

Let's Go, TTO?

The Difference in Reading Motivation between Pupils in  
Bilingual and Regular Education in the Netherlands

Student: Lente Venderink  
Student number: 6225411  
Supervisor: prof. dr. Ewout van der Knaap  
Second reader: dr. Trenton Hagar  
Date: 15 January 2025

### Abstract

Several studies have found a higher overall motivation from bilingual pupils when compared to regular pupils. However, differences in reading motivation specifically have not been studied yet. The present study, therefore, examines the difference in reading motivation between regular and bilingual pupils, and also considers the differences between forms 2, 4 and 6, and between genders. It was hypothesized that bilingual pupils would have a higher reading motivation than regular pupils, and that within regular education there would be differences between forms and gender, but not in bilingual education. One hundred and ninety-eight pupils from a Dutch pre-university secondary school participated by filling out a questionnaire on reading motivation. The answers to the questionnaire were divided up into five categories: Intrinsic Motivation – Engagement (IME) and Curiosity (IMC), and Extrinsic Motivation – Others (EMO), Social (EMSo) and School (EMSc). No significant differences were found between regular and bilingual pupils overall. For regular pupils, EMSo significantly declined through forms 2, 4 and 6. For both regular and bilingual pupils, female pupils reported a significantly higher IME than male pupils. No other significant differences were found. This study adds to the existing literature on motivation in bilingual education while separating intrinsic from extrinsic motivation, providing useful information for researchers and educators.

*Keywords:* reading motivation, bilingual education, gender, Netherlands, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, pre-university level

## Table of contents

1.	Introduction .....	5
2.	Theoretical Background .....	6
<b>2.1</b>	<i>Bilingual education in the Netherlands</i> .....	6
<b>2.2</b>	<i>Decline in reading enjoyment and proficiency</i> .....	7
<b>2.3</b>	<i>Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation</i> .....	9
<b>2.4</b>	<i>Bilingual pupils' motivation over time</i> .....	10
<b>2.5</b>	<i>Differences in motivation between genders</i> .....	12
<b>2.6</b>	<i>Hypotheses</i> .....	13
3.	Method .....	14
<b>3.1</b>	<i>Participants</i> .....	14
<b>3.2</b>	<i>Materials</i> .....	15
<b>3.3</b>	<i>Procedure</i> .....	16
4.	Results.....	17
5.	Discussion.....	20
<b>5.1</b>	<i>Differences in reading motivation between regular and bilingual pupils</i> .....	21
<b>5.2</b>	<i>The development of reading motivation through forms 2, 4 and 6</i> .....	22
<b>5.3</b>	<i>Gender differences in reading motivation</i> .....	23
<b>5.4</b>	<i>Comparison PISA-2018 (Gubbels et al., 2019)</i> .....	24

<b>5.5</b>	<b><i>Broader implications</i></b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>5.6</b>	<b><i>Limitations and future research</i></b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>27</b>
	<b>References</b> .....	<b>29</b>
	<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>35</b>
	<b><i>Appendix A</i></b> .....	<b>35</b>
	<b><i>Appendix B</i></b> .....	<b>38</b>
	<b><i>Appendix C</i></b> .....	<b>42</b>
	<b><i>Appendix D</i></b> .....	<b>44</b>

## 1. Introduction

A worldwide decline in reading motivation and enjoyment has been taking place over the past decade (Brozo, 2005; Clark et al., 2023). The Netherlands is not an exception to this decline (Gubbels et al., 2019). A decline in reading motivation, however, can have serious consequences for people's reading proficiency (Meelissen et al., 2023). Reading motivation is, therefore, an important subject to research, especially considering reading motivation interventions have been proven to have positive effects on reading motivation and proficiency (Davidse, 2022; Van der Sande et al., 2023; Van Steensel et al., 2016). However, most studies on reading motivation in the Netherlands do not make a distinction between pupils following either Dutch-English bilingual (Dutch: *tweetalig onderwijs* or *tto*) or regular (i.e. Dutch monolingual) education, while at Dutch secondary schools, there seem to be differences in reading enjoyment between these two groups. Based on my own observations after three years of working in education, it seems that bilingual pupils oftentimes talk enthusiastically about the books they are currently reading, whereas regular pupils mostly complain about how "boring" reading is.

While general motivational differences between bilingual and regular pupils in the Netherlands have been studied extensively (e.g. Mearns et al., 2020; Sylvén & Thompson, 2015; Verspoor et al., 2015), differences in reading motivation or enjoyment specifically have not yet been studied. The present study would, therefore, like to contribute to the existing literature by examining the differences in reading motivation and enjoyment between bilingual and regular pupils. The research question for the current study is therefore as follows:

- (1) How does the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual education differ from pupils in regular education at a Dutch secondary school?

As differences between age groups and gender may also be present, the following sub-questions were added:

- (1.1) How does the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual and regular education develop through forms 2, 4 and 6?
- (1.2) How does the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual and regular education differ between male and female participants?

## 2. Theoretical Background

### 2.1 Bilingual education in the Netherlands

Bilingual education has officially been present in the Netherlands since 1989. It was introduced as an additional challenge for only the top-performing pupils who wanted to learn subject content while increasing their English proficiency (Maljers, 2007, as cited in Mearns et al., 2020). It was even seen as a modern variant of grammar school (Dutch: *gymnasium*), which is a level of education reserved for high-achieving pre-university level (Dutch: *vwo* or *voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs*) pupils only (Verspoor et al., 2015, p. 10). Nowadays, bilingual education is not only offered at the pre-university level, but also at the general level (Dutch: *havo* or *hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs*) and pre-vocational level (Dutch: *vmbo* or *voorbereidend middelbaar beroepsonderwijs*). Because of this, bilingual education today is not seen as only conceivable to the 'elite' anymore.

Not only do bilingual pupils outperform regular pupils of the same age in English proficiency (e.g. Huibregtse et al., 2000; Verspoor & Edelenbos, 2009; Verspoor et al., 2015),

but both pre-university and pre-vocational bilingual education have been found to come with many additional benefits. For instance, Denman et al. (2013) interviewed both pupils and teachers at five Dutch pre-vocational bilingual schools. They found that pupils' self-reported self-esteem and motivation had increased, and that teachers and pupils believed that bilingual education helps pupils prepare for their future and enhances their cross-cultural communication with other speakers of English (p. 298). Additionally, Mearns (2016) looked at four Dutch schools offering both pre-vocational, general and pre-university level bilingual education, and one school offering regular education at the pre-vocational, general and pre-university level as a control group. She found that bilingual pupils "possessed more features traditionally associated with successful learning and motivation" (Mearns, 2016, p. 283) than the regular pupils, such as a higher confidence and self-esteem, a better attitude towards English, and a focus on international orientation and integrativeness. Lastly, Christoffels et al. (2015) studied cognitive flexibility differences between a bilingual and a regular group at a secondary school offering pre-university education. They found that the bilingual pupils struggled less with a global-local switching task and had a reduced global precedence effect, which indicated higher cognitive control skills among the bilingual pupils (Christoffels et al., 2015, p. 377). Bilingual education, thus, seems the superior option as opposed to regular education.

## **2.2 Decline in reading enjoyment and proficiency**

In multiple countries, reading enjoyment among teenagers and adolescents has been declining. In the United Kingdom, for instance, only 43.4% of children aged 8 to 18 stated that they enjoyed reading in their free time in 2023, which is the lowest percentage recorded since 2005 (Clark et al., 2023, p. 12). Additionally, 15-year-olds from Sweden, Italy, Germany,

Greece, Russia and the United States were found to experience a “slump” in reading motivation (Brozo, 2005, p. 48). In the Netherlands, this decline is also present. According to the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) study of 2018, 63% of Dutch 15-year-olds only read when they must, which is a 9% increase since 2009. Additionally, 42% (2009: 35%) think reading is a waste of time and 59% (2009: 51%) only read to find the information they need (Gubbels et al., 2019, p. 35). In a ranking of 95 countries, the Netherlands has even received the final place for reading enjoyment in both 2009 and 2018 (Gubbels et al., 2019, p. 34).

