

Running Head: RECREATIONAL READING LITERATURE REVIEW

Recreational Reading for Academic Achievement in College Students and Adults

Denise A. Wallace

Valdosta University

A glance through the literature shows that recreational reading increases student achievement at all educational levels. Students that read for pleasure tended to benefit by: increased vocabulary, writing, and critical thinking skills. Even though studies show increased levels in student achievement from students who read for pleasure, encouraging life-long reading practices continues to be an issue. Studies and implemented programs to encourage recreational reading are evidenced through four main age groups in education: elementary school, middle school, high school, and college or adult readers. The focus of this literature review is on the literature devoted to college or adult age readers and how recreational reading affects their achievement. The literature reviews are categorized into the following: reading habits of adults, benefits of recreational reading for adult learners and recreational reading programs.

Reading habits of adults:

The most recent National Endowment of the Arts' preliminary summary report *Reading on Rise* (National Endowment of the Arts [NEA], 2009), revealed that for the first time in 26 years, adult Americans are showing an increase in reading habits. The report is based on the findings of the National Endowment for the Arts' 2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (N=18,000+, statistically significant at CI 95%). The significance of this survey is that it is built upon prior surveys that found a dramatic decline in adult reading rates; *Reading at Risk* (NEA, 2004) and *To Read or Not to Read* (NEA, 2007); both showed that since 1982, American adults from ages 18 and older had begun to read less with a decline from 56.9% in 1982 to 46.7% in 2002. These surveys did not explain why adults were reading less just that they were.

The findings of the present NEA summary report (2009) show that all adult age groups are reading more (50.2%), and that there is a significant rise in the amount of reading in the

youngest adult age group of 18 to 24, from 42.8% in 2002 to 51.7% in 2008. Like the earlier surveys the rise in reading could not be explained, but the summary concluded that a likely hypothesis may include that the efforts made by both the NEA and other agencies to address the reading issues presented in the prior reports have made some significant difference most apparent in the youngest adult age group (NEA, 2009). Finding an even split in the American adult population between readers (50.2%) and non-readers (49.8%), the report summary (NEA, 2009) continues to stress the overall contributions that readers give to society as discussed in *To Read or Not to Read* (2007), and notes that “the tendency to read or not to read correlates with broader differences in educational, cultural, and civic engagement” (p.8).

Research by Mokhtari, Reichard, and Gardner (2009) explored whether or not a student’s internet or television habits supplanted academic or recreational reading habits. Their study used a time-diary survey (N=539) with students and found that the internet (M=2.47 hours; SD=1.5) was the dominant activity students preferred, but that it did not ‘displace’ the amount of time spent on recreational reading (M=1.14; SD=0.85) (Mokhtari, 2009). They actually found the students spending more time on recreational reading (average 7.98 hours per week) than previous researchers reported: 2 hours per week by Gallik (1999), 2.5 hours per week by Blackwood et al., (1991), and 4.75 hours per week by Sheorey and Mokhtari (1994); and they attributed this finding to improved measurement techniques using a time-diary survey. The researchers concluded in suggesting that other researchers interested in studying reading habits use the time-diary method but cautioned researcher interpretations due to students’ heavy use of multitasking and an uncertainty in students’ internet skills (Mokhtari, 2009).

Gallik (1999) set out to study the amount of time students spent on recreational reading in relation to academic achievement. The study used a questionnaire survey (N=139) with students

to compare the recreational reading habits of college students during the school year and during the summer against gains in academic achievement. Gallik (1999) found that 63% of students spent an average of 2 hours or less per week on recreational reading during the school year with only 13% spending more than 6 hours per week. Conversely for vacation reading, 48% of students read for 2 hours or less and 25% read for 6 hours or more. Gallik (1999) argues that the differences between this study and other research in the field are due to the blocks of time used to determine time spans; he explains that this study and Blackwood's (1991) used similar blocks of 0-1, 1-2, and 3-5 (3-4 for Blackwood et al., 1996) hours of time spent reading whereas Sheorey and Mokhtari (1994) used blocks of 0-4, 5-9, 10-14 hours and more time spent reading.

