The Effects of Choice on Student Reading Motivation

by

Abbey Marie Bachmann

A dissertation submitted to the department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Curriculum and Instruction

Chair of Committee: Dr. Laveria Hutchison

Co-Chair of Committee: Dr. Jie Zhang

Committee Member: Dr. Cameron White

Committee Member: Dr. Laura Turchi

University of Houston
April 2021

Acknowledgements

As this dissertation is the culmination of four years of hard work, I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge all those who made this possible. To all members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Laveria Hutchison, Dr. Jie Zhang, Dr. Laura Turchi, and Dr. Cameron White, I would not have been able to produce the work in this dissertation without the help, guidance, and support of each of you. The past four years have been incredibly influential on my academic and life trajectory and each of you helped to mold me into the teacher, researcher, and scholar that I am today. Words cannot express how thankful I am to have had all of you along this journey with me.

To my co-workers and friends who have helped with every article, interview, and feedback that I've asked of you, thank you. You've made the process of working and teaching full time while working on this dissertation much easier than it would have been otherwise. Everything you've agreed to help with and provide feedback on has aided me in making another step forward toward this final product. I appreciate you all more than you know.

My family deserves as much praise and acknowledgement as I do for the completion of this dissertation. From assuring conversations and encouraging words, you all pushed me to keep going when the work and responsibilities were overwhelming. To my parents, Glenn and Georgianna Gagnon, you both are the reason I even wanted to get to this point in my career in the first place. You've not only encouraged and supported every dream I've had for the past 35 years, but you've always made it clear that you fully believed that I could achieve anything I set my mind to. To my husband, Richard Bachmann – you've sacrificed as much as I have throughout this process. I appreciate

your encouraging words, hugs, help, and support even on the days when my actions, words, and tone may have indicated otherwise. I may have given up a long time ago if you had not been behind me pushing me along. Here's to celebrating reaching this milestone together! To Waffles, Peanuts, Ella, and Marcy, the fluffy family members who deserve an honorary degree as well – the long work nights were assuaged with your company, presence, fluffy hugs, and forced breaks. You made it all worth it.

Abstract

Background: Studies show that lack of student motivation to read is a primary cause of reading disengagement. This disengagement increases exponentially as students move into adolescence, often exacerbating already student achievement due to existing education inequities. A way to increase student motivation to read is to provide choice. However, few studies have examined the effect of choice on reading motivation exclusively in secondary classrooms. **Purpose:** This study examines how student choice impacts student motivation to read in secondary English classrooms. The following research questions guide the research: (RQ1) When students are provided with a choice in novels, does student reading motivation improve? (RQ2) Is there a difference in student reading motivation levels when students are provided with or without choice in novels? (RQ3) What are teacher perceptions of student reading motivation when students are provided with a choice in novels? **Methods:** This mixed methods study surveyed 194 ninth grade English I students at a suburban high school in southeastern Texas using an adapted reading motivation scale of 25 Likert-scale items measuring self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and autonomy. The scale was administered to students twice from November 2020 to January of 2021: once upon completion of a unit during which students read a teacher-selected novel and once again upon completion of a unit with controlled choice in reading. Quantitative data analysis included scale reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, and paired samples t tests. For qualitative data, four English I teachers participated in semi-structured interviews and a focus group conducted by the researcher on their perceptions of student reading motivation. Interviews were transcribed and coded using directed content analysis to establish similar categories and

then coded for themes. **Results:** One hundred and seventy-two students completed both administrations of the reading motivation survey which revealed a Cronbach Alpha of .91 for the choice administration and .919 for the no choice novel administration which indicates a high level of internal consistency. The results from a paired samples t test indicated that the scale means for the after choice survey results (M= 3.26) were significantly greater than the scale means for the after no choice survey results (M = 2.69, t(171) = 14.27, p < .001. Two major themes contributing to motivated student reading were derived from the teacher interviews: shared experiences and established relevance in a text. Teachers observed more behaviors associated with motivation, such as progress in pages when reading and the absence of distracted behaviors while reading, when students saw relevance in what they were reading and were able to share their reading experience with teachers or peers through class or small group discussions. These observations by teachers during choice reading units are supported by the increase in motivated behaviors as indicated through student reading motivation survey results. **Conclusion:** Students self-reported more motivated reading behaviors when provided with a choice of book as compared to reading a teacher assigned novel. Teacher perceptions of the role of relevance in reading motivation support the use of a choice centered approach to teaching literature in the secondary English classroom.