Reading enjoyment, however, leads to a higher engagement in reading, which in turn predicts student achievement outcomes according to Guthrie et al. (2012, p. 630). Neff (2015) concluded the same after analysing the United States’ PISA-2009 results. He found that reading enjoyment predicted reading outcomes, with a higher reading enjoyment resulting in higher reading outcomes (Neff, 2015, p. 66). Moreover, Guthrie et al. (1999) found that third- and fifth-form pupils’ self-reported amount of reading time was associated with test scores for reading comprehension, even when other factors (i.e. background knowledge, previous marks, intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy) were controlled for (p. 251). For tenth-form pupils, they even found that reading time was correlated with test scores for reading comprehension, also when other factors (i.e. past achievement, SES and self-efficacy) were controlled for (Guthrie et al., 1999, p. 251). It, therefore, does not come as a surprise that Dutch pupils’ reading proficiency has been declining as well. Up until 2015, Dutch pupils’ reading proficiency had been stable. However, between 2015 and 2022 the average test scores for reading proficiency decreased significantly with 44 points. Because of this, the Dutch average test scores dropped below the average test scores of OESO- and EU14-countries (Meelissen et al., 2023, p. 52). Additionally, 33% of Dutch pupils score lower than



the level that, according to PISA, is needed to function properly in Dutch schools and society. This is a 15% decrease since 2015 (Meelissen et al., 2023, p.56). These developments are concerning.

### **2.3 Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation**

When discussing motivation, it is important to first make a distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. According to Deci and Ryan's (2000) self-determination theory, "[i]ntrinsically motivated behaviors are those that are freely engaged out of interest without the necessity of separable consequences, and to be maintained, they require satisfaction of the needs for autonomy and competence" (p. 233). Intrinsic motivation is, thus, motivation driven by personal interest and enjoyment (e.g. a hobby), whereas extrinsic motivation is motivation driven by the need to achieve external goals (e.g. higher marks). According to Deci et al. (1991), intrinsic motivation mostly improves achievement (p. 332). This conclusion was made first by Gottfried (1985), who found that pupils with a higher academic intrinsic motivation "had significantly higher school achievement, more favorable perceptions of their academic competence, lower academic anxiety, and lower extrinsic classroom orientation, and were rated by their teachers as being generally more intrinsically motivated" (p. 642).

For reading motivation specifically, numerous studies about varying age groups have found that intrinsic motivation generates higher achievement outcomes than extrinsic motivation. For instance, Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) looked at fourth- and fifth-form children's reading motivation in the United States and found that reading motivation significantly predicted children's reading amount and breadth. Moreover, a higher intrinsic motivation accounted for the variance in amount and breadth of reading when extrinsic motivation was controlled for, but for extrinsic motivation this was not the case (p. 429).

Additionally, Lau (2009) examined reading motivation amongst secondary school pupils between 11 and 18 years old in Hong Kong. She created a model and found that, for junior secondary pupils, intrinsic and social motivation were significant predictors of reading amount. For senior secondary pupils, only intrinsic motivation was a significant predictor of reading amount. For both junior and senior secondary pupils, self-efficacy and extrinsic motivation did not significantly predict reading amount (Lau, 2009, p. 374). Finally, Schiefele et al. (2012) conclude in an overview of multiple studies on reading motivation in secondary schools all over the world that intrinsic motivation has beneficial effects on reading motivation, whereas extrinsic motivation has a relatively small or negative impact (p. 457). The previously discussed 9% increase in Dutch 15-year-olds reporting that they only read when they must (Gubbels et al., 2019, p. 35) is, thus, troubling, as this highlights a shift from intrinsic to extrinsic motivation, which is also reflected in both reading enjoyment and proficiency.

#### **2.4 Bilingual pupils' motivation over time**

As previously mentioned, multiple studies have found that bilingual pupils have a higher motivation than regular pupils. It is, however, notable, that none of these studies make a distinction between intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. For instance, Sylvén and Thompson (2015) looked at first-form bilingual and regular pupils in Sweden and found that the bilingual pupils were significantly more interested in foreign languages, less ethnocentric, less anxious to speak English, more positive towards English, more confident in their L2 and more willing to communicate in English (p. 40). Similarly, Mearns et al. (2020) asked bilingual and regular pupils from four general level secondary schools to fill out a questionnaire and found that bilingual pupils had a higher level of motivation in terms of "their attitudes towards English,

other foreign languages and the L2 English-speaking community, instrumental motivation, response to English lessons, and extramural exposure to English” (p. 733). Lastly, Verspoor et al. (2015) examined first- and third-form pupils from three pre-university bilingual schools, and one school as a control group, on their motivation. They found that the bilingual pupils were significantly more motivated than the control group and this motivation contributed significantly to the final proficiency in the third form (Verspoor et al., 2015, p. 20). The latter two studies, however, also question if the bilingual pupils are more motivated because of the different type of education they receive or if they were already more motivated to begin with, as they chose this type of education themselves.

A decrease in motivation as learners grow older is to be expected for regular pupils (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009, p. 13), but multiple studies, unexpectedly, found this for bilingual pupils as well. For instance, Mearns (2016) found that motivation levels for Dutch bilingual pupils either remained largely the same or even declined across first, second and third forms (p. 283). Similarly, Mearns et al. (2020) found that there was little difference between the motivational levels of first- and third-form bilingual pupils in the Netherlands (p. 733). Additionally, third-form bilingual pupils were significantly more negative towards their English lessons than first-form bilingual pupils (Mearns et al., 2020, p. 733). Mearns (2016) concludes that bilingual education in the Netherlands is more likely to sustain the motivation bilingual pupils already have when starting secondary school, rather than awake some other new motivation (p. 283). In contrast, this awakening of motivation is possible for the regular pupils when the right approach is adopted (Mearns, 2016, p. 283).

## 2.5 Differences in motivation between genders

Multiple studies have found significant differences in reading motivation between genders, regardless of age or country of origin. For example, Neff (2015) found that in the United States' PISA-2009 (age: 15), gender was a significant predictor of voluntary reading time and that being female correlated with more voluntary reading time (p. 68). Similarly, Smith et al. (2012) found higher levels in reading enjoyment for girls between 8 and 12 years old in New Zealand than for boys of the same age (p. 206). For the United Kingdom, Logan and Johnston (2009) reproduced these findings as girls between 10 and 11 years old read significantly more frequently and had a significantly more positive attitude towards reading and school than boys (p. 207). For girls between 11 and 16 years old in the United Kingdom, similar results were found, as girls had a significantly higher reading motivation and value of reading than boys (McGeown et al., 2014, p. 561). Again, unfortunately, these studies do not make a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

For bilingual education specifically, studies have obtained different outcomes regarding the differences in motivation between genders. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2009) studied third- and fourth-form secondary pupils in Basque bilingual schools. Their results showed a significant effect for positive attitudes towards English in favour of female students in both the regular and bilingual groups (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009, p. 13). In contrast, in the Netherlands, Mearns and De Graaff (2018) looked at pupils in the first three forms of the general level and found that girls in regular education showed significantly more motivation than boys towards learning English, foreign languages and their in-school learning experience. This gap, however, was not significant for bilingual pupils (Mearns & De Graaff, 2018, p. 18). Further research is, thus, needed to clarify gender differences in bilingual education, also considering differences between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

## 2.6 Hypotheses

Based on the studies reviewed above, the following hypotheses have been formed for the research questions:

- (1) How does the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual education differ from pupils in regular education at a Dutch secondary school?

H<sub>1</sub>: Bilingual pupils will have a higher (intrinsic) reading motivation and enjoyment than regular pupils.

- (1.1) How does the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual and regular education develop through forms 2, 4 and 6?

H<sub>1.1a</sub>: Regular pupils' reading motivation and enjoyment will decline through forms 2, 4 and 6.

H<sub>1.1b</sub>: Bilingual pupils' reading motivation and enjoyment will remain stable through forms 2, 4 and 6..

- (1.2) How does the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual and regular education differ between male and female participants?

H<sub>1.2a</sub>: Female participants will have a higher reading motivation and enjoyment than male participants in regular education.

H<sub>1.2b</sub>: For the bilingual pupils, there will be no significant difference.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1 Participants

A total of 16 classes with 434 pupils from a secondary school in the middle region of the Netherlands have been asked to participate in this study. As most of the pupils in the 2vwo- and 4vwo-classes were younger than 16 years old, their parent or caretaker had to give consent for their participation in this study, resulting in 136 consent forms. The 6vwo-pupils were able to give consent themselves at the start of the questionnaire, as they were older than 16 years. As some pupils were absent the day the questionnaire was conducted, 45.62% of the pupils that were asked ultimately filled out the questionnaire, resulting in a total of 198 pupils participating in this study. The participants consisted of 31 bilingual 2vwo pupils (f: 22, m: 9), 43 regular 2vwo pupils (f: 22, m: 21), 27 bilingual 4vwo pupils (f: 13, m: 13, o: 1), 24 regular 4vwo pupils (f: 12, m: 12), 33 bilingual 6vwo pupils (f: 18, m: 14, o: 1), and 40 regular 6vwo pupils (f: 14, m: 26). Even though the number of 4vwo pupils is smaller than that of the 2vwo or 6vwo pupils, the focus of the present study was put on these classes, as the pupils in these classes have an average age of 15, which allows for a comparison to the 15-yearolds in PISA-2018 (Gubbels et al., 2019). The reason pre-university level was chosen is because this provides a bigger sample size and allows for jumps of two years while still using the fourth form. The secondary school used in this study is certified by the Dutch organisation for internationalisation of education, Nuffic, as a senior *tto*-school, meaning that pupils following bilingual education receive at least fifty percent of their classes in English (Nuffic, n.d.). The regular pupils only receive education in English during English class.

