacy: Putting the crisis in context. Retrieved May 14, 2012, from www.hepg.org/her/abstract/639

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 437–447. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.80.4.437.

Marshall, H.H., & Weinstein, R.S. (1984). Classroom factors affecting students' self-evaluation: An interactional model. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(3), 301–325.

Melnick, S.A., & Gable, R.K. (1990). The use of negative item stems: A cautionary note. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 14(3), 31–36.

National Governors Association. (2009). *Supporting adolescent literacy achievement*. Washington, DC: NGA Center for Best Practices.

Schunk, D.H. (1982). Effects of effort attributional feedback on children's perceived self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(4), 548–556. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.74.4.548.

Schunk, D.H. (1983a). Ability versus effort attributional feedback: Differential effects on self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(6), 848–856. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.75.6.848.

Schunk, D.H. (1983b). Developing children's self-efficacy and skills: The roles of social comparative information and goal setting. *Contemporary*

Educational Psychology, 8(1), 76–86. doi:10.1016/0361-476X(83)90036-X.

Schunk, D.H. (1984). Self-efficacy perspective on achievement behavior. *Educational Psychologist*, 19(1), 48–58. doi:10.1080/00461528409529281.

Spaulding, C.L. (1992). *Motivation in the classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Strahan, D. (2008). Successful teachers develop academic momentum with reluctant students. *Middle School Journal*, 39(5), 4–12.

Torgesen, J.K., Rashotte, C., Alexander, A., Alexander, J., & MacPhee, K. (2003). Progress towards understanding the instructional conditions necessary for remediating reading difficulties in older children. In B. Foorman (Ed.), *Preventing and remediating reading difficulties: Bringing science to scale* (pp. 275–298). Baltimore: York.

Zimmerman, B.J., & Ringle, J. (1981). Effects of model persistence and statements of confidence on children's self-efficacy and problem solving. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(4), 485–493. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.73.4.485.

More to Explore

Malloy, J., Marinak, B., & Gambrell, L. (2010). *Essential readings on motivation*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Links to this book and a free podcast can be found at www.reading.org/General/Publications/Podcasts.aspx

About the Authors

William A. Henk is a professor at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA; e-mail william.henk@marquette.edu.

Barbara A. Marinak is an associate professor at Mount St. Mary's University, Emmitsburg, Maryland, USA; e-mail barbara.marinak@gmail.com.

Steven A. Melnick is a professor at Alvernia University, Reading, Pennsylvania, USA; e-mail steven.melnick@alvernia.edu.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

Figures and Tables:

FIGURE 1 The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2

Listed below are statements about reading. Please read each statement carefully. Then circle the letters that show how much you agree or disagree with the statement. Use the following key:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

Example: **I think pizza with pepperoni is the best kind.**

If you are *really positive* that pepperoni pizza is the best, circle SA (Strongly Agree).
If you *think* that it's good, but maybe not best, circle A (Agree).
If you *can't decide* whether or not it's best, circle U (Undecided).
If you *think* that pepperoni pizza is not all that good, circle D (Disagree).
If you are *really positive* that pepperoni pizza is not very good, circle SD (Strongly Disagree).

(PS) 1. Reading is a pleasant activity for me.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 2. I read better now than I could before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 3. I can handle more challenging reading materials than I could before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 4. Other students think I'm a good reader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 5. I need less help than other students when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 6. I feel comfortable when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 7. When I read, I don't have to try as hard to understand as I used to do.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 8. My classmates like to listen to the way that I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 9. I am getting better at reading.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 10. When I read, I can figure out words better than other students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 11. My teachers think I am a good reader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 12. I read better than other students in my classes.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 13. My reading comprehension level is higher than other students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 14. I feel calm when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 15. I read faster than other students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 16. My teachers think that I try my best when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 17. Reading tends to make me feel calm.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 18. I understand what I read better than I could before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 19. I can understand difficult reading materials better than before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 20. When I read, I can handle difficult ideas better than my classmates.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 21. When I read, I recognize more words than before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 22. I enjoy how I feel when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 23. I feel proud inside when I think about how well I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 24. I have improved on assignments and tests that involve reading.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(GN) 25. I think that I'm a good reader.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 26. I feel good inside when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 27. When I read, my understanding of important vocabulary words is better than other students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 28. People in my family like to listen to me read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 29. My classmates think that I read pretty well.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 30. Reading makes me feel good.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 31. I can figure out hard words better than I could before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 32. I think reading can be relaxing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 33. I can concentrate more when I read than I could before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 34. Reading makes me feel happy inside.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 35. When I read, I need less help than I used to.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 36. I can tell that my teachers like to listen to me read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 37. I seem to know the meanings of more words than other students when I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 38. I read faster than I could before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 39. Reading is easier for me than it used to be.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 40. My teachers think that I do a good job of interpreting what I read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 41. My understanding of difficult reading materials has improved.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 42. I feel good about my ability to read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(OC) 43. I am more confident in my reading than other students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PS) 44. Deep down, I like to read.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 45. I can analyze what I read better than before.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(SF) 46. My teachers think that my reading is fine.	SA	A	U	D	SD
(PR) 47. Vocabulary words are easier for me to understand when I read now.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

FIGURE 2 The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2: Directions for Administration, Scoring, and Interpretation

The *Reader Self-Perception Scale 2* enables educators and researchers to gauge how students in grades 7 through 10 feel about themselves as readers. The scale consists of 47 items that address reader self-perceptions according to four dimensions of self-efficacy (Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback, and Physiological States). Students are instructed to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement using a 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). Information derived from the *RSPS2* can assist in devising ways to enhance students' self-confidence in reading and to increase their motivation to read. The following directions explain what should be done to administer, score, and interpret the instrument.

