International Journal of Thesis Projects and Dissertations (IJTPD)
Vol. 14, Issue 2, pp: (69-79), Month: April - June 2026, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Relative Effectiveness of the Different Reading Strategy Clusters in the Reading Motivation of the 11th Graders

Philip D. Sapasap

Sto. Tomas National High School

Department of Education

Patac, Sto. Tomas, La Union, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20743165

Published Date: 18-June-2026

Abstract: **Reading motivation has been a large-scale problem in the education sector, and it has been the basis of many researchers to constantly search for varied strategies to assist students and thereby increase their reading motivation. To fill in the gap in this unexplored area of research, a study on identifying the relative effectiveness of the different strategy clusters in the reading motivation, which utilized quasi-experimental time series design, was conducted to 115 eleventh graders from four different strands (STEM, ABM, ICT-CSS, HE-Caregiving). In order to determine the relative effectiveness of the different strategy clusters, three different tools were used which are reading test, overt off-task behavior tally sheet and students' reading strategy preference survey.**

This study yielded the following findings:1) all strands displayed high motivation level in paired cluster along reading performance and overt off-task, while both paired and small group reading strategies are the most preferred reading strategy clusters by all strands; 2) paired and small group are relatively effective to the students' motivation along reading performance, while paired cluster appeared effective along overt off-task and reading strategy preference survey; and 3) paired came out as the best strategy cluster to increase their reading motivation.

Keywords: **reading strategies, motivation, reading performance, off-task behavior, reading preference.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Reading is a life skill. In fact, it is one of the most important skills for educational and professional successes (Oyetunde 2009, Yusuf, 2010, Alderson and Urquhart 1984, Chai 2001, Hudson 1982, Goodman, 1970). Increasingly, new research across many countries shows that the best predictor of future education achievement and life success is reading ability, or more significantly, being an engaged reader (Diakiw, 2017). That is why, reading is formally introduced and cultivated as early as possible because many believe that early success may set a positive academic and psychosocial outcome, whereas hampered reading may lead to less desirable outcomes (Stainthorp, R & Hughes, D., 2004).

When a student reads, he gains numerous benefits from it. First, reading makes a student well-informed. The information he gathered from reading would be useful in his studies in which he can quickly give solutions to problems and can easily make better decisions. Second, reading provides comfort to a student. When reading becomes a form of hobby for the student, he can certainly entertain himself apart from satisfying his curiosity. Third, reading can be a good source of motivation.

All these benefits of reading can only be attained and enjoyed by the students when they know how to apply necessary skills in reading as aforementioned. However, with each passing year it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain the motivation of students in reading and in comprehending different texts. In the classroom set up, there are students who are motivated to read while others are just simply passive recipients of instruction. These eminent problems among high school students were shown through their off-task reading behaviours such as showing lack of interest, staring into space, not

paying attention, fidgeting, and the like. It is a great challenge, therefore, on the part of the teacher to motivate the students especially the reluctant and passive ones to develop a deep sense of love and appreciation in reading.

Motivation is very substantial and a key factor in developing the reading habit of a person. It does not point toward mere frills, fun, or transitory excitement, but to a cognitive commitment toward reading to learn and to extending one's aesthetic experience (Guthrie and Humenick 2004).

Students who are more positively motivated have strong beliefs in their competence in different tasks, are intrinsically motivated to learn, and have clear goals for achievement. Students with the lower motivation often characterize as lacking or being relatively low on achievement (Guthrie and Wigfield, 2007). Motivation is really a factor that influences the reading habit and comprehension of a student.

In the light of what was mentioned above, motivation serves as a driving force for the students to become successful readers. Without it, students cannot focus on what they are doing and most importantly on their studies. The teacher, foremost, must know how to increase the motivation of the students, otherwise, problems prevalent to reading activities would surface, such as: 1.) the students may show various off-task reading behaviours which indicates their lack of interest of what they are doing; 2.) only a few students might finish reading the entire text; 3.) the students might display little understanding of the text read; and 4.) some of the students might fake reading by simply flipping on the pages of the book.

Students' motivation to read has shifted in importance over the past years. It changes over time because of the different factors affecting it such as technological advancement, use of social media, and the like. These factors also contribute to the decrease of the attention span of the students in reading in which it becomes the basis of some researchers to constantly search for various strategies to assist students and increase their reading motivation.

In connection to this, two recognized strategies used in learning a language in the field of research have become the focus of this study. These are individual learning and cooperative learning and are believed to increase the motivation of students to learn.