### 3.2 Materials

The participants have filled out an online questionnaire on reading motivation and enjoyment, which can be found in Dutch and English in Appendix A, using Google Forms. It took participants between 5 to 10 minutes to fill out. The questionnaire starts by asking the participants' age, gender, form and type of education (i.e. questions 1-4). For gender, the option "other" was added for the inclusion of non-binary participants.

The part of the questionnaire on reading motivation (i.e. questions 5-20) was taken from a study done by an organisation that does research for educational institutions only, DUO Onderwijsonderzoek (2017). They made their questionnaire in cooperation with Stichting Lezen, which is a Dutch organisation focused on improving reading skills among children and adolescents. Because the purpose of both of these organizations is to improve education in the Netherlands with their large-scale studies, it was decided that their questionnaire was a reliable option for the present study to adopt. For this part of the questionnaire, following DUO Onderwijsonderzoek (2017), the introduction below was used in Dutch for clarification:

[We will ask you a few questions about reading books in your free time. With books, we do not mean schoolbooks, but books you like reading yourself (for instance novels or comics). These books can both be paperbacks or e-books. E-books are books you read off, for example, an e-reader, tablet, smartphone or laptop.] (DUO Onderwijsonderzoek, 2017)

DUO Onderwijsonderzoek (2017) makes a distinction between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and motivation considering regulating factors in their questionnaire. As the current study is only interested in the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the questions on motivation considering regulating factors have been left out. Within intrinsic motivation, two separate categories can be distinguished: reading because of curiosity

(questions 7, 13 and 20), and reading to be fully engaged in a story (questions 6, 10 and 16).

Within extrinsic motivation, three separate categories can be distinguished: reading to do well in school (questions 11, 14 and 18), reading to do better than others (questions 8, 15 and 17), and reading for social acceptance (questions 9, 12 and 19). Following DUO Onderwijsonderzoek (2017), question 5 was added as a general measure of motivation.

The part of the questionnaire on reading enjoyment (i.e. questions 21-25) was taken from PISA-2018 (Gubbels et al., 2019) in order to be able to compare results. Following DUO Onderwijsonderzoek (2017), the participants have responded to questions 5-25 through a 4-point Likert-scale, with a 1 meaning they completely disagree and a 4 meaning they completely agree. Moreover, using a 4-point Likert-scale obligates pupils to make a choice and, therefore, reduces neutral outcomes. The questionnaire has been conducted in Dutch to avoid misunderstanding amongst participants. The questions have been randomized before conducting the questionnaire.

### **3.3 Procedure**

Following the guidelines of the Faculty Ethics assessment Committee Humanities (FEtC-H), two weeks prior to the start of the research, the participants were sent an information letter and a consent form that a parent or caretaker had to sign when the participant was under 16 years old. After two weeks, the researcher visited every class for 10 minutes to distribute the questionnaire and collect answers through Google Forms from pupils that provided consent forms. Next, results were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 30). The independent variables for this study were type of education, gender and form. The dependent variables were the answers to the questionnaire. First, a principal components analysis (PCA) and a descriptive analysis were conducted. As there were three independent and multiple



dependent variables, a three-way MANOVA was then performed, as suggested by UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group (n.d.), also following McGeown et al. (2014) and Lau (2009). Finally, follow-up univariate ANOVAs with Bonferroni corrections were conducted to explore the effects on each dependent variable individually.

#### 4. Results

First, a PCA was conducted to establish the underlying factor structure of the 21 Likert-scale items in the questionnaire (i.e. questions 5-25). However, prior to this, it was necessary to assess whether the data were suitable for factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.86, which exceeds the recommended value of 0.60 (Kaiser, 1974, p. 35), and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ( $\chi^2(210) = 2448.36, p < .001$ ), indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The PCA revealed five components with eigenvalues greater than 1, which together explained 70.4% of the total variance. A varimax rotation was applied to help interpret the solution. The rotated factor matrix revealed a clear simple structure, with strong primary loadings and minimal cross-loadings. Factor 1 was labeled Intrinsic Motivation – Engagement (IME) and consisted of questions 5, 6, 10, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 (factor loadings ranged from .70 to .86). Factor 2 was labeled Intrinsic Motivation – Curiosity (IMC) and consisted of questions 7, 13 and 20 (factor loadings ranged from .71 to .83). Factor 3 was labeled Extrinsic Motivation – Others (EMO) and consisted of questions 8, 15 and 17 (factor loadings ranged from .77 to .80). Factor 4 was labeled Extrinsic Motivation – Social (EMSo) and consisted of questions 9, 12 and 19 (factor loadings ranged from .54 to .76). Finally, Factor 5 was labeled Extrinsic Motivation – School (EMSc) and consisted of questions 11, 14 and 18 (factor loadings ranged from .82 to .87). Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, providing values of .92, .82, .82, .73, and

.89 for IME, IMC, EMO, EMS<sub>o</sub>, and EMS<sub>c</sub>, respectively, indicating good reliability for each factor. A descriptive analysis on all factors for all independent variables separately was included and can be found in Tables 1, 2 and 3 under Appendix B. Almost all participants received higher scores on the intrinsic motivation factors than the extrinsic motivation factors, except for EMS<sub>c</sub>, which received higher scores among regular and bilingual pupils in 2<sup>nd</sup> form, and bilingual female and regular male pupils.

Secondly, to answer how the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual education differs from pupils in regular education at a Dutch secondary school (RQ1), a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to investigate the effects of type of education (regular, bilingual) on the five dependent variables IME, IMC, EMO, EMS<sub>o</sub> and EMS<sub>c</sub>. The analysis revealed that type of education did not have a statistically significant multivariate effect on the combined dependent variables, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .98$ ,  $F(5, 180) = .72$ ,  $p = .610$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ . This indicates that the type of education did not significantly influence pupils' overall reading motivation.

A two-way MANOVA was, then, conducted within the regular and bilingual pupils' data separately to investigate the effects of form (2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>) and gender (male, female, other) on the dependent variables IME, IMC, EMO, EMS<sub>o</sub>, and EMS<sub>c</sub>, in order to answer how the reading motivation and enjoyment of pre-university level pupils in bilingual and regular education develops through the forms (RQ1.1) and how they differ between male and female participants (RQ1.2). Within the regular pupils' data, the multivariate results revealed that form did not have a statistically significant multivariate effect on the combined dependent variables, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .87$ ,  $F(10, 194) = 1.42$ ,  $p = .173$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .07$ , indicating that the form a regular pupil was in did not significantly influence pupils' overall reading motivation. In contrast, a statistically significant main effect of gender on the combined

dependent variables was found, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .80$ ,  $F(5, 97) = 4.84$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .20$ , indicating that the gender a regular pupil has significantly influences their overall reading motivation. The analysis also examined the interaction effects between factors. However, the interaction between form and gender did not reach statistical significance, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .97$ ,  $F(10, 194) = .32$ ,  $p = .975$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .02$ .

Within the bilingual pupils' data, again, the analysis revealed that form did not have a statistically significant multivariate effect on the combined dependent variables, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .82$ ,  $F(10, 158) = 1.66$ ,  $p = .094$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .10$ , indicating that the form a bilingual pupil was in did not significantly influence pupils' overall reading motivation. However, the multivariate results revealed a statistically significant main effect of gender on the combined dependent variables, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .74$ ,  $F(10, 158) = 2.55$ ,  $p = .007$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .14$ , indicating that the gender a bilingual pupil has significantly influences their overall reading motivation. The analysis also examined the interaction effects between factors. However, the interaction between form and gender did not reach statistical significance, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .91$ ,  $F(15, 218.49) = .51$ ,  $p = .937$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .03$ .