Administration

For the results to be useful, the students must: (1) understand exactly what they are to do, (2) have ample time to complete all items, and (3) respond honestly and thoughtfully. Briefly explain to them that they are being asked to complete a questionnaire to find out more about how students in their grade feel about themselves as readers. Tell them that they will be reading a series of statements and indicating how strongly they feel about them. Note that the task should take about 15 to 20 minutes to complete, but that they can take as long as necessary. Emphasize that this is *not* a test, and that there are no *right* answers. Tell them that their responses will be kept confidential.

To begin, ask the students to fill in their names, grade levels, and classrooms as appropriate. Read the directions aloud and work through the example with the students as a group. Discuss the response options and make sure that all students grasp the rating scale before continuing. It is important that students know they may raise their hands to ask quietly about any words or ideas they do not understand. The students should then begin to read each item silently and to circle their responses. When all items are completed, the students should stop and await further instructions. Students who work more slowly should not be disturbed by others who have completed the task.

Scoring

To score the *RSPS2*, enter the following point values for each response on the scoring sheet (Strongly Agree=5, Agree=4, Undecided=3, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1) for each item number under the appropriate scale. Sum each column to obtain a raw score for each of the four scales.

Interpretation

The total possible score for each scale will vary according to the number of items in the scale. Because the Progress scale consists of 16 items, the maximum score is 80 (i.e., 16 X 5). Observational Comparison and Social Feedback each have 9 items, so their top scores will be the same (45), but the 12-item Physiological States scale top score will be 60 (12 X 5). Each scale score can be interpreted by comparing it with the criteria on the scoring sheet. For example, a Progress score from 49 to 73 would be in the average range, whereas scores of 48 or below would be low and scores of 74 and above would be in the high range. Evaluators should be sensitive to the fact that scores at the extremes of the average range could represent very different results.

As a further aid to interpretation, Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics by grade level for each scale. The raw score of a group or individual can be compared to that of the norming group at each grade level. Table 3 presents percentile rankings by scale.

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

FIGURE 3 The Reader Self-Perception Scale 2 Scoring Sheet

Student Name _____

Teacher _____

Grade _____ Date _____

Scoring Key: 5 = Strongly Agree (SA)
4 = Agree (A)
3 = Undecided (U)
2 = Disagree (D)
1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

PROGRESS	OBSERVATIONAL COMPARISON	SOCIAL FEEDBACK	PHYSIOLOGICAL STATES
2._____	5._____	4._____	1._____
3._____	10._____	8._____	6._____
7._____	12._____	11._____	14._____
9._____	13._____	16._____	17._____
18._____	15._____	28._____	22._____
19._____	20._____	29._____	23._____
21._____	27._____	36._____	26._____
24._____	37._____	40._____	30._____
31._____	43._____	46._____	32._____
33._____			34._____
35._____			42._____
38._____			44._____
39._____			
41._____			
45._____			
47._____			
Raw Score _____ of 80	_____ of 45	_____ of 45	_____ of 60
Percentile _____	_____	_____	_____
High	74+	39+	35+	50+
Above Average	66–73	34–38	31–34	44–49
Average	60–65	28–33	28–30	35–43
Low	48–	28–	27–	34

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

Table 1. Number of Items and Internal Consistency Reliabilities for Each Scale (*n* = 3,030)

Scale	Number of items	Alpha reliabilities
Progress	16	.95
Observational Comparison	9	.92
Social Feedback	9	.87
Physiological States	12	.94

Note: The RSPS2 consists of 47 items; 46 items representing the four scales plus 1 general item (#25. "I think I am a good reader").

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics by Scale and Grade Level

Grade	n	Progress			Observational comparisons			Social feedback		
		Mean	S.D	S.E.	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	Mean	S.D.	S.E.
1.										
7	690	61.7	14.3	.54	31.1	7.7	.29	29.9	6.2	.24
8	754	62.8	13.1	.48	32.0	7.7	.29	30.6	6.3	.23
9	924	59.6	11.8	.39	30.0	7.1	.23	28.6	5.5	.18
10	662	61.1	10.3	.40	31.3	6.8	.27	30.2	5.5	.21
Total	3030	61.2	12.5	.23	31.0	7.4	.13	29.7	5.9	.11

Note: Total possible raw scores are Progress (80), Observational Comparison (45), Social Feedback (45) and Physiological States (60).

Table 3. Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS2): Percentiles by Scale Score

Percentiles	Progress	Observational comparisons	Social feedback	Physiological states
5	35	18	20	19
10	46	22	23	24
15	50	24	25	27
20	53	26	26	30
25	56	27	27	32
30	58	28	27	34
35	60	28	28	36
40	61	29	28	37
45	62	30	29	39
50	63	31	29	40
55	64	32	30	42
60	65	33	31	43
65	66	34	32	45
70	67	35	32	46
75	69	36	33	48

Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 56, No. 4 (2013): pg. 311-320. DOI.

Table 3. Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS2): Percentiles by Scale Score

Percentiles	Progress	Observational comparisons	Social feedback	Physiological states
80	71	37	34	49
85	74	39	36	52
90	76	41	37	55
95	79	44	40	58