Individual Learning as a concept is associated with other educational concepts such as 'personalization', 'student-centered learning', and 'ownership' of learning. This learning strategy has been regarded by numerous researches as a beneficial strategy to students especially in terms of developing students' cognition and building learning interest and motivation. Candy (1991) highlighted these benefits as 1.) Student acquires knowledge by his or her own efforts and develops the ability for inquiry and critical evaluation; 2.) It includes freedom of choice in determining those objectives, within the limits of a given project or program and with the aid of a teacher; 3.) It requires freedom of process to carry out the objectives; and 4.) It places increased educational responsibility on the student for the achieving of objectives and for the value of the goals.

Different from cooperative learning activities, independent learning activities such as silent reading and reading books of one's own choice are assumed to allow students select their own books and read silently without the pressure of being challenged with teachers' intervention or peers' questions (Krashen, 2011).

On the other hand, the classroom environment and organization are quite traditional, with row seating arrangement facing the teacher. Students only listen to their teacher and understand and follow the instructions without being given a chance to actively participate in teaching and learning process (Najmonnisa & Haroon, 2014). With this, Mills and Durden as cited by Adams (2013), cooperative learning has been a highly researched topic in education. Over the last quarter century, cooperative learning strategies have arrived as a popular option to traditional instruction due to the positive influence on student esteem, performance, and on-task behavior.

Cooperative learning is a teaching method, in which students of diverse background are assembled in groups to accomplish a common task (Ramos & Pavón, 2015). This task promotes interaction and cooperation among group members that leads to gain more academic and social competencies than working as an individual (Larson, 2012; Buchs & Butera, 2015; Casey & Goodyear, 2015; Lirola, 2016; Sharan, 2015).

Cooperative Learning has strong theoretical foundation. It is rooted in Constructivist, Social Constructivist, Social Cohesion and motivational perspectives. According to the constructivist view of learning, students learn best when they are effectively engaged in learning process and working in a joint effort with different students to achieve a common goal. While Constructivism concentrates on individual experience for learning new concepts and skills (Sharan, 2015).

The learning strategies that increase students' reading motivation became the focus of various researches, and these researches claim that learning either individually or cooperatively improve fluency, accuracy, self-esteem and motivation.

II. FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Below are the theories on motivation in which the study is anchored:

Weiner's *Attribution theory* of student motivation is recognized from its ability to associate achievements of individuals to past experiences through causal attributions as the mediating link (Dörnyei, 2003). The theory focuses on the perception of people towards experiences and does not look at the experiences that people undergo (Williams & Burden, 1997:104). Thus, as hypothesizes by this theory, an individual attributes his or her past successes or failures to a great extent their motivational disposition (Dörnyei, 2001).

Meanwhile, *Goal Theories* focus on the purpose or reasons that students perceive for achieving in learning (Anderman & Midgley, 1998). As Dörnyei (2001) puts it, goals are essential to the study of motivation, but its definition is not spared by any complexity. Originally, Maslow's hierarchy of needs which he claimed as best-known theory of motivation has been replaced that of the concept of goal. Goals affect individuals' performance based on the four mechanisms as enumerated by Locke and Latham (2002):

• Goals serve a directive function as they direct attention and effort toward goal-relevant activities and away from irrelevant activities.

• Goals have an energizing function, and they help individuals regulate their effort to the difficulty of the task.

• Goals positively affect persistence.

• Goals affect action indirectly by leading to the arousal, discovery, and/or use of task-relevant knowledge and strategies.

Another theory on language learning motivation is *Self-determination Theory*. This theory embraces the distinction between two kinds of motivations which are *intrinsic and extrinsic*. The former states that an individual is motivated to perform a certain activity because of the internal rewards that he or she can acquire from it such as self-satisfaction and pleasure. Whereas the latter denotes that a person's motivational drive depends on the extrinsic rewards such as good grades or praise from peers.

In light of the above discussions, theories of motivation namely attribution theory, goal theories, and self-determination theory, in which this study is anchored, were explored as the main ones that have been identified in most literatures on learning motivation (Keblawi, 2015).

On the other hand, there are various assessment tools which could determine a student's motivation to read. These are as follows and are considered to measure student's level of motivation: *reading performance, off-task behaviours,* and *reading preference.*

Many factors can affect a child's reading ability including his background knowledge, skill, home environment, school experiences and level of interest. Pure reading performance, however, is most directly linked to the progress of a child's literacy skills and his motivation to perform a reading activity.