The results of the study do not entirely support the hypothesis that recreational reading increases academic achievement; finding no significant correlation ($r=.08$) between recreational reading during classes and academic achievement. However Gallik's (1999) research does report that there is "a weak but statistically significant correlation" ($r=.275$, $p=.01$) between students who read for pleasure during vacations and academic achievement (p. 484). The study concluded that "pleasure" or recreational "reading in itself is not a strong predictor of achievement in college" (Gallik, 1999, p. 486), but conceded that those students who already possess a reading skill set from early childhood are academically advantaged in college (Gallik, 1999).

Looking beyond the act of merely reading, Jolliffe and Harl (2008) asked about the transition from high school to college and what these incoming students were reading. The sample size was very small ($N=21$ students), but in-depth. Similar to Mokhtari (2009), Jolliffe and Harl (2008) used a reading journal in addition to a questionnaire and an exit interview. They found that students are reading more than apparent, that this reading is done online with

information sources of personal interest (recreational reading) not related to their course work, and that students are engaged in other activities at the same time. However, comparisons between amounts of reading in their last year of high school (7.6 hours per week, 70% academic reading) vs. their first year of college (12.9 hours per week, 84% academic reading) were considered ‘moderately low’ amount of reading by the students. In discussing students’ attitudes towards academic reading they found that the students “saw the reading that they had to do for school as uninspiring, dull, and painfully required” (Jolliffe & Harl, 2008, p. 611).

Findings of significant note, from student journals, were of the connections that students were able to draw from the texts they read to their own personal growth and life experiences, as well as from the texts to worldly happenstance and understanding. Jolliffe and Harl (2008) concluded that the faculty needs to incorporate way to increase the types of connections students are able to make from the texts they read to themselves, the world and to other texts; and that the faculty needs to find ways to enrich their curriculums to reflect this need while utilizing more effective interactive technology (Jolliffe & Harl, 2008).

Chen (2007) broadened the understanding of recreational reading habits of adults by comparing cultural differences between reading habits of Taiwanese students to those of Western cultures (from previous studies). The research looks at the results of surveys from two groups of Taiwanese college students (N=32,792 first year students; N=29,406 third year students) concerning their recreational reading habits, their differences in gender, parental background, college type and college major, and what they were reading. The report states that these surveys were conducted as part of the National Science Council in Taiwan’s project “A National Survey of College Student Life Experiences in Taiwan.” (Chen, 2007, p. 644).

Results of the research show significant differences in reading habits of Taiwanese culture to that of Western culture with Taiwanese students reading more per week ($M=10.71$ hours) in their first year of college than do students of Western colleges: 2.5 hours (Blackwood et al., (1991) and 4.75 hours (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 1994). Third year students read even more ($M=12.74$ hours). Chen (2007) attributes these differences to be the use of per day vs. per hour between the studies. Further, unlike Western cultures, Taiwanese males read more than females (first year: males ($M=1.57$ hours; $SD=1.98$), females ($M=1.49$; $SD=1.64$); third year: males ($M=1.90$; $SD=2.18$), females ($M=1.76$; $SD=1.86$). This is attributed as Chen states to “the concept of reading in Chinese culture is not viewed as a ‘feminine behavior;’” and that “Historically in Taiwan, reading was a man’s job” (Chen, 2007, p. 650).

Differences were also found between college type (with private school students reading more than public school students), college major (with education majors reading the least) and academic achievement (with only highest achievers showing a positive correlation, lesser achievers showed a negative correlation between recreational reading and academic achievement) in regards to time spent reading (Chen, 2007). Implications of this study center on the need to consider cultural background in interpreting survey results and the need to engage education majors, who read less than all other majors, in better reading habits.

The study of Blackwood, Flowers, Rogers, & Staik, (1991) set out to study if students were actively engaged in recreational reading, when they read the most and whether or not parental support was a factor in their reading habit development. Data were collected using three measurements (demographic-the Montevallo Student Survey, the LOGO scale, and the Pleasure Reading Questionnaire) distributed to college students ($N=333$; males=113, females=219).

Results showed that 88% of students enjoyed reading for pleasure; a Chi Square analysis of these students reported that females (90%) read more than males (84%).