Finally, follow-up univariate ANOVAs with Bonferroni corrections were conducted to explore these effects on each dependent variable individually. The data of regular pupils will first be discussed. For EMSO, there was a moderately significant medium main effect of form,  $F(2, 101) = 3.47$ ,  $p = .035$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .06$ . Post hoc comparisons revealed that regular 2<sup>nd</sup> form pupils ( $M = 2.04$ ,  $SD = .69$ ) reported significantly higher social pressure when reading than regular 6<sup>th</sup> form pupils ( $M = 1.68$ ,  $SD = .64$ ,  $p = .044$ ), while no significant differences were found between 2<sup>nd</sup> form and 4<sup>th</sup> form pupils, and 4<sup>th</sup> form and 6<sup>th</sup> form pupils. Additionally, for IME, there was a highly significant large main effect of gender,  $F(1, 101) = 16.36$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .14$ . Post hoc comparisons revealed that regular female pupils ( $M$

= 2.69, SD = .79) reported significantly higher engagement when reading than regular male pupils (M = 2.14, SD = .60,  $p < .001$ ). No significant main effects were found for IMC, EMO and EMSc and no significant interactions were found between any of the factors.

For the bilingual pupils, for IMC, there was a moderately significant medium main effect of form,  $F(2, 83) = 3.88$ ,  $p = .025$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .09$ . Post hoc comparisons revealed that bilingual 6<sup>th</sup> form pupils (M = 2.61, SD = .80) reported a higher curiosity when reading than bilingual 2<sup>nd</sup> form pupils (M = 2.10, SD = .97). This, however, only approached significance,  $p = .055$ . Additionally, for IME, there was a highly significant medium main effect of gender,  $F(2, 83) = 6.45$ ,  $p = .002$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .14$ . Post hoc comparisons revealed that bilingual female pupils (M = 2.79, SD = .83) reported significantly higher engagement when reading than bilingual male pupils (M = 2.19, SD = .78,  $p = .003$ ), while no significant differences were found between male and other pupils, and female and other pupils. No significant main effects were found for EMO, EMSO and EMSc and no significant interactions were found between any of the factors.

## 5. Discussion

The present study examined the difference in reading motivation between pre-university level pupils in bilingual and regular education at a Dutch secondary school. Additionally, the present study included sub-questions aiming to investigate the development through forms 2, 4 and 6, and potential gender differences in reading motivation. This section interprets the findings considering the theoretical background and discusses the implications, limitations and recommendations for future research.

## 5.1 Differences in reading motivation between regular and bilingual pupils

The first research question (RQ1) investigated the difference in reading motivation between pupils in bilingual and regular education and hypothesized that bilingual pupils would have a higher (intrinsic) reading motivation and enjoyment than regular pupils ( $H_1$ ). Surprisingly, however, the MANOVA results revealed no statistically significant effects for type of education on the combined or separate dependent variables of reading motivation. Table 1 (Appendix B) does show that bilingual pupils have a higher mean score than regular pupils on all dependent variables except for EMSO. However, as these differences were not significant,  $H_1$  could not be accepted. This finding contrasts with earlier studies which found that bilingual pupils generally show a higher overall motivation than regular pupils, regardless of level (*vmbo/havo/vwo*: Mearns, 2016; *havo*: Mearns et al., 2020; *vwo*: Verspoor et al., 2015), or whether it was self-reported (Denman et al., 2013) or even studied outside of the Netherlands (Sylvén & Thompson, 2015). A potential explanation for this difference could lie in the sample used. At this secondary school, regular, bilingual, general level and pre-university level education all takes place in the same building, meaning that pupils' motivation could have been influenced by the school culture (Fyans & Maehr, 1991). The pupils all develop themselves within the same school context, with the same teachers and curriculum and they are able to socialize with and, therefore, influence each other. The findings could also be explained by the specific measures that were taken. While previous studies focused on general motivation towards English, the present study focused on reading motivation in particular, even distinguishing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. It is possible that bilingual pupils' motivation is more pronounced in areas other than reading motivation.

## 5.2 The development of reading motivation through forms 2, 4 and 6

The second research sub-question (RQ1.1) investigated the difference in reading motivation between bilingual and regular pupils in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> form and hypothesized a decline in reading motivation through these forms for both regular and bilingual pupils (H<sub>1.1a</sub>), while bilingual pupils' reading motivation would remain stable (H<sub>1.1b</sub>). Even though the MANOVA results showed no statistically significant effects of form for either education type, the follow-up univariate ANOVAs did provide some statistically significant results. As can be seen in Table 2 (Appendix B), regular pupils' reading motivation does not decline throughout 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> form, except for EMSO (2<sup>nd</sup> form: M = 2.04, 4<sup>th</sup> form: M = 1.81, 6<sup>th</sup> form: M = 1.68). The other factors either fluctuate or stay largely the same. The difference in EMSO between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> form regular pupils was also found to be statistically significant, indicating that regular 2<sup>nd</sup> form pupils were more extrinsically motivated to read than regular 6<sup>th</sup> form regular pupils because of social factors, e.g. wanting their parents to be proud and because others say it is important. However, as only one factor significantly declined for regular pupils, H<sub>1.1a</sub> could not be accepted. Interestingly, for bilingual pupils, the intrinsic motivational factors increase instead of decline through 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> form (IME – 2<sup>nd</sup> form: M = 2.17, 4<sup>th</sup> form: M = 2.21, 6<sup>th</sup> form: M = 2.41; IMC – 2<sup>nd</sup> form: M = 2.10, 4<sup>th</sup> form: M = 2.53, 6<sup>th</sup> form: M = 2.61). For IMC, the difference between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> form even approached significance, suggesting that bilingual 6<sup>th</sup> form pupils were more intrinsically motivated to read than bilingual 2<sup>nd</sup> form pupils out of curiosity, e.g. enjoying reading about certain topics and wanting to learn more. The extrinsic motivational factors stayed largely the same. However, the difference in IMC only approached significance, resulting in the acceptance of H<sub>1.1b</sub>. These findings diverge from studies showing a decline in motivation with age (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009) but aligns with Mearns (2016) and Mearns et al. (2020), who found that bilingual pupils' motivation remained

relatively stable across forms. The difference in EMS<sub>o</sub> between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> form pupils is not surprising, as sensitivity to peer pressure is known to decline with age (Verhoeven et al., 2019). However, the lack of significant differences for other types of reading motivation suggests that additional factors affect pupils' reading motivation, e.g. individual interests, amount of reading time or SES. The stability in motivation among bilingual pupils could be attributed to the difference in curriculum, as the bilingual curriculum might provide more engagement and, therefore, motivation for the pupils.

### 5.3 Gender differences in reading motivation

The third and final research sub-question (RQ1.2) investigated the difference in reading motivation between genders (male, female, other) in both bilingual and regular education and hypothesized that female pupils in regular education would demonstrate higher reading motivation than male pupils (H<sub>1.2a</sub>), while no significant gender differences would exist for bilingual pupils (H<sub>1.2b</sub>). The results partially supported both hypotheses. The MANOVA results showed a significant main effect of gender on overall reading motivation for both education types, with female pupils reporting significantly higher IME than their male peers (regular – male:  $M = 2.14$ , female:  $M = 2.69$ ; bilingual – male:  $2.19$ , female:  $2.79$ ), indicating that female pupils were more intrinsically motivated to read than male pupils because of reasons regarding engagement and enjoyment, e.g. wanting to experience adventures and having reading as a hobby. This aligns with prior research throughout the world (USA: Neff, 2015; NZ: Smith et al., 2012; UK: Logan & Johnston, 2009, McGeown et al., 2014), which consistently found higher reading motivation among females. However, it contradicts Mearns and De Graaff (2018) who found that Dutch bilingual pupils showed no differences in motivation between genders. Nevertheless, no significant differences were found for the other factors, in

both regular and bilingual education, supporting Mearns and De Graaff's (2018) findings. As only one factor statistically differed between regular male and female participants,  $H_{1.2a}$  could not be accepted. As one factor did statistically differ between bilingual male and female participants,  $H_{1.2b}$  could also not be accepted. These results highlight the importance of separating intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors in research, as it appears there mostly is an existing gender difference in intrinsic motivation only.

#### **5.4 Comparison PISA-2018 (Gubbels et al., 2019)**

In order to compare the data to PISA-2018 (Gubbels et al., 2019), first, participants that were not 15 years old had to be excluded, as PISA-2018 only used 15-year-olds in their study. PISA-2018 reported their data in percentages. Therefore, the data from the present study had to be converted into percentages as well. The results can be found in Table 4 below.

As can be seen, the present study's data is more positive than PISA-2018 on all statements and on four of the five statements for PISA-2009. Overall, the participants from the present study seem to have a more positive attitude towards reading than the participants from PISA-2009 and -2018, who are intended to represent the Netherlands as a whole. It is likely that the PISA-percentages are lower because pre-vocational level pupils were included, as they are generally less motivated than pupils in other educational tracks (Koert, 2020). Nonetheless, the higher percentages from participants in the present study could explain the non-significant results from the present study, as the 15-year-olds in the present study already differ from the norm.