Guthrie and Wigfield (2007) claimed that a high result in students' reading test is attributed to their level of motivation.

Further, reading performance is a reflection of a student's undertaking on a particular reading activity. Teachers use it as an important tool to provide a wealth of information to guide classroom practice and to manage learning and learners. It could be used to improve instruction and help students take control of their learning (Bostwick & Gakuen, 1995).

Hence, in this study, students' reading performance, which is greatly influenced by their learning motivation according to Guthrie and Wigfield (2007), is measured in a form of reading test.

Another indicator of reading motivation is off-task behavior. It is defined as any behavior that does not involve the learning task or material, or where learning from the material is not the primary goal (Karweit & Slavin, 1982). Off-task behavior can take a number of forms, including off-task conversation with other students (or the teacher), interacting with materials other than the learning materials (such as a magazine), and sleeping in class (Allday & Pakruar, 2007). Other off-task reading behaviors that are eminent among learners are staring into space, not paying attention during the activity, showing lack of interest, fidgeting, always getting out of seat, and the like.

Inattention or off-task behavior is a serious challenge educator faces nowadays. In fact, an off-task behavior has been identified as one of the most common reasons for student referrals (Roberts, 2010).

Moreover, off-task behavior or inattention has been shown to negatively affect learning (Elkhatib, 1991). Teaching students the skills they need to become attentive and actively engaged in school is of the utmost importance.

Further, Buschick, Shipton, Winner and Wise (2007) state that the occurrences of off-task behaviors during the reading activity is an indication of lack of motivation to read. This inattentiveness from the students has been found to be the biggest factor that accounts for loss of instructional time which leads to poor reading skills (Karweit & Slavin, 1981). When difficulty in reading is experienced by the students, low motivation to learning becomes evident. Thus, the more off-task behaviors shown during the instructional time, the lesser the learning motivation of the students.

Lastly, reading strategy preference also proved that it can affect the reading motivation of a student (Mead, 2012). This includes, and not limited to, reading materials and reading strategies used during the instructional time.

Schools have become an authentic environment, which makes room for students' preferences, interests, and developing their literacy skills. In such a context, the implications for reading instruction include the need to provide opportunities for students to express their preferences and strategies, to encourage their involvement in reading a variety of genres, and to engage them in selecting strategies which are helpful in increasing their engagement in reading.

Teachers' grouping practices play a critical role in facilitating effective implementation of reading instruction. Maheady (1997) referred to grouping as one of the alterable instructional factors that "can powerfully influence positively or negatively the levels of individual student engagement and hence academic progress." Relative to this, Alhamdu (2015) in his study revealed that students' preference or interest has positive relationship with reading motivation. Hence, the higher their reading motivation level when they like the activity that they are performing.

Conversely, the abovementioned indicators of motivation are interdependent to strategies in reading motivation specially to help assess the reading motivation level of a student.

Below are research on different reading strategies with claim to increase reading motivation of students, and are grounded to the theories of independent learning and cooperative learning.

Independent Reading, as defined by Glasswell & Ford (2010) is a beneficial strategy in tackling complex text when implemented properly. During independent reading, teachers are provided with the opportunity to individually conference with students in order to monitor their progress

Independent reading strategy is anchored on the theory of independent learning which states that students should have an understanding of their learning, being motivated to take responsibility for their learning, and working with teachers to structure their learning environment (Candy, 1991; Gorman, 1998; Bates and Wilson, 2002; and Perry et al., 2006). There is also a consensus in the literature that independent learning does not only involve students working alone. Instead, the important role of teachers can play in enabling and supporting independent learning is stressed (Alexander et al, 1992; Boekaerts, 1997; Williams, 2003).

In connection to this strategy of reading, a plenty of independent reading activities have been used by many researchers to increase the learning comprehension and motivation of students. In the implementation of this study, five strategies that could decrease the off-task behavior of the students are utilized, and thus, increase their reading motivation. These are the*: a.) Anticipation-Reaction Guide; b.) KWL Chart; c.) Predict and Expect; d.) Think-aloud; and e.) Concept Map.*

Meanwhile, *Paired Reading*, is a strategy that allows students to become engaged in a text while working with a peer partner. Typically, the pair includes an above-level reader and an on-level or below-level reader. The text of choice is at the level of the above-level reader so it is a challenge level text for the partner (Morgan, Wilcox, & Eldridge, 2000). This strategy allows students to not only collaborate but exposes the lower-level student to challenging text in an engaging way.