Keywords: choice, books, reading motivation, interest, autonomy

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

The idea that all teachers are a teacher of reading emphasizes the importance of reading in all content areas. Reading skills are valuable and provide students with a foundation on which to obtain and learn new information in all content areas. The importance of students acquiring reading skills has never been questioned; however, with a changing society and changing students, reading and literacy are more important than ever. The achievement gap in America, the differences in standardized test scores from students of different racial groups and income levels, increases exponentially as students move into their adolescent years, resulting in educational inequities that must be addressed at all levels of education (Mackey et al., 2015, Garcia & Weiss, 2017; Darling-Hammond, 2009). All students deserve the right to an education that will build their literacy skills and abilities.

Reading skills are crucial for real world preparation. The ability to understand a variety of texts allows students to enter any job market with the ability to read materials needed to perform their job and adequately understand their co-workers. With the increased reliance upon technology and electronic means of communication due to the COVID-19 pandemic, digital literacy and reading have become more important. Specifically, reading literary texts allows students to build empathy (Kidd & Castano, 2018). Empathy is a necessary component of social emotional learning and one that can contribute to students acclimating to an ever-changing and increasingly diverse world in which we live. So much tension and divisiveness in our society stems from a lack of understanding of people who are different from ourselves and the fear that many have

been taught to have of the "outsider." If encouraging our students to read more can help to address the divide in the world and provide necessary skills for the workforce, then schools should be taking steps and adopting approaches that all us to work toward that goal.

To minimize the achievement gap in reading, educators need to improve reading instruction by increasing student critical thinking (Kevelson, 2019). Building relationships and getting to know the students that are in classrooms is the first and most important step educators can take to help students develop the critical thinking skills associated with reading (Roberts, 2018). If educators take the time to get to know their students - this means understanding what they think, understand their cultural background, and knowing their voice - then they can select texts that allow students to see themselves, connect to the issues in their world, hear their own voices, and feel empowered. This critical approach to selecting texts for the classroom is a key aspect of critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy as a focus for teachers would allow educators to search for the students' voices that have been excluded for so long and allow those voices to flourish, to be validated, and to be heard (Kincheloe, 2008). My investment in this research study is in the hope that changing the way we approach teaching literature and reading texts in the secondary classroom can help to pave the way for the necessary changes that our society so desperately needs today to minimize the reading achievement gap.

Need for the Study

Students in secondary classrooms are often assigned class novels to read that have been repeatedly assigned in all high schools in America for the past few decades. There is

no denying that our society, and therefore our secondary classrooms as they are a microcosm of our society, have become increasingly diverse. Houston, the focus area for the study, is one of the most racially diverse cities in the nation (U.S. News & World Report, 2020). The growing diversity of secondary classrooms in the Houston area is juxtaposed against a list of books in the classic canon that are overwhelming represent white authors and characters including authors such as Harper Lee, James Joyce, and William Faulkner. While many of these texts are great tools to teach various literary skills, they are not likely to be the texts that students in today's society in one of the most diverse cities in the nation can relate to or see themselves in (Kolbas, 2001). The one size fits all novel does not exist, and students should be allowed the opportunity to read text which features familiar faces, places, and obstacles.

It is not out of the ordinary when asking a high school senior how many books they read over the last four years of school, for them to respond with a number they can count on one hand. Students often resort to online summaries to keep them afloat during a literary analysis unit. When provided with the opportunity to self-select a book, the number of books a student reads often increases according to Miller (2012). When students were asked why this was, their answer was clear. They were able to read books that they were interested in reading. Students were still held accountable for what they read, but without a way to opt out of reading, via online summaries, and an instilled sense of ownership over the chosen book, it was something in which they were more invested.