**Table 4**

*Percentage (completely) agree to the reading enjoyment statements with English translations*

	PISA- 2009	PISA- 2018	Present study
<i>Ik lees alleen als het moet.</i> I only read when I have to.	54	63	49
<i>Lezen is een van mijn favoriete hobby's.</i> Reading is one of my favourite hobbies.	20	18	28
<i>Ik vind het leuk om met anderen over boeken te praten.</i> I like talking to others about books.	19	19	26
<i>Lezen vind ik tijdverspilling.</i> I think reading is a waste of time.	35	42	37
<i>Ik lees alleen om de informatie op te zoeken die ik nodig heb.</i> I only read to find the information I need.	51	59	40

*Note.* Adapted from *Resultaten PISA-2018 in vogelvlucht* (p. 35) by J. Gubbels, A. Van Langen, N. Maassen and M. Meelissen, 2019, Universiteit Twente. Copyright 2019 by Universiteit Twente.

## 5.5 Broader implications

The findings have several implications for the current educational practice. First, the lack of significant differences in reading motivation between bilingual and regular pupils suggests that bilingual education alone may not inherently generate a higher reading motivation. As

there seems to be a worldwide decline in reading motivation (Brozo, 2005; Clark et al., 2023), it has become even more crucial to find a solution to this problem, especially considering reading motivation is also an indicator of reading proficiency (Meelissen et al., 2023; Verspoor et al., 2015). Multiple studies have found low to high positive effects of reading motivation interventions on pupils' reading motivation and proficiency (Davidse, 2022; Van der Sande et al., 2023; Van Steensel et al., 2016). Stokmans (2007) even found that a relatively short intervention of six weeks can already have a positive effect on pupils' reading motivation. Therefore, schools should consider additional interventions for an improvement in reading motivation across both education types. Strategies such as incorporating pupils' preferences in reading materials, providing a wide range of reading materials and creating opportunities to have social interactions about the reading materials have been found to be effective in enhancing reading motivation (Gambrell, 2011). Second, the lack of differences between forms within both educational tracks challenges the findings that an age-related decline in motivation is expected. Further examination is needed in order to find out what factors, e.g. teaching practices or external influences, affect this stability. Finally, the recurring gender differences in motivation emphasize the need for gender-focused educational approaches. For instance, introducing diverse reading materials discussing varying interests could help reducing these differences.

## **5.6 Limitations and future research**

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the number of participants was lower than the present study intended at the start because of the required consent forms. At the time the questionnaire was distributed, the current researcher was known more amongst 2<sup>nd</sup> form pupils, which resulted in more pupils being willing to help and, thus, more consent forms in

2<sup>nd</sup> form than in 4<sup>th</sup> form. This immediately introduces a second limitation: social desirability bias. Even though the researcher did not currently teach any of the classes, pupils knew the researcher from around the school or previous years, which might have caused them to respond differently. Including qualitative data, such as interviews or focus groups, could offer deeper insights into pupils' reading motivation. Third, the study focused exclusively on pre-university level pupils, which limits the generalizability towards other educational levels, such as pre-vocational or general secondary education. Future research could explore whether similar patterns occur in these groups. Fourth, because of the cross-sectional design of the study, no conclusions could be made about causal relationships or longitudinal trends. A longitudinal design would provide more insights into how reading motivation develops over time. Finally, future studies should include other factors, like SES, teaching practices and reading time, to investigate the reason for differences in reading motivation.

## **6. Conclusion**

This study sought to address the questions of whether there are any differences in reading motivation between regular and bilingual pre-university pupils at a school in the middle region of the Netherlands, and whether there are any differences between forms 2, 4 and 6, or between genders. While no significant differences were found between regular and bilingual pupils overall, a few were found between forms and genders. For regular pupils, there was a significant difference found between forms 2 and 6 only for EMS<sub>o</sub>, while the other factors remained stable. For bilingual pupils, all factors largely remained stable throughout forms 2, 4 and 6, with a difference between forms 2 and 6 in IMC, which only approached significance. For gender, a significant effect was found in both regular and bilingual education, with female pupils reporting a significantly higher IME than male pupils. While bilingual education did not

lead to significantly higher reading motivation overall, its potential to reduce the gaps between forms and genders should be further investigated. By addressing these gaps, educators can improve pupils' reading development and ensure that both regular and bilingual pupils become motivated to read again.

## References

- Brozo, W. G. (2005). Avoiding the “fourth-grade slump”. *Thinking Classroom*, 6(4), 48-49.
- Christoffels, I. K., De Haan, A. M., Steenbergen, L., Van den Wildenberg, W. P. M., & Colzato, L. S. (2015). Two is better than one: Bilingual education promotes the flexible mind. *Psychological Research*, 79, 371–379. <https://doi.org/0.1007/s00426-014-0575-3>
- Clark, C., Picton, I., & Galway, M. (2023). *Children and young people’s reading in 2023*. National Literacy Trust. [https://cdn.literacytrust.org.uk/media/documents/Reading\\_trends\\_2023\\_G6DVx3V.pdf](https://cdn.literacytrust.org.uk/media/documents/Reading_trends_2023_G6DVx3V.pdf)
- Davidse, V. (2022). *Wie leest, wie weet? Een onderzoek naar de relatie tussen leesmotivatie, leesfrequentie en tekstbegrip bij middelbare scholieren op het vmbo en vwo* [Master thesis, Utrecht University]. Utrecht University. Retrieved September 6, 2024, from <https://studenttheses.uu.nl/handle/20.500.12932/41478>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3/4), 325–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653137>
- Denman, J., Tanner, R., & De Graaff, R. (2013). CLIL in junior vocational secondary education: Challenges and opportunities for teaching and learning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777386>
- DUO onderwijsonderzoek (2017). *De leesmotivatie van Nederlandse kinderen en jongeren*. Stichting Lezen. Retrieved October 4, 2024, from

<https://www.lezen.nl/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/De20leesmotivatie20van20Nederlandse20kinderen20en20jongeren.pdf>

Fyans, L. J., & Maehr, M. L. (1991). *“School culture,” student ethnicity, and motivation*. University of Illinois.

Gambrell, L. B. (2011). Seven rules of engagement: What's most important to know about motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(3), 172–178.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01024>

Gottfried, A. E. (1985). Academic intrinsic motivation in elementary and junior high school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(6), 631–645.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.77.6.631>

Gubbels, J., Van Langen, A. M. L., Maassen, N. A. M., & Meelissen, M. R. M. (2019). *Resultaten PISA-2018 in vogelvlucht*. Universiteit Twente.

<https://doi.org/10.3990/1.9789036549226>

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Metsala, J. L., & Cox, K. E. (1999). Motivational and Cognitive Predictors of Text Comprehension and Reading Amount. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 3(3), 231–256. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0303\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0303_3)

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Research on student engagement* (pp. 601–634). Springer.

[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_29)

Huibregtse, I., Admiraal, W., De Bot, K., Coleman, L., & Westhoff, G. (2000). Effecten en didactiek van tweetalig voortgezet onderwijs. *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen*, 64(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttwia.64.02hui>

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>

Koert, P. (2020). *Students' motivation in prevocational secondary education: A comparative study of mainstream and bilingual schools in the Netherlands* [Master Thesis,

University of Groningen]. University of Groningen. Retrieved January 11, 2025, from

<https://research.rug.nl/nl/publications/students-motivation-in-prevocational-secondary-education-comparat>

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language Attitudes in CLIL and Traditional EFL Classes.

*International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 4–17.

Lau, K. L. (2009). Reading motivation, perceptions of reading instruction and reading amount:

A comparison of junior and senior secondary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(4), 366–382.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2009.01400.x>

Logan, S., & Johnston, R. (2009). Gender differences in reading ability and attitudes: Examining where these differences lie. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(2), 199–214.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2008.01389.x>

Mearns, T. (2016). *Chicken, egg or a bit of both? Motivation in bilingual education (TTO) in the Netherlands* [Doctoral thesis, University of Aberdeen/Utrecht University].