Paired Reading (also called Partner Reading) can be used in a variety of circumstances and with a variety of content. This strategy encourages students to work together and supports peer-assisted learning and cooperation through reading, listening, and responding to other readers. (Simon, 2017)

In addition to this, paired reading strategy is anchored on the theory of cooperative learning which states that learning becomes more efficient when students of diverse background are assembled in groups to accomplish a common task (Ramos & Pavón, 2015). This task promotes interaction and cooperation among group members that leads to gain more academic and social competencies than working as an individual in accomplishing a task (Larson, 2012; Buchs & Butera, 2015; Casey & Goodyear, 2015; Lirola, 2016; Sharan, 2015).

As supported by different researches in the field of reading, reading in pair is a productive and valuable alternative to larger reading group, and can give struggling readers a sense of security in pairs that bigger groupings cannot (Hart, 2013).

Some of the many cooperative learning structures under paired reading consist of different numerous teaching ways of organizing students' interaction, as described by Olsen and Kagan (1992), in Richards and Rodgers (2001). Some of which are the *a.) Guess the Word; b.) Partner Reading; c.) Peer Tutoring; d.) Think-Pair Share; and e.) Three-Step Interview which are utilized in the study.*

Another strategy which is also anchored on the theory of cooperative learning is the *Small Group Reading* strategy. This strategy allows educators to provide engaging instruction targeted toward that group's academic needs in which students are provided more one-on-one opportunities. During small group activities, educators are able to question students in a way they may not be able to do in whole group instruction.

In addition, the small-group approach enables teachers to meet the needs of each student. Small-group instruction is more effective than other group instruction because teachers can: a.) differentiate instruction to meet each student's needs; b.) better match instruction to each student's level, and c.) respond to children's reading more effectively (Amendum, et al., 2009). Teachers who provide much of their reading instruction in a small group format often cite that it is easier and more efficient for them and their students than a whole group format (Wasik, 2008).

Activities on small group reading are large in number; however, the researcher has chosen five to use in the study which are: *Story impressions, Semantic Mapping, Literature Circles, Roundtable Discussion, and Gallery Walk.*

As a summary, reading strategies such as independent (individual reading) and cooperative learning (paired reading and small group reading) are two separate strategies claiming that both increase the reading motivation of the students as supported by various researches conducted. Independent learning articulated that learning is best and effective once a student is motivated, and when given choice and ownership. While cooperative learning believes that students learn best when engaged in reading activities and worked collaboratively with different students to achieve a common goal. These two strategies have also been supported by three language motivation theories namely Attribution theory, Goal Theories and Self-Determination Theory. These motivation theories correlate with cultivating a love of reading while simultaneously maintaining students' motivation to learn.

III. OBJECTIVES

This study determined the relative effectiveness of the different reading strategy clusters in increasing the reading motivation of the 11th graders of Sto. Tomas National High School for the school year 2018-2019. The specific objectives were as follows:

1. To identify the level of motivation of the students in each reading strategy cluster along reading test; overt off-task behavior; and reading strategy preference.

2. To determine the relative effectiveness of the different strategy clusters based on reading performance; overt off-task behavior; and reading strategy preference.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The quasi-experimental time series design was utilized in this study. It investigated whether the treatment (reading strategy clusters) could increase the motivation level of the participants who belong to the different strands in the senior high school curriculum. Also, the experiment was administered to find out which among the three reading strategy clusters can best increase the reading motivation of the participants.

The study was conducted to four intact classes of 11th graders of Sto. Tomas National High School. Two of the strands under the Academic track were chosen which are the Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) and Accountancy Business and Management (ABM). On the other hand, in the Technical-Vocational (Tech-Voc.) track, two strands were also included which are the Caregiving and Computer System Servicing (CSS). The STEM strand is composed of 21 students, while the ABM has 24 students. On the other hand, there are 39 students under the Caregiving strand, while there are 31 students in CSS.

This study considered the 11th graders, ages 16-17, as the recipient of the study because studies are scarce in terms of increasing reading motivation, and in which the target population are 11th graders. In addition to this, the study was

conducted in their 21st Century Literature from the Philippines and the World subject during the second semester of the school year 2018-2019.

To come up with the needed data for the study, three different tools were used: reading test, overt off-task behavior tally sheet and students' reading strategy preference survey.

To determine the reading performance of the students, a ten-item multiple-choice type of tests was given to the class every after a literature lesson.