If students are interested in the topic or material in front them, the desire to succeed and perform is naturally going to be higher. (Gambrell, 2015). This means that students are reading the books in front of them, not pretending to do so. An English

curriculum that builds in the opportunity for students to choose a text that interests them is one that will allow teachers to teach literature while lessening the battle of apathy and the tendency for students to look to online resources to do the work of reading for them. There is a clear need for choice of text to be incorporated in the secondary English classroom to the increase the likelihood of capturing student interest (Ciecierski & Bintz, 2015). Strictly adhering to the classic canon, disregarding the background and interests of the students in a classroom, is doing students a disservice, and failing to help them reach their full reading potential. This necessary recultured curriculum will allow students to access texts that they can connect with to encourage the skills needed to address societal issues outside the classroom (Joseph et al., 2010).

Student interest in a book is one construct of reading motivation. If students are motivated to read a text, they are likely to read more frequently (Allred, 2016). Studies exist that have examined student choice of books and time allotted to read in classrooms and the relationship of these two concepts to student achievement and/or motivation. However, few studies exist that look exclusively at student choice of books and the direct effect on student reading motivation. This research study aims to focus the research on the link between student choice of book and student motivation to read. When students can choose a novel that they see the relevance in, what happens to their motivation levels? When students are more motivated to read a book, teachers are able to bypass getting students interested in a text in order to focus on the skills to be taught as well to develop an enjoyment of reading (Roberts, 2018). Students can analyze characters, setting, plot, diction, and author's craft in much greater depth. This could be a crucial step to help minimize the gap in reading achievement. Students are empowered with a

sense of ownership in their learning, and in turn, emotionally invested in their learning (Dabrowski & Marhsall, 2018). This interest becomes an important element in critical pedagogy in that students can use the text they are invested in as a way of examining the world and societal issues around them. Working towards developing students' world views can lead to conversations about developing, exploring, and tackling societal issues that are sparked by a book a student has read driven by a topic they are interested in. (Kincheloe, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Keeping students motivated to read is a struggle for many teachers especially regarding students in secondary English classes. English teachers are not immune to this dilemma, and educators often find themselves racking their brains and spending countless hours on ways to improve their lessons to increase student buy-in regarding literature. For maximum learning to take place, students should be invested in and motivated to learn the task at hand (Dewey, 1929). If the texts a student reads are reflective of and relevant to their lives outside the classroom and it is something that they can relate to, then the burden of establishing the relevance for reading is no longer on the teacher's shoulders. Students will want to read as they will see as applicable to their lives outside the walls of a classroom. Additionally, the argument of providing students with choice in the classroom can allow students to feel a sense of belonging and responsibility within the classroom to increase student motivation (Guthrie et al., 2004). If students are more motivated to read the book for their class, they are likely to be more engaged in the material being taught as well.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine if providing students with a choice in the book they read increases student reading motivation in the secondary English classroom.

Research Questions

Given the purpose of the study, the following research questions are proposed: (RQ1) When students are provided with a choice in novels, is student reading motivation affected? (RQ2) What is the difference in student reading motivation levels when students are provided with choice in novels versus having no choice in novels? (RQ3) What are teacher perceptions of student reading motivation when students are provided with a choice in novels?

Significance of the Study

This study was designed to provide more information as to the relationship between choice of literary books in the secondary English classroom and its effect on student reading motivation. The results of this study are significant for educators and administrators to help establish the relevance and importance of incorporating student choice of books into classroom instruction and pedagogical approaches at all levels. The results of this study are also significant for curriculum developers to establish the need and rationale for the incorporation of choice of novels into more secondary English curricula. Policy makers and district officials can also benefit from the results of this study by being providing research-based evidence to justify funds for the use of expansive classroom libraries for student choice use.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, terms below are defined:

      Text – Texts in the context of this study can be defined as any reading material that a student can read, such a book, novel, short story, poem, novella, article, passage, speeches, or transcripts. For survey administrations and literature units, texts were novels.

      Novel – A lengthy work of narrative fiction usually written in prose form.

      Class Novels– Novels (as defined above) in which all students are reading the same novel as selected by the instructor. No choice is provided to students as to which novel they are reading.