ResearchGate. Retrieved October 17, 2024, from

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299514067\\_Chicken\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299514067_Chicken_)

[Egg\\_or\\_a\\_Bit\\_of\\_Both\\_Motivation\\_in\\_bilingual\\_education\\_TTO\\_in\\_the\\_Netherlands](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299514067_Chicken_Egg_or_a_Bit_of_Both_Motivation_in_bilingual_education_TTO_in_the_Netherlands)

Mearns, T., & De Graaff, R. (2018). Bucking the trend? Motivational differences between boys and girls who opt in or out of bilingual education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-*

*Based Language Education*, 6(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.17003.me>

- Mearns, T., De Graaff, R., & Coyle, D. (2020). Motivation *for* or *from* bilingual education? A comparative study of learner views in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(6), 724–737.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1405906>
- McGeown, S. P., Duncan, L. G., Griffiths, Y. M., & Stothard, S. E. (2014). Exploring the relationship between adolescent's reading skills, reading motivation and reading habits. *Reading and Writing*, 28(4), 545–569.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-014-9537-9>
- Meelissen, M. R. M., Maassen, N. A. M., Gubbels, J., Van Langen, A. M. L., Valk, J., Dood, C., Derks, I., In 't Zandt, M., & Wolbers, M. (2023). *Resultaten PISA-2022 in vogelvlucht*. Universiteit Twente. <https://doi.org/10.3990/1.9789036559461>
- Neff, L. (2015). *The relationship between reading enjoyment, gender, socioeconomic status, and reading outcomes in PISA 2019* [Doctoral thesis, George Fox University]. George Fox University. Retrieved October 25, 2024, from <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1053&context=edd>
- Nuffic (n.d.). *Kwaliteitsstandaard tweetalig onderwijs 2.0*. Retrieved October 4, 2024, from <https://www.nuffic.nl/sites/default/files/2020-08/kwaliteitsstandaard-tweetalig-onderwijs-2-0.pdf>
- Schiefele, U., Schaffner, E., Möller, J., & Wigfield, A. (2012). Dimensions of reading motivation and their relation to reading behavior and competence. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(4), 427–463. <https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.030>
- Smith, J. K., Smith, L. F., Gilmore, A., & Jameson, M. (2012). Students' self-perception of reading ability, enjoyment of reading and reading achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22, 202–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2011.04.010>



- Stokmans, M. (2007). *De casus Bazar: Effectmeting van een leesbevorderingsproject*. Eburon.
- Sylvén, L. K., & Thompson, A. S. (2015). Language learning motivation and CLIL: Is there a connection? *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3(1), 28–50. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.3.1.02syl>
- UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group (n.d.). *Choosing the correct statistical test in SAS, STATA, SPSS and R*. Retrieved January 3, 2025, from <https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/sas/modules/introduction-to-the-features-of-sas/>
- Van der Sande, L., Van Steensel, R., Fikrat-Wevers, S., & Arends, L. (2023). *Effectiveness of Interventions that Foster Reading Motivation: A Meta-analysis*. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(21), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09719-3>
- Van Steensel, R., Van der Sande, L., Bramer, W., & Arends, L. (2016). *Effecten van leesmotivatie-interventies. Uitkomsten van een meta-analyse. Reviewstudie in opdracht van het Nationaal Regieorgaan Onderwijsonderzoek, Projectnummer 405-15-717*. Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam.
- Verhoeven, M., Poorthuis, A. M., & Volman, M. (2019). The role of school in adolescents' identity development. A literature review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(1), 35–63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-018-9457-3>
- Verspoor, M., De Bot, K., & Xu, X. (2015). The effects of English bilingual education in the Netherlands. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 3(1), 4–27. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.3.1.01ver>
- Verspoor, M., & Edelenbos, P. (2009). Tweektalig onderwijs: Beter geschoolde leerlingen in 2024. In R. De Graaff & D. Tuin (Eds.), *De toekomst van het talenonderwijs: Nodig? Anders? Beter?* (pp. 147–164). IVLOS and NaB-MVT.

Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 420–432. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.89.3.420>

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### Questionnaire on reading motivation and enjoyment

1. Hoe oud ben je?

*How old are you?*

2. Wat is je geslacht?

*What is your gender?*

Man – Vrouw – Overig

*Male – Female – Other*

3. In welke klas zit je?

*What form are you in?*

2 – 4 – 6

4. Welk type onderwijs volg je?

*What type of education do you follow?*

Tweetalig – Regulier

*Bilingual – Regular*

Antwoordopties vraag 5-25: Volledig oneens – Oneens – Eens – Volledig eens

*Answer options questions 5-25: Completely disagree – Disagree – Agree – Completely agree*

5. Ik vind boeken lezen leuk.

*I like reading books.*

6. Ik lees omdat ik door verhalen ga fantaseren.

*I read because stories make me fantasize.*

7. Ik lees omdat ik me graag met bepaalde onderwerpen bezighoud.

*I read because I like to engage with certain topics.*

8. Ik lees omdat ik bij de besten van de klas wil horen.

*I read because I want to be a part of the top of the class.*

9. Ik lees omdat mijn ouders het belangrijk vinden dat ik veel lees.

*I read because my parents think it is important that I read a lot.*

10. Ik lees omdat ik zo avonturen kan beleven in mijn hoofd.

*I read so I can experience adventures inside my head.*

11. Ik lees omdat ik dan betere cijfers kan halen op school.

*I read so I can receive higher marks in school.*

12. Ik lees omdat andere mensen zeggen dat lezen belangrijk is.

*I read because other people say reading is important.*

13. Ik lees omdat ik zo meer kan leren over dingen die ik interessant vind.

*I read so I can learn more about the things I find interesting.*

14. Ik lees om beter te worden in bepaalde vakken op school.

*I read to become better at certain subjects in school.*

15. Ik lees omdat ik het dan beter ga doen op school dan mijn klasgenoten.

*I read so I will do better in school than my classmates.*

16. Ik lees omdat ik me graag verplaats in de hoofdpersoon van een verhaal.

*I read because I like to put myself in the story's main character's position.*

17. Ik lees omdat ik dan meer weet dan andere leerlingen.

*I read so I will know more than other pupils.*

18. Ik lees omdat ik het daardoor beter ga doen op school.

*I read because I will do better in school because of it.*

19. Ik lees omdat ik wil dat mijn ouders trots op me zijn.

*I read because I want my parents to be proud.*

20. Ik lees omdat ik graag nadenk over bepaalde onderwerpen.

*I read because I like thinking about certain topics.*

21. Ik lees alleen als het moet.

*I only read when I have to.*

22. Lezen is een van mijn favoriete hobby's.

*Reading is one of my favourite hobbies.*

23. Ik vind het leuk met anderen over boeken te praten.

*I like talking to others about books.*

24. Lezen vind ik tijdverspilling.

*I think reading is a waste of time.*

25. Ik lees alleen om de informatie op te zoeken die ik nodig heb.

*I only read to find the information I need.*

## Appendix B

## Tables with descriptive statistics of type of education, form and gender

Table 1

*Descriptive statistics for type of education*

Type of education	Factor	N	M	SD
Regular	IME	107	2.39	.74
	IMC	107	2.34	.80
	EMO	107	1.33	.49
	EMSo	107	1.85	.67
	EMSc	107	2.15	.92
Bilingual	IME	91	2.55	.86
	IMC	91	2.41	.87
	EMO	91	1.44	.65
	EMSo	91	1.84	.75
	EMSc	91	2.05	.89

**Table 2***Descriptive statistics for form*

Type of education	Form	Factor	N	M	SD
Regular	2 <sup>nd</sup>	IME	43	2.14	.36
		IMC	43	2.28	.88
		EMO	43	1.31	.50
		EMSo	43	2.04	.69
		EMSc	43	2.25	.98
	4 <sup>th</sup>	IME	24	2.14	.26
		IMC	24	2.51	.92
		EMO	24	1.38	.46
		EMSo	24	1.81	.61
		EMSc	24	2.06	.82
	6 <sup>th</sup>	IME	40	2.17	.34
		IMC	40	2.31	.62
		EMO	40	1.33	.51
		EMSo	40	1.68	.64
		EMSc	40	2.11	.93
Bilingual	2 <sup>nd</sup>	IME	31	2.17	.43
		IMC	31	2.10	.97
		EMO	31	1.40	.61
		EMSo	31	2.02	.89
		EMSc	31	2.22	1.01
	4 <sup>th</sup>	IME	27	2.21	.39
		IMC	27	2.53	.75
		EMO	27	1.41	.67
		EMSo	27	1.72	.54
		EMSc	27	1.96	.78

6 <sup>th</sup>	IME	33	2.41	.51
	IMC	33	2.61	.80
	EMO	33	1.51	.69
	EMSo	33	1.76	.75
	EMSc	33	1.97	.86

---



**Table 3***Descriptive statistics for gender*

Type of education	Gender	Factor	N	M	SD
Regular	Male	IME	59	2.14	.60
		IMC	59	2.30	.78
		EMO	59	1.40	.52
		EMSo	59	1.92	.64
		EMSc	59	2.25	.95
	Female	IME	48	2.69	.79
		IMC	48	2.40	.83
		EMO	48	1.26	.44
		EMSo	48	1.78	.69
		EMSc	48	2.03	.89
Bilingual	Male	IME	36	2.19	.78
		IMC	36	2.44	.85
		EMO	36	1.49	.79
		EMSo	36	1.94	.85
		EMSc	36	2.11	.99
	Female	IME	53	2.79	.83
		IMC	53	2.35	.87
		EMO	53	1.42	.55
		EMSo	53	1.75	.69
		EMSc	53	1.99	.83
	Other	IME	2	2.72	1.18
		IMC	2	3.50	.71
		EMO	2	1.17	.24
		EMSo	2	2.17	.24
		EMSc	2	2.50	.24



## Appendix C

### Plagiarism Rules Awareness Statement

Faculty of Humanities

Version June 2024

#### Fraud and Plagiarism

Scientific integrity is the foundation of academic life. Utrecht University considers any form of scientific deception to be an extremely serious infraction. Utrecht University therefore expects every student to be aware of, and to abide by, the norms and values regarding scientific integrity.