Second, Buschick, Shipton, Weiner, and Wise's (2007) overt off-task behavior observation tally sheet is a tool used to observe the frequency of the overt off-task behaviors displayed by each student during the reading activity. Each time an off-task behavior was observed, the researcher made a tally mark in the assigned column. Afterwards, these tally marks were totalled, and the mean score would determine the level of motivation of the learner.

Third, the students' reading strategy preference survey is a tool used by the students after their reading class to express their preference and feelings toward the reading strategies introduced to them. In addition, a journal is added to the survey for the students to express their feelings towards the reading activity they performed.

To collect the needed data in the study, the researcher used the following procedure:

First, a permission was sought from the school head to conduct the experiment to the 11th graders of STNHS senior high school.

Second, the strands where the respondents would be taken were identified. These are the STEM, ABM, HE-Caregiving, and ICT-CSS strands.

Third, clusters of reading strategies which would be used in the study were selected which are the independent, the paired, and the small group.

Fourth, five reading strategies under each cluster were chosen. Under independent cluster, strategies like ARG, Think-Aloud, Concept Map, Predict and Expect, and KWL were selected. For paired cluster, reading strategies such as Think-Pair Share, Guess the Word, Partner Reading, Three-Step Interview, and Peer-Tutoring were included. While for small group, Semantic Map, Story Impression, Literature Circle, Gallery Walk, and Roundtable Discussion were chosen for this cluster.

Fifth, lesson plans were prepared for the conduct of the experiment. Each lesson was designed for 60 minutes per session and contains at least three to five reading strategies. Moreover, all lesson plans in every cluster were conducted for the duration of five weeks.

Sixth, reading lessons were conducted to all students of the selected strands. They were exposed to all of the reading strategies in each cluster.

In addition, during the conduct of each reading strategy, the three different tools such as reading test, overt off-task behavior tally sheet, and students' reading strategy preference survey were utilized to gather the needed data.

Then, the gathered data from the three different instruments used were analyzed using the needed statistical tools.

Finally, the analyzed results were the bases in identifying the strategy cluster that best increase the reading motivation of the students. Further, sample videos were taken during the course of the reading activities to triangulate the evidences gathered from the overt-off task behaviors displayed by the students.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Respondents' Reading Motivation Level

As shown in Table 1 on the succeeding page, students from the four strands displayed the highest reading performance level in paired reading strategy cluster which is evident in the overall mean score of 7.60. This is followed by small group reading strategy cluster with overall mean of 6.82; while independent cluster has the lowest with 6.37. In relation to the mean scores under paired cluster, STEM and ABM displayed a very high reading performance as both posted mean scores of 8.19 and 8.63, respectively. While ICT-CSS and HE-Caregiving showed high reading performance with mean scores of 6.37 and 6.83, respectively.

TABLE I: READING PERFORMANCE OF THE STUDENTS

	Independent			Paired			Small Group		
Strands	M	DR	I	M	DR	I	M	DR	I
STEM	6.76	H	HM	8.19	VH	VHM	7.90	H	HM
ABM	6.21	H	HM	8.63	VH	VHM	7.51	H	HM
ICT-CCS	6.54	H	HM	6.73	H	HM	5.88	A	AM
HE-Caregiving	5.96	A	AM	6.83	H	HM	5.97	A	AM
Overall Mean	6.37	H	HM	7.60	H	HM	6.82	H	HM

Legend:	***Range***	***Descriptive Rating (DR)***	***Equivalent Interpretation (I)***
	8.01-10.00	*- Very High Reading Performance (VH)*	*Very High Motivation (VHM)*
	6.01-8.00	*- High Reading Performance (H)*	*High Motivation (HM)*
	4.01-6.00	*-Average Reading Performance (A)*	*Average Motivation (AM)*
	2.01-4.00	*-Low Reading Performance (L)*	*Low Motivation (LM)*
	0.00-2.00	*-Very Low Reading Performance (VL)*	*Very Low Motivation (VLM)*

Further, a summary of students' overt off-task behavior is shown in the table below.