      Choice Novel– Choice novels are books are novels, as defined above, in which students were able to choose from either through free choice or controlled choice.

      Free Choice Reading – Students can choose a book or novel to read for class assignments with no restrictions placed upon them.

      Controlled Choice Reading – Students can choose a novel to read for class assignments from a list of novels pre-selected by the instructor.

      Motivation – The drive that helps or prevents people from reaching their goals or desires.

      Reading Motivation – Guthrie & Wigfield (2000) define reading motivation as an "individual's personal goals, values, and beliefs with regard to the topics, processes, and outcomes of reading" (p. 405). The RAND (2002) report states that motivation is a concept that a reader brings to a reading situation. Defined by the three constructs measured with an adapted reading motivation scale in this study: intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and autonomy.

Intrinsic Motivation – Activities people partake in for reasons that benefit themselves: "for the pleasure and satisfaction derived from their performance" (Deci et al., 1991, p. 327). These behaviors stem from curiosity, interest, and the desire to learn new things.

Self-Efficacy – "People's beliefs in their capability to exercise some measure of control over their own functional and over environmental events" (Bandura, 2001, p.10). Specific to reading, self-efficacy can be defined as "beliefs regarding ability and proficiency in reading tasks" (Chapman, & Tunmer, 1995, p. 154).

Autonomy – The need to feel in a sense of control of choices and decisions.

English classes – The English classes in this study are English I courses. These students are enrolled as freshmen students in the high school in the study.

Teacher – The teacher of record for students in the English I course in the study.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Overview

The amount of research conducted about student choice in reading and its effect on student motivation in the classroom is limited. There are studies that have been conducted looking at choice as one factor among many for student motivation or interest, but not many studies focus exclusively on choice and its effect on student reading motivation. Limitations in a variety of studies show that often, too many variables are examined in a study to really allow researchers to look exclusively at the effects of choice on student reading motivation, specifically in the secondary English classroom.

Research articles, as well as expert practitioner articles on reading motivation and student choice in reading were accessed through databases such as JSTOR, EBSCO Host, Academic Search Complete, and Web of Science. Through the combined use of these various online databases, it was found that 'reading motivation and 'choice in reading' were the most appropriate search terms that produced the desired results. Because of the lack of research exclusively on student choice and reading motivation, there were many articles that needed to be sifted through to find articles relevant to the research questions being addressed.

This section opens with a review of theoretical and conceptual frameworks for student engagement in the classroom, culturally relevant pedagogy, and the best research methods for examining student reading motivation. Additionally, general findings of factors contributing to reading motivation will be reviewed as well as the benefits of choice and student reading motivation. Specific examples of students' improved

motivation to read utilizing choice in text and lack of motivation when not provided with choice will be the final area addressed in this section of the research study.

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

Tomlinson & Allan (2000) state that students should be given choice in at least one of the following factors for every assignment: content, process, product, or conditions for learning. When given choice, "…adolescents are more likely to invest in the deep thinking needed for intellectual growth" (Gallagher & Kittle, 2018). Student choice in reading refers to the student's ability to choose which book they read for classroom instruction. Unlike free reading, in which students read exclusively for enjoyment, choice in reading for instructional purposes provides students with the ability to choose a book of interest while still being asked to complete work and assignments for class centered around their chosen book. Mercurio (2005) details that students are most successful when provided with the instruction and opportunity to select texts that are right for them and to engage in meaningful discussions about the texts. Additionally, students will be more naturally committed to their reading while enjoying their books all while being able to discuss literary elements present in their chosen book. Choice in books and time to read are necessary for reading instruction to be successful. Allowing students to read books that they are interested in helps to combat resistance, apathy, and disinterest. (Gallagher & Kittle, 2018).

Self-Determination Theory

Student choice of books and the relationship to motivation is grounded in self-determination theory (SDT). SDT centers around the notion that people are proactive and engaged as a function of the social context and conditions that are experienced (Ryan &

Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation can be enhanced through the innate psychological needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness. SDT places a great value on motivation because when motivation is authentic and intrinsic, more interest, excitement, and confidence are the results as compared to pure external motivation factors. Competency, autonomy, and relatedness are the essential components for optimal growth, development, and wellbeing. (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The social environment that SDT centers as heightening a person's development, performance, and well-being should be an environment which takes into considering a person's background and interests to achieve the ideal social situation for learning.