The most important forms of deception that affect this integrity are fraud and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the copying of another person's work without proper acknowledgement, and it is a form of fraud. The following is a detailed explanation of what is considered to be fraud and plagiarism, with a few concrete examples. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list!

If fraud or plagiarism is detected, the study programme's Examination Committee may decide to impose sanctions. The most serious sanction that the committee can impose is to submit a request to the Executive Board of the University to expel the student from the study programme.

#### Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the copying of another person's documents, ideas or lines of thought and presenting it as one's own work. You must always accurately indicate from whom you obtained ideas and insights, and you must constantly be aware of the difference between citing, paraphrasing and plagiarising. Students and staff must be very careful in citing sources; this concerns not only printed sources, but also information obtained from the Internet.

The following issues will always be considered to be plagiarism:

- cutting and pasting text from digital sources, such as an encyclopaedia or digital periodicals, without quotation marks and footnotes;
- cutting and pasting text from the Internet without quotation marks and footnotes;
- copying printed materials, such as books, magazines or encyclopaedias, without quotation marks or footnotes;
- including a translation of one of the sources named above without quotation marks or footnotes;
- paraphrasing (parts of) the texts listed above without proper references: paraphrasing must be marked as such, by expressly mentioning the original author in the text or in a footnote, so that you do not give the impression that it is your own idea;
- copying sound, video or test materials from others without references, and presenting it as one's own work;
- submitting work done previously by the student without reference to the original paper, and presenting it as original work done in the context of the course, without the express permission of the course lecturer;



Universiteit Utrecht

- copying the work of another student and presenting it as one's own work. If this is done with the consent of the other student, then he or she is also complicit in the plagiarism;
- when one of the authors of a group paper commits plagiarism, then the other co-authors are also complicit in plagiarism if they could or should have known that the person was committing plagiarism;
- submitting papers acquired from a commercial institution, such as an Internet site with summaries or papers, that were written by another person, whether or not that other person received payment for the work.


### ChatGPT/Generative AI

You are not allowed to generate text, code, figures, images, etc. with Generative AI and present it as your own work. This is a form of fraud.

The rules also apply to rough drafts of papers or (parts of) theses sent to a lecturer for feedback, to the extent that submitting rough drafts for feedback is mentioned in the course handbook or the thesis regulations.

The Education and Examination Regulations (Article 5.14) describe the formal procedure in case of suspicion of fraud and/or plagiarism, and the sanctions that can be imposed.

Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse. Each individual is responsible for their own behaviour. Utrecht University assumes that each student or staff member knows what fraud and plagiarism entail. For its part, Utrecht University works to ensure that students are informed of the principles of scientific practice, which are taught as early as possible in the curriculum, and that students are informed of the institution's criteria for fraud and plagiarism, so that every student knows which norms they must abide by.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the above.	
Name: Lente Venderink Student number: 6225411	
Date and signature:  15 January 2025	

Submit this form to your supervisor when you begin writing your Bachelor's final paper or your Master's thesis.

Failure to submit or sign this form does not mean that no sanctions can be imposed if it appears that plagiarism has been committed in the paper.

## Appendix D

### Beoordeling onderzoeksproject

De eerste begeleider treedt op als eerste beoordelaar en is verantwoordelijk voor de communicatie tussen de beoordelaars, de registratie van het eindcijfer in Osiris en de rapportage aan de afstudeerder (cijfer en motivering) in Osiris Zaak: Beoordeling onderzoeksvoorstel en-project.

Het beoordelingsproces kent vier stappen:

- (1) De eerste en tweede beoordelaar beoordelen onafhankelijk van elkaar het onderzoeksproject. Zij vullen daartoe individueel een beoordelingsformulier in en formuleren hun voorlopige oordeel, waarna de formulieren worden geüpload in Osiris Zaak.
- (2) De beoordelaars bepalen daarop in overleg het eindcijfer. Dat overleg vindt plaats op instigatie van de eerste beoordelaar en binnen 10 werkdagen nadat de student het verslag heeft ingeleverd in Osiris Zaak. In bepaalde gevallen kan een derde beoordelaar worden ingeschakeld. In dat geval wordt het eindcijfer bepaald binnen 20 werkdagen na inlevering.<sup>1</sup>
- (3) Nadat de beoordelaars tot een gezamenlijk oordeel zijn gekomen, vullen zij een derde beoordelingsformulier in. De eerste beoordelaar uploadt dit definitieve beoordelingsformulier in Osiris Zaak en registreert en ondertekent het resultaat in Osiris Docent.
- (4) De student wordt via Osiris Zaak geïnformeerd over de beoordeling. De eerste beoordelaar kan vervolgens een (eind)gesprek voeren waarin mondeling de onderbouwing wordt verstrekt.

N.B. Bij stappen (1) en (2):

Voor de vaststelling van het cijfer mogen de beoordelaars de “eigen” systematiek hanteren. Hiermee wordt de systematiek bedoeld die gangbaar is binnen de graduate schools van de schoolvakfaculteiten waar de beoordelaars aangesteld zijn. Binnen de GST worden hiertoe twee becijferingssystematieken gehanteerd, die overeenkomen in de inhoudelijke criteria waarop beoordeeld wordt, maar technisch verschillen in de manier waarop de uiteindelijke cijfervaststelling tot stand wordt gebracht.

De cijferbepaling voor onderzoeksprojecten binnen de educatieve masteropleidingen “Taal en Cultuurwetenschappen” en “Mens en Maatschappijwetenschappen” volgt de kwalificatiesystematiek onder *Alfa-Gamma* (zie onder, p. 6). Cijferbepaling voor onderzoeksprojecten binnen de masteropleiding “Science Education and Communication” volgt de rekenkundige, gewogen systematiek onder *Bèta* (zie onder, p 6.).

---

<sup>1</sup> In gevallen waarin eerste en/of tweede beoordelaar daarom verzoeken, en in gevallen waarin eerste en tweede beoordelaar het niet eens kunnen worden over het eindoordeel, wordt een derde beoordelaar ingeschakeld. Deze wordt aangezocht door de eerste beoordelaar. De student wordt door de eerste beoordelaar op de hoogte gesteld dat er een derde beoordelaar is ingeschakeld, en dat de nakijktermijn wordt verlengd.

## BEOORDELINGSFORMULIER ONDERZOEKSPROJECT GRADUATE SCHOOL OF TEACHING

STUDENTGEGEVENS	
Naam:	Lente Venderink
Studentnummer:	6225411
Masterprogramma GST:	Engelse Taal en Cultuur: Educatie en Communicatie
Omvang onderzoeksproject in EC:	20 ECTS
Titel onderzoeksproject:	Let's go, TTO? The difference in reading motivation between pupils in bilingual and regular education in the Netherlands
Inleverdatum:	15 januari 2025
EERSTE BEOORDELAAR	
Naam:	Ewout van der Knaap
Afdeling/departement (evt. faculteit):	Talen, Literatuur en Communicatie
TWEEDE BEOORDELAAR	
Naam:	Trenton Hagar
Afdeling/departement (evt. faculteit):	Talen, Literatuur en Communicatie
INGEVULD DOOR:	<input type="checkbox"/> begeleider (= eerste beoordelaar) <input type="checkbox"/> tweede beoordelaar
Voorlopig cijfer:	
Definitief cijfer:	(gezamenlijk bepaald door begeleider en tweede beoordelaar)
Datum:	
Handtekening:	

**FORMELE RANDVOORWAARDEN**

RANDVOORWAARDEN		COMMENTAAR
Correct taalgebruik	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Titelpagina	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Samenvatting	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Annotatie en literatuurlijst	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	
Vormgeving en afwerking	<input type="checkbox"/> voldaan <input type="checkbox"/> niet voldaan	