TABLE II: OVERT OFF-TASK BEHAVIORS DURING THE READING ACTIVITY

Cluster	**STEM**		**ABM**		**ICT-CSS**		**HE-Caregiving**		**Overall Mean**	
	f*	**Rank**	**f***	**Rank**	**f***	**Rank**	**f***	**Rank**	**f***	**Rank**
Independent										
ARG	9	4.5	15	4	39	3	23	2.5	21	3
Think-Aloud	6	1	7	1	25	1	20	1	15	1
Concept Map	7	2	11	2	38	2	23	2.5	20	2
KWL	8	3	13	3	42	4	24	4	22	4
Predict & Expect	9	4.5	18	5	60	5	48	5	33	5
Sub-Total	**39**		**64**		**204**		**138**		**111**	
Paired										
Guess the Word	6	5	11	3.5	35	3	24	1.5	19	3
Partner Reading	5	3	11	3.5	56	5	31	5	26	5
Peer-Tutoring	3	1	8	2	33	2	25	3	17	2
Think-Pair Share	5	3	7	1	27	1	24	1.5	16	1
Three-Step Interview	5	3	12	5	46	4	28	4	23	4
Sub-Total	**24**		**49**		**197**		**132**		**101**	
Small Group										
Gallery Walk	10	1	16	1	43	1	33	1	26	1
Literature Circle	16	4	24	5	75	4	62	4	44	4
Roundtable Discussion	14	3	19	4	68	3	50	3	38	3
Semantic Mapping	11	2	17	2	64	2	46	2	35	2
Story Impression	20	5	18	3	82	5	71	5	47	5
Sub-Total	**71**		**94**		**332**		**262**		**190**	

* *Multiple Response*

As shown in Table 2 on the previous page, students from all strands have shown to have the lowest overall mean of 101 of overt off-task behavior under paired reading cluster. Whereas, for independent cluster, an overall mean of 111 was posted, while small group cluster tallied the highest overt-off task score of 190. With reference to the mean scores under paired reading cluster, STEM and ABM showed the lowest total frequencies of overt off-task behavior of 24 and 49, respectively. On the other hand, ICT-CSS and HE-Caregiving posted the total frequency scores of 132 and 101, respectively.

Meanwhile, a summary of students' reading performance is shown in the table below. It can be seen in table that students from the different strands preferred paired and small group reading clusters as evidenced by the overall mean percentage of 64.50 percent and 63.80 percent, respectively. Nonetheless, independent reading strategy cluster is less favored by the students as it posted the lowest overall mean percentage of 48.05 percent. With respect to the result of paired and small group reading strategy clusters, STEM posted mean percentages of 81.4 percent and 86.3 percent, ABM with 69.7 percent and 75.7 percent, ICT-CSS with 56.2 percent and 45.1 percent, and HE-Caregiving with 50.5 percent and 48.0 percent, respectively.

TABLE III: READING PREFERENCE OF THE STUDENTS

Cluster	STEM			ABM			ICT-CSS			HE-Caregiving			Overall Mean		
	%	DR	I	%	DR	I	%	DR	I	%	DR	I	%	DR	I
Independent															
ARG	36	QP	LM	67.4	MuP	HM	54.8	MP	AM	67.9	MuP	HM	56.45	MP	AM
Think Aloud	86	VMP	VHM	65.2	MuP	HM	48.4	MP	AM	34.6	QP	LM	58.48	MP	AM
Concept Map	71	MuP	HM	66.5	MuP	HM	56.5	MP	AM	55.1	MP	AM	62.38	MuP	HM
KWL	29	QP	LM	37	QP	LM	35.5	QP	LM	43.6	MP	AM	36.18	QP	LM
Predict & Expect	29	QP	LM	17.4	NP	VLM	22.6	QP	LM	38.5	QP	LM	26.78	QP	LM
Average	**50**	**MP**	**AM**	**50.2**	**MP**	**AM**	**42.8**	**MP**	**AM**	**47.9**	**MP**	**AM**	**48.05**	**MP**	**AM**
Paired															
Guess the Word	73	MuP	HM	58	MP	AM	46.2	MP	AM	47	MP	AM	56.05	MP	AM
Partner Reading	76	MuP	HM	70.7	MuP	HM	59.7	MP	AM	53.2	MP	AM	64.95	MuP	HM
Peer-Tutoring	88	VMP	VHM	63	MuP	HM	59.7	MP	AM	53.8	MP	AM	66.15	MuP	HM
Think-Pair-Share	92	VMP	VHM	85.9	VMP	VHM	73.4	MuP	HM	66.7	MuP	HM	79.43	MuP	HM
Three-Step Interview	78	MuP	HM	71	MuP	HM	41.9	MP	AM	31.6	QP	LM	55.58	MP	AM
Average	**81**	**VMP**	**VHM**	**69.7**	**MuP**	**HM**	**56.2**	**MP**	**AM**	**50.5**	**MP**	**AM**	**64.5**	**MuP**	**HM**
Small Group															
Gallery Walk	89	VMP	VHM	76.8	MuP	HM	51.6	MP	AM	59.8	MP	AM	69.28	MuP	HM
Literature Circle	84	VMP	VHM	73.9	MuP	HM	50.5	MP	AM	45.3	MP	AM	63.45	MuP	HM
Roundtable Discussion	76	MuP	HM	56.5	MP	AM	40.3	MP	AM	46.2	MP	AM	54.8	MP	AM
Semantic Mapping	83	VMP	VHM	84.1	VMP	VHM	47.3	MP	AM	42.7	MP	AM	64.15	MuP	HM
Story Impression	100	VMP	VHM	87	VMP	VHM	35.5	QP	LM	46.2	MP	AM	67.18	MuP	HM
Average	**86**	**VMP**	**VHM**	**75.7**	**MuP**	**HM**	**45.1**	**MP**	**AM**	**48**	**MP**	**AM**	**63.8**	**MuP**	**HM**