Ryan & Deci (1985) present the SDT sub theory of cognitive evaluation theory (CET) to support the social and environmental factors that promote intrinsic motivation. CET, focusing on the essential needs of competence and autonomy, argues that "social-contextual events (e.g., feedback, communications, rewards) that conduce toward feelings of competence during action can enhance intrinsic motivation for that action" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 70). However, feelings of competence cannot be conducive to building intrinsic motivation with the existence of autonomy. Choice, along with the recognition of feelings and opportunities for self-direction, have been proven to encourage and enhance intrinsic motivation because a greater sense of autonomy is allowed (Ryan & Deci, 1985). It is crucial to note that the principals of CET are only applicable when interest is initially present. This reinforces the notion that providing students a choice of book based on relevance can spark the initial interest for the theories of CET and SDT to be enacted.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Motivation and the constructs of self-efficacy, autonomy, and interest were interpreted through the lens of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP). Culturally relevant pedagogy is comprised of three main tenets: academic success, development of cultural competence, and developing critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Despite existing educational inequities, all students must develop their academic skills. Getting students to be invested and motivated to succeed academically is a key component of CRP. Culture should be used an avenue for which students can best learn in the classroom rather than the separate of culture and classroom. Specific selection of texts for student use requires educators to dive deep into the lives of their students to choose texts and options for students to read that are culturally relevant and relatable (Sharma & Christ, 2017). Making connections between the text students are invested in and the broader world around them is the final component of CRP. There should be a bigger perspective and purpose for students for what they are reading or being asked to read. Incorporation of CRP in the classroom can provide minoritized students with the environment, tools, skills, and support to achieve success.

The motivation constructs investigated in this study can be viewed from a culturally relevant perspective by considering the conditions of established relevance, positive attitudes, enhanced meaning, and engendered competency as laid out by Ginsberg and Wlodkowski (2019). These components of a classroom, when activated, allow for higher student motivation through culturally relevant practices. "The more mutually supportive the elements of teaching are, the more likely they are to evoke, encourage, and sustain intrinsic motivation" (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2019, p. 58).

Using the guide of self-determination theory and cognitive evaluation theory, this study analyzed and interpreted the results of data through the lens of culturally relevant pedagogy.

Methods to Assess and Study Student Motivation

There are a variety of methods used to measure and assess student motivation. Surveys, questionnaires, observations, and interviews are some of the most common ways; however, which of these methods have been tested, evaluated, and proven to be reliable in reporting results of reading motivation in students? All approaches have their advantages and disadvantages; therefore, a combination of methods could provide the most well-rounded and inclusive findings.

Davis et al. (2018) examined a variety of reading motivation scales to examine the construction and psychometric properties of each scale. As motivation is a multifaceted and complex construct, many of the scales investigated measure a variety of constructs including intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, social reasons for reading, competency, and value of reading. Reading motivation scales in which students self-report are the most used type of assessment for reading motivation. The appeal is that these scales are often easy to use and easily accessible within a classroom setting.

The Adolescent Motivation for School Reading (AMSR) scale was administered in a study by Coddington (2009). This scale measures the following constructs of reading motivation: intrinsic motivation, avoidance, self-efficacy, perceived difficulty, prosocial interactions, and antisocial interactions. The readings for school that can be used for the survey include nonfiction books, fiction books, textbooks, Websites, newspapers, or magazines. The four-point Likert type scale responses for this survey have been

implemented successfully in previous motivation surveys by Coddington & Guthrie (2009) through the Young Reader Motivation Questionnaire.