Indien aan een van deze formele randvoorwaarden niet voldaan is, kan de begeleider/eerste beoordelaar besluiten het onderzoeksproject niet inhoudelijk te beoordelen. De student krijgt een reparatiemogelijkheid. De grensbepaling “voldaan/niet voldaan aan de randvoorwaarden” kan afhankelijk zijn van de discipline (bijv. aantal taalfouten dat getolereerd wordt). Hierbij kan verder gebruik worden gemaakt van de volgende elementen van toelichting:

1. Correct taalgebruik: zinsbouw, spelling en interpunctie zijn correct.
2. Titelpagina: titelpagina bevat titel, naam, studentnummer, namen begeleiders, datum, evt. plaats waar onderzoek is uitgevoerd, en mogelijk andere relevante informatie (bijv. beoogd tijdschrift, indien het verslag de vorm heeft van een te publiceren artikel).
3. De samenvatting is accuraat, beknopt, coherent en leesbaar. De samenvatting bevat een korte beschrijving van het onderzoeksobject en de onderzoeksvraag, de context waarbinnen het onderzoek is uitgevoerd, evt. het onderzoeksontwerp en/of de betrokken deelnemers, en de belangrijkste resultaten.
4. Annotatie en literatuurlijst zijn weergegeven volgens de formele regels van het vakgebied.
5. Vormgeving en afwerking zijn verzorgd volgens de binnen de opleiding gehanteerde richtlijnen.

## INHOUDELIJK OORDEEL EN ONDERBOUWING RESULTAAT

De beoordelaar geeft per categorie/inhoudelijk criterium een oordeel dat voorzien wordt van een korte onderbouwing, waarbij er ingegaan kan worden op de in ieder kader nader omschreven aspecten. Er zijn 7 inhoudelijke criteria. Daarnaast is er een 8e criterium m.b.t. het onderzoeksproces.

1. ONDERZOEKSVRAAG	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende <input type="checkbox"/> voldoende <input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Onderzoeksvraag: afbakening van het onderzoek is helder en begrijpelijk onderbouwd. De onderzoeksvraag en het doel zijn helder en nauwkeurig geformuleerd. Het is duidelijk welk type kennis het onderzoek zal opleveren voor verder educatief onderzoek en/of de educatieve praktijk. Deelvragen zijn helder en nauwkeurig geformuleerd, en worden logisch afgeleid van de hoofdvraag en dragen bij aan de beantwoording ervan. Indien dit relevant is, wordt er een heldere en nauwkeurige hypothese geformuleerd. Het type onderzoek wordt benoemd [ontwerponderzoek, effect study, case study, corpusonderzoek, etc.] en de onderzoeksmethode is adequaat om de onderzoeksvraag te beantwoorden.</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>	
2. ACADEMISCHE INBEDDING	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende <input type="checkbox"/> voldoende <input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Academische inbedding/relevantie: het is duidelijk binnen welk vakgebied (vakdidactisch/schooldiscipline) of breder educatief domein het onderzoek is gesitueerd. De context waarbinnen het onderzoek is uitgevoerd is helder beschreven. Het is helder welke kennis over het onderwerp wel en niet aanwezig is (knowledge gap). De centrale concepten en termen worden duidelijk gedefinieerd. De (educatief) wetenschappelijke en/of praktische relevantie van het onderzoek wordt duidelijk gemaakt.</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>	
3. ONDERZOEKSMETHODE/ONTWERP	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende <input type="checkbox"/> voldoende <input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>De onderzoeksmethode/het ontwerp is helder en nauwkeurig omschreven (onderzoeksinstrumenten, wijze van dataverzameling, wijze van data-analyse), en wordt voldoende verantwoord op basis van wetenschappelijke literatuur en is adequaat om de onderzoeksvraag te beantwoorden. De onderzoeksinstrumenten zijn valide en betrouwbaar</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>	
4. ANALYSE/RESULTATEN	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende <input type="checkbox"/> voldoende <input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Analyse/Resultaten: de dataverzameling volstaat om de onderzoeksvraag te kunnen beantwoorden. De resultaten worden helder en efficiënt gepresenteerd. Er is een goede balans tussen beschrijving en analyse. Er is voldoende terugkoppeling tussen de resultaten en de wetenschappelijke literatuur. Met correct brongebruik wordt het onderscheid tussen eigen analyse en analyse van anderen duidelijk aangegeven. De interpretatie van de resultaten is begrijpelijk en acceptabel. Toepasselijke materialen worden in bijlagen beschikbaar gesteld.</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>	

5. CONCLUSIE/DISCUSSIE	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> voldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Conclusie/Discussie: in de conclusie wordt antwoord gegeven op de onderzoeksvragen. De reikwijdte van de resultaten wordt besproken (generaliseerbaarheid en beperkingen). Implicaties voor verder (vak/algemeen) didactisch onderzoek en/of de educatieve praktijk worden besproken. Er worden specifieke aanbevelingen gedaan. Er wordt gereflecteerd op betrouwbaarheid en validiteit van het onderzoek. Relevante potentiële zwakke punten worden benoemd, er worden alternatieven gesuggereerd die tot meer valide en betrouwbare resultaten hadden kunnen leiden.</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>			
6. SAMENHANG EN STRUCTUUR VAN HET BETOOG	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> voldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Samenhang en structuur van het betoog: het verslag heeft een heldere structuur: de informatie wordt in een logische volgorde gepresenteerd. De argumentatie is helder, coherent en begrijpelijk. Hoofdstukken, paragrafen en alinea's zijn duidelijk ingedeeld.</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>			
7. LEESBAARHEID EN STIJL	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> voldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Leesbaarheid en stijl: het taalgebruik voldoet aan wetenschappelijke standaarden, is leesbaar en begrijpelijk. De terminologie wordt precies en specifiek gehanteerd.</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p> <p><u>Eventueel deelcijfer (bèta):</u></p>			
8. ZELFSTANDIGHEID	<input type="checkbox"/> onvoldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> voldoende	<input type="checkbox"/> goed
<p><i>Zelfstandigheid (in te vullen door 1<sup>e</sup> begeleider): De feedback is zorgvuldig verwerkt. Afspraken en deadlines werden gerespecteerd. De student heeft op specifieke aspecten veel/weinig hulp nodig gehad</i></p> <p><u>Commentaar:</u></p>			
EVENTUEEL: SAMENVATTEND OORDEEL			
CIJFERVOORSTEL:			



**Alfa-Gamma**

*Bij de onderbouwing van het voorlopig/definitief cijfer kan rekening worden gehouden met de volgende kwalificaties.*

**4 of 5:** voldoet op meerdere ( $\geq 2$ ) punten niet aan de standardeisen van bovenstaande beoordelingscriteria, waardoor het geheel een beoordeling krijgt van onvoldoende kwaliteit.

= onvoldoende

**6** - Voldoet aan de standardeisen alle of bijna alle van de bovenstaande beoordelingscriteria, maar in zijn geheel op beperkte wijze.

= voldoende

**7** - Voldoet aan de standardeisen voor alle van de bovenstaande beoordelingscriteria, en gaat daarmee als geheel duidelijk uit boven het niveau dat een 6 rechtvaardigt.

= ruim voldoende

**8** - Voldoet aan de standardeisen voor alle van de bovenstaande beoordelingscriteria wat een 7 zou rechtvaardigen, en brengt op een of enkele criteria een extra punt van waardering waardoor het geheel met een goed beoordeling gerechtvaardigd is.

= goed

**9** - Zie de kwalificatie voor een 8, maar hier gelden extra punten van waardering voor meerdere criteria waardoor het geheel minstens met een zeer goed beoordeling gerechtvaardigd is.

= zeer goed tot uitstekend

**10** - De extra elementen voor waardering worden geleverd op vrijwel alle criteria, waardoor een algehele beoordeling als uitzonderlijk qua prestatie gerechtvaardigd is.

= excellent

**Bèta**

*Aan ieder van de bovenstaande beoordelingscriteria worden numerieke cijfers toegekend, met de onderstaande weging. Criterium 8 (zelfstandigheid) wordt bij bèta niet verdisconteerd in de beoordeling van het onderzoeksproject (research paper), maar krijgt een apart cijfer en weging in het kader van het totale research project bij de opleiding Science Education and Communication.*

Weging criteria:

Onderzoeksvraag:	10%
Academische inbedding:	15%
Onderzoeksmethode/ontwerp:	15%
Analyse/resultaten:	25%
Conclusie/discussie:	15%
Samenhang en structuur van het betoog:	10%
Leesbaarheid en stijl:	10%.