Addressing when students read, Blackwood et al., (1991) found that students read less during the school year (male M=2.5 hours per week; female M=2.4 hours per week) then while on vacation (male M=2.7 hours per week; female M=3 hours per week. Data concerning parental support revealed that there was no significant effect in the amount of time spent reading during the school year or during vacations. When backgrounds of parents were investigated, Blackwood et al., (1991) found that neither education levels of parents nor occupation of parents significantly affected the amount of time students spent reading. Students preferred to read newspapers and literature over other forms of reading material. Blackwood et al., (1991) concluded that senior level students have skills necessary for lifelong learning and that parental encouragement may influence educational goals more so than reading habits (p.8).

The joint study by Salter and Brook (2007) focused on the choices students make in regards to their free time activities: do they read in their free time, if they don't read what do they do, and how are they using technology in their daily lives. Measurement was by a 15 question survey via paper or online; (N=163; paper=30, online=133). Results show that student do read in their free time (61%), but that they prefer watching TV (72%), hanging out with friends (69%) and napping (64%) slightly more. Surprisingly the least preferred activity was playing video games (15%). Internet use was not listed as one of the free time activities but their study (Salter & Brook, 2007) addressed internet use separately and found that 77% of students queried used the internet 3-5 times a day; with an additional 21% using the internet at least once a day. When asked what they do online, Salter and Brook (2007) found that students engaged in class

assignments and emailing or instant messaging equally (85%), with personal interest activities at 79%.

Two questions were asked by Salter and Brook (2007) concerning leisure reading: leisure reading per day and leisure reading per day during the school year; the majority of students (66%) spent less than 1 hour per day leisure reading whereas during the school year students (34%) spent less than 1 hour on leisure reading per day. In contrast, the amount of students (5%) who spent more than 2 hours per day leisure reading increased during the school year to 64% (combined total of 2-4 hours and 5 hours or more spent on leisure reading during the school year). From a library standpoint, Salter and Brook (2007) concluded that libraries could better serve their students by using a similar survey to aid in collection development. Such surveys provide information about the types of reading students engage in and preferred formats; they further suggested implementation of activities to encourage reading (Salter & Brook, 2007).

Benefits of Recreational Reading:

Ross (2000) engaged in an extensive study to investigate how useful information can be gleaned from recreational reading without deliberately seeking it (the information) out. The sample in this study was made up of 194 heavy readers who participated in open ended interviews, 65% were female, 35% were male. The majority age was 21-30 with the range from age 16 to 80. Heavy reader status was determined by readers who read more than one book per week and consider reading an important part of their lives. The educational level of this group was high (Ross, 2000).

The study served several purposes with the focus of the article on books that made a difference in the lives of the readers (Ross, 2000). Ross (2000) found that reading is an

interwoven part of the readers lives: heavy readers turn to books as an information source before asking someone; fiction is preferred over non-fiction in terms of finding meaning, but non-fiction is resourceful for factual information; 60% of the readers feel that at least one book or story has made a difference in their lives; and books become a part of them.

When asked to describe how a book changed their lives responses carried similar themes; Ross (2000) described these themes as: awakening, new perspective or enlargement of possibilities; models for identity; reassurance, comfort, confirmation of self worth, strength; connection with others, awareness of not being alone; courage to make a change; acceptance; and disinterested understanding of the world. Ross (2000) concludes “It is clear that readers play a crucial role in enlarging the meaning of the text by reading it within the context of their own lives. Through their act of making sense of texts and applying them to their lives, readers creatively rewrite texts and turn them into a powerful source of consolation or warning, confirmation of identity or support for change” (p. 79).

To further the work done by Ross (2000), Moyer (2007) focused on the “educational outcome” of information found from recreational reading (p.66). The study used survey (n=62) and follow up interview (n=7) measurement instruments. Results ($r=.51$) from the data collected support Moyer’s (2000) hypothesis “that while there is a relationship between education and recreation, readers are not choosing to read solely for the purpose of learning, but that learning is an unexpected benefit of leisure, albeit one that is very important to the reader” (p. 70).

Individual learning categories show that patrons learn a lot by reading fiction (81%), fiction reading helps patrons understand their world (71%), and patrons have a better understanding of other countries and culture after reading fiction (77%). At the same time patrons found fiction

reading to be fun (98%), reading fiction was an enjoyable part of their life (96%), and fiction reading was a pleasant hobby (95%).