Coddington (2009) conducted principal axis factoring (PAF) on the 200 plus responses received from the AMSR. The goal of using PAF was to identify constructs of motivation from the original survey items. After completing the PAF and subsequently principal components analysis (PCA) for each subset of constructs, the proposed AMSR displayed the following factor loadings for each construct: Intrinsic Motivation had a Cronbach's Alpha of .92, Avoidance had a Cronbach Alpha at .75, Self-Efficacy at .89, Perceived Difficulty at .92, Prosocial Interactions at .80, and Antisocial Interactions at .84. The completed 38 item AMSR displays that students should be assessed on reading motivation with a scale that measure various dimensions of reading motivation. (Coddington, 2009). Multiple motivation constructs can predict achievement even when the effects of the other constructs have been accounted for. Overall, the AMSR is a reliable and valid measure for students to self-report reading motivation.

Another self-reporting measure of motivation is the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI). The IMI is intended to measure the subjective experience of a participant while completing a task or activity. The constructs measured include interest, perceived competence, effort, value, felt pressure, and perceived choice while performing a given activity. All items across the constructs on the IMI have been shown to be "…analytically coherent and stable across a variety of tasks, conditions, and settings" (Center for Self Determination Theory, 2020). The criteria for all items included on any subscale is a factor loading of at least .60 and no cross loadings above .40. IMI items can be modified to fit various activities. For example, an item that states, "I tried hard to do

well at this activity" can be reworded to state, "I tried hard to do well when reading my book in class." A study conducted by McAuley et al. (1987) found overwhelming support for the validity of the IMI.

Tsigilis & Theodosiou (2003) examined the temporal stability of the IMI in sample of 144 undergraduate students. The IMI was administered after an endurance field test on two separate occasions. The researchers carried out a factor analysis followed by varimax rotation that revealed that three factors (perceived competence, interest, and effort) accounted for over 65 % of the total variance. All factors loaded at .60 or higher, with the perceived competence items loading at .86. The scale overall loaded at .70. Overall, the IMI is a stable measure of intrinsic motivation.

Both the AMSR and the IMI are research backed self-reporting motivation measures for students. However, self-reporting scales can have their drawbacks. Many valid and reliable scales have been geared towards assessing the motivation of upper elementary and middle grades. There are significantly fewer scales that are focused on early childhood and adolescents. Additionally, since reading motivation is multidimensional, many existing scales only measure a few of the constructs associated with reading motivation. Much of the research that has been done utilizing self-report reading motivation scales has been with a sample size of under 200 (Davis et al. 2018). There is a need for a greater power of analyses with larger sample sizes in order generalize the results of the motivation surveys.

Even though the research suggests that self-report student motivation questionnaires can be a great way to assess the potential motivation of a student in a classroom, there are other methods that researchers can take in addition to student self-

reported measures in order to yield more thorough information that creates an accurate representation of student reading motivation in the classroom. For example, checklists and rating scales can be filled out by teachers in response to student behaviors in the classroom and student work. Examples of items on a checklist such as this could include "This student doesn't try when faced with a difficult problem" (Chapman, 2003). Activities, autonomy, and individual factors for students all could be rated by the teacher with a checklist or rating scale.

Along the same lines, teacher interviews can provide potential insight into the teacher's perceptions of how motivated students are when reading. An interview allows the researcher to gain a more objective approach to how reading motivation is conveyed in the classroom. A semi-structured interview would allow the researcher to gain perspectives from the teachers regarding student behavior, work, and dialogue with the student that can result in a well-rounded and thorough representation of student reading motivation. Teacher interviews regarding observed student reading motivation can be valid sources of data when utilized in conjunction with measures that gain insight from students as well (Ciampa, 2012).

The benefit for the researcher of alternative measures aside from self-report scales is a higher validity than the student self-reported measures. This is especially important with self-reporting measures and answers from younger secondary grades. The advantage of studying motivation in a more natural context and learning situation ensures inclusion of motivational stimuli and context such as the classroom environment. (Fulmer & Frijters, 2009). Teachers are natural observers of student behavior and therefore, could provide information that students are unable to realize about themselves. Overall, there

are a variety of methods to use to evaluate student reading motivation in the secondary

classroom. A blended approach of student self-reported scales and qualitative data such

as teacher interviews provided this study with a well-rounded and detailed look into

student reading motivation.