Legend:	***Range***	***Descriptive Rating (DR)***	***Interpretation (I)***
	80.01-100	*- Very Much Preferred (VMP)*	*Very High Motivation (VHM)*
	60.01-80.00	*- Much Preferred (MuP)*	*High Motivation (HM)*
	40.01-60.00	*- Moderately Preferred (MP)*	*Average Motivation (AM)*
	20.01-40.00	*- Quite Preferred (QP)*	*Low Motivation (LM)*
	00.00-20.00	*- Not Preferred (NP)*	*Very Low Motivation (VLM)*

2. Relative Effectiveness of the Strategy Cluster on Reading Motivation

As shown in Table 4, statistical test yielded a significant effect on the paired and small group strategy clusters on the reading motivation of the students along their reading performance as both posted positive mean differences and probability value of 0.002 and 0.012, respectively.

TABLE IV: PAIRWISE COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENT READING STRATEGY CLUSTERS

Cluster	Mean Difference	p-value
Independent and Paired	-0.47088	0.002
Independent and Small Group	-0.37805	0.012
Paired and Small Group	0.09283	0.526

Level of Significance: α = 0.05

Moreover, among the three clusters, paired cluster yielded a significant effect on students' reading motivation based on statistical test as proven by the probability value of 0.033 which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. This is reflected in Table 5 below.

TABLE V: RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGY CLUSTERS ON THE DIFFERENT STRANDS IN THE OVERT OFF-TASK BEHAVIOR OF THE STUDENTS

Cluster	p-value
Independent	0.183
Paired	0.033
Small Group	0.563

Level of Significance: α = 0.05

Finally, Table 6 below shows that along reading strategy preference survey, statistical test produced significant effect on the paired reading strategy cluster as proven by the probability value of 0.004 which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance.

TABLE VI: RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGY CLUSTERS ON THE DIFFERENT STRANDS IN THE PREFERENCE SURVEY OF THE STUDENTS

Cluster	p-value
Independent	0.54
Paired	0.004
Small Group	0.089

Level of Significance: α = 0.05

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Students from the four strands have shown high to very high level of motivation and, performed better in their reading performance when they do paired and small group activities. On the other hand, all strands showed lesser overt off-task behaviors under paired cluster. Moreover, students showed higher preference to paired reading strategy cluster, thus showing high level of motivation in their paired reading tasks. The students preferred doing group tasks and working cooperatively and collaboratively than performing the reading activity alone.

2. Reading strategy clusters like paired and small group relatively increase the reading performance of the students in the four strands. Moreover, between these two reading strategy clusters, paired has shown the highest increase on the level of the reading motivation of the students. On the other hand, paired reading strategy cluster showed a relative effect on the reading motivation of students in the four strands along overt off-task behaviors. Along students' preference survey, paired cluster showed a relative effect on the reading motivation of the students in the four strands.

3. Statistically, paired reading strategy cluster appeared the best strategy clusters in increasing the reading motivation of the eleventh graders.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, A. R. (2016). Cooperative learning effects on the classroom. Retrieved June from https://www.nmu.edu/education/sites/DrupalEducation/files/UserFiles/Adams_Anthony_MP.pdf.

[2] Alhamdu, A. (2015). Interest and reading motivation. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/323576174.

[3] Andrews, T., & Tynan, B. (2014). Changing student learning preferences: What does this mean for the future of universities? Retrieved from http://www.ascilitate.org/conferences/hobart11/downloads/papers/Andrews-full.pdf.

[4] Bada, S. (2015). Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching and learning. [Electronic version]. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1c75/083a05630a663371136310a30060a2afe4b1.pdf.