In the interviews conducted by Moyer (2007) commonalities were that patrons “had read since childhood, had come from a family of readers, had always read, or couldn’t remember a time when they were not readers” (p.72). Patrons felt that there was a relationship between leisure reading and learning, and that learning was easier and more fun through fictional modes than through traditional methods. Of special note was that the patrons interviewed did not watch a lot of television. Moyer (2007) found eleven types of responses from patrons when asked what types of things they learned from fiction and concluded that four of them were representative of significant education outcomes for readers: ‘people and relationships’ helped readers learn more about themselves; ‘other countries, cultures, and time periods’ helped readers learn about others; ‘enriches life’ by fulfilling lifelong learning and educational needs; and ‘different perspectives’ to help see other points of view via individual or cultural engagement (Moyer, 2007, p.74-75).

In her research paper, *Sustaining the Culture of the Book: The Role of Enrichment Reading and Critical Thinking in the Undergraduate Curriculum*, MacAdams (1995) focuses attention on the role reading in any form plays in promoting critical thinking skills in adult learners. Her research is backed heavily by the literature on the topic (a mini literature review in itself) and surmises the need to encourage reading within the context of current and upcoming technology. Special emphasis is placed on the effects of the current image culture on critical thinking skills and how librarians can help offset these effects and encourage reading within this culture.

Five studies were conducted by Nell (1988) over a six-year period to study various aspects of recreational reading. The first study compared the reading habits of 129 students and 33 heavy readers (reader who read more than one book a week for pleasure). Measurement was through a reading comprehension speed test and a reading habits questionnaire that investigated reading ability (students $M=221$ words per minute; $SD=73$; readers $M=412$ words per minute; SD not stated), reading habits, and motive strength. Reading speed was found to correlate significantly with time spent reading books ($r=.34$, $p<.001$) and number of books read ($r=.33$, $p<.001$) (Nell, 1988). Nell conclude that reading habits may develop for people who have faster reading speeds and that reading habits may not develop for people who have slower reading speeds; however the results were not able to determine if reading comprehension develops because of reading habits or as a precondition to reading habits (Nell, 1988).

The second study (Nell, 1988) looked at rates of reading in a natural environment and used the sample group of heavy readers ($n=33$, with actual completed data for $n=30$). Research instruments included a reading mood questionnaire and two laboratory reading sessions where reading speed and timing per page was monitored. The rate at which a passage was read was found to vary (flexibility ratio) from quick skimming through parts of least interest ($M=534$ words per minute; $SD=245$) to slower reading for parts with the most interest ($M=394$ words per minute; $SD=140$) with a significant difference, $t(56)=3.55$, $p<.01$. Results show that faster readers ($M=2.95$) have a greater flexibility ratio than slower readers ($M=1.89$) based on words per minute and that there is a strong correlation between reading speed and flexibility ratio, $r(28)=.69$, $p<.001$.(Nell, 1988).

Nell's (1988) third study looked at how readers rank books based on preference, merit and difficulty. Three subjects groups were used: the 129 students from the first study (including

a follow up with 79 of them two years later), 44 librarians (23 professional librarians, and 21 library assistants) and 14 university English lectures. Measurement was through a reading preference test based on extracts from 30 books and allowed for several hypotheses to be investigated at the same time. Nell (1988) states the hypotheses of this study as “whether a ludic continuum could be demonstrated across two taste cultures, and to determine whether the Protestant ethic conviction that pain and virtue are constant companions would lead ludic readers to arrange works of fiction in a literary merit sequence that is the inverse of their own ludic reading preference sequence. For the same reason it was hypothesized that merit and difficulty rankings would be closely related ... that readability score rankings on both measures would be significantly correlated with reader’s preference and merit rankings” (p. 21). Results supported hypotheses but Nell (1988) concluded that reliability of statistical methods used to rank order correlation coefficients (Spearman’s rho) for Fog Index and Cloze rankings was suspect and that “it may be measuring an undefined construct in the domain of language production” (p. 33).

The fourth study for Nell (1988) focused on physiological effects of reading for pleasure and found that there is an ‘arousal’ factor for the same group of 33 heavy readers while reading. Measurement was collected via electro-physical transducers connected to an OTE 16-channel polygraph, interfaced with an Ampex PR2000 16-channel analog tape recorder and a Systron-Donner time code generator operating in a 10-second frame; operated in two sessions. Data was collected while subjects conducted nine different tasks. Results found that readers were physiologically more aroused while reading (M=314,220; VS=56,021) than while at the base line of measurement: relaxed (M=214,765; VS=30,450) (Nell, 1988).