Benefits of Choice in the Classroom Regarding Motivation

Mercurio (2005) conducted a qualitative study in which the researchers looked at

their current students' reasons for not reading in class to create a program with the

intention of increasing student motivation and engagement in the book they are reading.

Negative experiences, lack of interest in the topic, and level of book difficulty were all

reasons that students reported not being motivation to read the book they were reading in

class. Students in reading classes, as part of the study, could choose the book they

wanted to read as part of the class curriculum. Students were asked to keep journal entries

about their book as well as share their book experiences with a partner and complete

book projects. Field notes, surveys, teacher observations and in-depth interviews, of nine

random students, were collected by the researchers to determine the students' perceptions

on choice in their reading (Mercurio, 2005).

The results of the qualitative data show that students were more motivated to read

when they could select their own books to read in class. More specifically, students

learned how to select books that were right for them, engaged in meaningful discussions

and reflections about their books, became more involved and invested in their reading,

discussed literary elements present in their books in natural discussion, and learned that

they could really enjoy a variety of books. The data gathered by researchers was from

student writing and conversations that teachers had with students. Many student quotes

were provided to prove the findings of student discussion of literary devices, student selection of books appropriate for them, and meaningful discussions behind had amongst students. One teacher survey recorded at the beginning of the study that students were reading two hours at home per week. This number increased to four hours per week at the end of the study for most students in the study. In student discussions, 86% of students were talking about and recommending books to other students in class. The shared experience of being able to collaborative and discuss with other students about what they were reading was appealing for students to continue to read. Overall, student attitudes toward reading increased, along with their motivation to read (Mercurio, 2005).

It was clear from the data presented by Mercurio (2005) that student ability to choose their book was the largest contributing factor to motivation, interest, and desire to read. Some limitations in this study that need to be explored further would be a longer-term program, and the differences between a program of choice and a program focused on required, assigned reading. Mercurio (2005) even states that a further study should investigate student perceptions of choice versus no choice as well as looking at literacy activities within each of those types of programs.

Like Mercurio (2005), Ivey & Broaddus (2001) conducted a study in which they looked at student motivation to read. A survey, with open-ended and short-answer responses, was administered to 1,765 sixth grade students in 23 schools in an urban area in the northeast and a rural area in the mid-Atlantic. Follow-up interviews were conducted with 16 girls and 15 boys from 3 diverse classrooms involved in the study. Both researchers in the study conducted individual content analysis on the items in the survey to cross-check and ensure consistency in survey interpretation results. Regarding

the open-ended responses on the distributed student surveys, students were asked what they enjoy about how their time is spent in reading class and what makes them want to read in class. Checklist items on the survey included preferences in reading materials, preferred reading activities at school, and where students find the books that they enjoy reading. Five short answer questions were also included in the survey: two that required students to list reading materials enjoyed at school and at home, one about reading frequency of these materials, and the final three questions asked students to list specific titles of favorite books enjoyed in various settings. Ivey & Broaddus (2001) chose to conduct the follow-up interviews with schools that showed high levels of engagement based on survey results. Follow-up interviews with students consisted of the researchers gathering more information about the students' survey responses such as how do you spend your time reading in class, and why a text worked best for them.

Ivey & Broaddus (2001) discovered some common themes prevalent in the surveys analyzed. Students overwhelming preferred the activities of free reading time (63%) and teacher reading out loud (62%) as compared to activities such as reading with the whole class (23%) or students reading out loud (26%). Students interviewed elaborated on these responses by saying that they enjoyed free reading time because they could choose a book they were interested in reading. Regarding survey responses about motivation to read, 42% of students stated choosing and having access to good reading materials was the largest contributing factor to willingness and motivation to read. Student interviews again, corroborated the information presented in the surveys. Students said that the motivation to read came from being interested in the book that they were reading. Interestingly, student interviewees reported that their worst experiences

with reading came when the teacher assigned them a class novel (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001).