[5] Baleghizadeh, S., & Farhesh, S. (2014). The impact of pair work on EFL learners' motivation. Retrieved from http://mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=561. [6]. CIGRÉ Tech. Brochure # 379, "Update of service experience of HV underground and submarine cable systems," 2009.

[6] Buschick, M., Shipton, T., Winner, L., Wise, M. (2015). Increasing reading motivation in elementary and middle school students through the use of multiple intelligences. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ ED498926.pdf.

[7] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2016). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.517.3731&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

[8] Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108.

[9] Dijk, M. (2015). The influence of reading motivation on reading behavior: A qualitative study on the reading behavior of high school students. Retrieved from https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/320007.

[10] Diakiw, J. (2017). Reading and success. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/jerry-diakiw/reading-and-life-success_b_16404148.html

[11] Estacio, J. M. (2017). Dimensions of reading motivation among Filipino bilinguals. TESOL Journal, 7, pp. 10-29.

[12] Fernandez, D. M., & Canado, M. P. (2014). Exploring the student's motivation in the EFL class. Present and Future Trends in TEFL, pp. 321-364.

[13] Gagné, M., & Deci, E. (2015). Self-determination theory and work motivation. Journal of Organizational Behavior. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.322.

[14] Godwin, K., Almeda, M., Petroccia, M., Baker, R., Fisher, A. (2018). Classroom activities and off-task behavior in elementary school children. Retrieved from http://www.upenn.edu/learninganalytics/ryanbaker/Godwinetal_v12. pdf&ved=2.

[15] Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scafiddi, N. T., & Tonks, S. (2014). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. [Electronic version]. Journal of Educational Psychology 96 (3), 403-423.

[16] Haque, M., & Sultana, A. (2018). Do pre-reading activities help learners comprehend a text better? Retrieved from http://dspace.bracu.ac.bd/bitstream/handle/10361/763/Md%20Mesbahul%20Huq.PDF?sequence=4.

[17] Hossain, A., & Tarmizi, R. A. (2015). Effects of cooperative learning on students' achievement and attitudes in secondary mathematics. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93, 473-477.

[18] Kann, R. (2014). Increasing motivation and reading comprehension of exceptional learners: Three modeling techniques. The Pointer. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/05544246.1984.9944965.

[19] Mandl, H., & Renkl, A. (2015). Commentary: A plea for "more local" theories of cooperative learning. Learning and Instruction, 2, 281-285.

[20] Osei, A. M., Liang, Q. J., & Stephen, M. A. (2016). The use of pre-reading activities in reading skills achievement in preschool education. European Journal of Educational Research 5 (1), 35-42.

[21] Pan, C. Y., & Wu, H. Y. (2016). The cooperative learning effects on English reading comprehension and learning motivation of EFL freshmen. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n5p13.

[22] Quinn, P. (2016). Cooperative learning and student motivation. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ ehd_theses.

[23] Renkl, A. (2015). Intrinsic motivation, self-explanations, and transfer. München: Institutfür Pädagogische Psychologie und Empirische Pedagogik, Lehrstuhl Prof. Dr. Heinz Mandi.

[24] Ridwan, M. (2017). Gallery walk: An alternative learning strategy in increasing students' active learning. Retrieved from http://pdfs.semanticscholar.org.

[25] Russo, R. L. (2014). The effects of a cooperative learning strategy on post-secondary students' mathematics achievement. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses.

[26] Sani, B., Wan Chik, M., Awg Nik, Y., & Raslee, N. (2015). The Reading Motivation and Reading Strategies Used by Undergraduates in University Teknologi MARA Dungun, Terengganu. Retrieved from http://www.academy publication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol02/01/04.pdf.

[27] Thomas, L., Jones, R., & Ottaway, J. (2014). Effective practice in the design of directed independent learning opportunities. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/effective_practice_in_the_ design_of_directed_independent_learning_opportunities.pdf.

[28] Wen-ying, M., Xi, L. (2016). A New View on Teaching Motivation—Self-determination Theory. Retrieved from http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/569f4bfbaab0c.pdf

[29] West, T. M. (2014). The Use of Incentives for Motivating Students to Read. Retrieved from https://dspace. sunyconnect.suny.edu/bitstream/handle/ 1951/64576/Trina_West_ Masters_Project_May2014.pdf;sequence=1

[30] Yang, G., Badri, M., Al Rashedi, A., & Almazroui, K. (2018*). The role of reading motivation, self-efficacy, and home influence in students' literacy achievement: a preliminary examination of fourth graders in Abu Dhabi.* Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-018-0063-0.