The fifth and final study in Nell (1988) is concerned with the psychological reasons for reading. The same group of 33 heavy readers was used with six of these readers participating in

a group discussion. Measuring instruments were the reading habits questionnaire, the reading mood questionnaire, the 2-hour taped group discussion, the sixteen personality factor questionnaire, and the Eysenck personality inventory. Looking at hypotheses garnered from the literature, Nell (1988) sought to investigate whether or not reading was being used as “a block to self-awareness or an enhancer of it”, how control over the reading was empowering, and to what degree imagination was enacted while reading (p.41).

The results from the measurements (Nell, 1988) suggest that readers enjoy control (ability to re-read, stop or start at their own desire) over the reading; read for escapism in terms of blocking self-awareness; evidence a high frustration index when not able to read; read to face fears or learn to remove them from ludic reading; read in bed almost every night; see books as old friends but re-reading is less than expected; use visualization techniques and incorporate vivid imagery while reading; require less cognitive effort when reading for pleasure; and share common ‘introvert’ personality attributes. Nell (1988) concluded that in terms of sovereignty while pleasure reading, heavy readers “transform fear to power, gloom to delight, and agitation to tranquility” (p.46).

Recreational Reading Programs:

Gauder, Giglierano, and Schramm (2007) developed a recreational reading program in reaction to results of the National Endowment of the Arts (2004) survey concerning the national decline in adult reading habits. The program was called Porch Reads and targeted 1,600 college sophomore students; it aimed to help increase reading habits by getting students interested in reading by creating a reading community. This was attempted by giving students a free book and inviting them to participate in reading discussions led by faculty in an informal out-of-

classroom environment. Measurement of the program's success was through evaluation forms distributed at each of the book discussions and data collection at the three stages of implementation: initial student interest (n=242) in the program narrowed from book distribution (n=209) to those who completed the evaluations after the discussions (n=149) (Gauder et al., 2007).

Evaluation forms (Gauder et al., 2007) measured how many books students read during the summer, students reading preferences, factors that motivated students' participation in the program, and students' perception of program worthiness. Gauder et al. (2007) found that the majority of students participating (80%) already had average to moderate reading habits and that the program did not attract non-readers. Gender wise, the program drew more female students than male students (3 to 1 ratio); and in relation to reading preference, non-fiction was preferred by males with fiction preferred by females (Gauder et al., 2007). The motivating factors were a combination of receiving a free book (n=135), wanting to read the free book (n=130), winning \$150 in bookstore cash (\$116), and discussing the book with faculty and peers (n=99). Conclusion found the Porch Reads program to be a success in meeting program goals of encouraging reading habits by establishing a reading community and was planned for continuation (Gauder et al., 2007).

Rathe-Recreational reading collections

In reaction to the National Endowment of the Arts (2004) survey and to internal assessment of patron recreational reading needs at the UNC's Michener Library, Rathe & Blankenship (2005) found in their end of the year survey, that the UNC's Michener Library's decision to institute a recreational reading area and program were successful. The program was

implemented by setting up a recreational reading area in a prominent location on the main floor of the library with adequate shelving, comfortable seating, and a small (400 title) collection that permitted easy browsing (dusk jackets left on). Success of program was collected at the end of the first year by providing paper surveys (n=27) in each book and on a table in the reading area, and through an online form (n=28). Patrons of the collection who completed the survey varied from undergraduate students (n=25) to graduate students (n=8) and included other members of the collegiate community (n=22) (Rathe & Blankenship, 2005).

Surveys (Rathe & Blankenship, 2005) found that patrons liked the collection due to the factors that were used in its development: the comfortable seating, location, and ease of browsing. In comparison with library circulation figures, Rathe and Blankenship (2005) found that books checked out in the first year of the collection (669 times) increased during the second year (1118 times); and faculty made up the largest percentage (49%) of users in the first year but were outnumbered during the second year by the students (54%). In terms of use it was stated that 28 students reported using the collection for recreational reading and 11 students reported using collection for class assignments (Rathe and Blankenship, 2005, p. 79). Conclusions reached by Rathe and Blankenship (2005) found that the recreational reading program of the UNC Michener Library was a success in meeting the recreational reading needs of its patrons.

In summary, the literature was weak in areas of correlations between recreational reading and 'measurable' achievement for adult readers (Gallik, 1999; Chen, 2007). However, there is enough material in the literature to support benefits (Ross, 2000; Moyer, 2007; Nell, 1988, National Endowment of the Arts, 2009) and needs (National Endowment for the Arts, 2004 & 2007; MacAdam, 1995) for recreational reading programs during childhood development and to

continue this support within adult reading environments (Rathe & Blankenship, 2005; Guader et al., 2007; MacAdam, 1995).

Of particular note was the differences cultural norms have on reading habits overall (Chen, 2007; Jolliffe & Harl, 2008; Blackwood, et al., 1991); this suggests that American culture should look closer at how it values and supports reading. Changing cultural views to support reading as a positive social activity may increase overall reading habits (National Endowment for the Arts, 2007). More so is the impact of current technology on cognitive processes and how, in younger generations, technology has changed not only what is being read and how it is being read, but how information is cognitively processed: more visually with image dominance (MacAdam, 1995; Jolliffe, & Harl, 2008; Mokhtari, et al., 2009). Missing from the literature is the influence of audio books on recreational reading practices and how this activity and traditional oral storytelling practices correlate to critical thinking skills.

References

- Blackwood, C., Flowers, S.S., Rogers, J.S., & Staik, I.M. (1991). *Pleasure reading by college students: Fact or fiction?* Paper presented at meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association Conference, Lexington, KY.
- Chen, S. (2007, May). Extracurricular reading habits of college students in Taiwan: Findings from two national surveys. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 50(8), 642-654.
- Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Gallik, J. (1999, March). Do they read for pleasure? Recreational reading habits of college

students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 42(6), 480-488. Retrieved June 13, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

Gauder, H., Giglierano, J., & Schramm, C. (2007, June). Porch reads: Encouraging recreational reading among college students. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 14(2), 1-24. Retrieved June 13, 2009, from <http://cul.haworthpress.com>, doi:10.1300/J1106v14n02_01.

Jolliffe, D., & Harl, A. (2008, July). Texts of our institutional lives: Studying the "reading transition" from high school to college: What are our students reading and why? *College English* 70(6), 599-617. Retrieved on June 13, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

MacAdam, B. (1995). Sustaining the culture of the book: The role of enrichment reading and critical thinking in the undergraduate curriculum. *Library Trends* 44(2), 237-64.

Mokhtari, K., Reichard, C., & Gardner, A. (2009, April). The impact of internet and television use on the reading habits and practices of college students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(7), 609-619. Retrieved June 13, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

Moyer, J. (2007, Summer). Learning from leisure reading. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 46(4), 66-79. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

National Endowment for the Arts. (2004). Reading at risk: A survey of literary reading in America : executive summary. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://arts.endow.gov/pub/RaRExec.pdf> .

National Endowment for the Arts, (2007). To read or not to read: A question of national consequence : executive summary. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from http://arts.endow.gov/research/ToRead_ExecSum.pdf .

National Endowment for the Arts. (2009). Reading on the rise A new chapter in American literacy. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS110100>.

Nell, V. (1988, Winter). The psychology of reading for pleasure: Needs and gratifications. *Reading Quarterly*, 23(1), 6-50. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/747903> .

Rathe, B., & Blankenship, L. (2005, April). Recreational reading collections in academic libraries. *Collection Management*, 30(2), 73-85. Retrieved on June 13, 2009, from <http://www.haworthpress.com/web/COL> , doi:10.1300/J105v30n02_06.

Ross, C. S. (2000). Finding without seeking: What readers say about the role of pleasure reading as a source of information. *Australasian Public Libraries and Information Services*,

13(2), 72-80. Retrieved on June 22, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

Salter, A., & Brook, J. (2007, September). Are we becoming an aliterate society? The demand for recreational reading among undergraduates at two universities. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 14(3), 27-43. Retrieved on June 22, 2009, from <http://cul.haworthpress.com>, doi:10.1300/J106v14n03_02.

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (1994). The reading habits of college students at different levels of reading proficiency. *Reading Improvement*, 31, 156-166.