Some limitations to consider regarding this study is that many different classrooms were being evaluated which were taught by a variety of teachers. The way that some teachers incorporate free reading time may be different than another teacher in a different classroom. Additionally, it is hard to determine the reliability of student responses if surveys were handed out by teachers and sent back to the researchers. Ivey & Broaddus (2001) reinforces Mercurio (2005) due to the results that both studies found that centered around student motivation and interest because of self-selection of reading materials. Both studies provide further justification for studies that would look closer at the relationship between student choice in reading and student reading motivation.

Guthrie et al. (2004) conducted a study in which the researchers looked at student reading comprehension, motivation, and engagement using a program called Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI). CORI is a program in which motivational strategies are combined with the use of cognitive strategies in instruction. The CORI program was compared to an instructional framework called SI (Strategy Instruction). SI lacks the strategies in motivational support that CORI offers. The participants in this study were third-grade students from four schools in a small city in the mid-Atlantic. Each school was randomly assigned to either the CORI or the SI method of instruction. Pretests and posttests were administered. Each respective instructional method was taught 90 minutes a day in third-grade classrooms from September through December. The five practices incorporated in the CORI program included establishing content goals for instruction in reading, providing students with choices and control in reading,

incorporating hands-on activities, using interesting texts for instruction, and collaborating about the text (Guthrie et al., 2007).

Assessments that were administered were comprehensive with the inclusion of a motivation questionnaire and passage comprehension. All items on the motivation questionnaire were assessed on a Likert-type scale with reliability being established. Passage comprehension was assessed by a standardized, computerized test created by Pearson. Teacher instruction of the CORI or SI programs were videotaped and subsequent interviews with teachers were coded. Each teacher practice was rated on a scale of 1-4 with 1 meaning "no visible implementation" of practice and 4 meaning "thorough implementation." The interviews and coding of teacher instructional practices revealed that CORI teachers scored higher overall in all categories as compared to the SI teachers. The pretest and posttest data for student revealed that student motivation levels at posttest correlated significantly with multiple text comprehension and passage comprehension (Guthrie et al., 2007).

Guthrie et al. (2007) clarifies that motivation and student engagement levels are part of the reason that student comprehension increases. Just one aspect of the classroom framework of CORI was student choice, but that was a contributing factor. While this study does show a connection between choice and student motivation to read, there are many factors that make up a classroom environment Further studies could be conducted to look more closely at reading motivation exclusively to determine its relationship to choose in reading in the English classroom.

Another study in which choice is an important aspect of student motivation and engagement is in Ivey & Johnston (2013) in which researchers looked at all eighth-grade

classes at a mid-Atlantic public school in a town with a population of around 22,000 people. Eighth-grade teachers at the study site all implemented a program in which students were able to choose a novel from around 150-200 titles of books in a teacher's classroom library. Students read these books in class and at home, but no assignments were attached to these novels. Discussions between teacher and student took place about the novel as well as writing assignments, but the study focuses on engaged student reading. Ivey & Johnston (2013) were operating on the definition of engaged reading as "motivated interaction with the text" (p. 256) Seventy-one student interviews were conducted at the end of the school year to gain student perspective and insight into motivated and engaged reading and the program (Ivey & Johnston, 2013).

In the interviews, students were asked a variety of questions about their personal experiences with reading during their eighth-grade year at school and at home. Student interview responses were analyzed and coded according to similarities. Groupings of responses were organized into causal relationships with 37 categories of relationships. Finally, five case studies were conducted for further interview analysis. Student motivation to read a text was evidence in most students when they discussed the amount of time read in class, the conversations that they had with peers about their books, the ability to choose edgier books that appealed to them, the opportunity to get know new classmates, and provided time to read in class. Overall, an increased attentiveness to books, a strong sense of autonomy over their learning, and stretching themselves to overcome challenges are signs of students engaged and motivated by what they are reading in class even without regular classroom accountability structures (Ivey &

Johnston, 2013). Many elements of motivated reading displayed by the students in this study are the elements which the current study addresses and aims to measure.

Establishing a common pattern with the previously visited research, Ivey & Johnston (2013) reinforce that student choice in reading is the backbone of student motivation to read and engagement. This study went into great depth as to the reasoning behind student choice and what aspects of motivated and engaged reading were produced as a result. One aspect worth noting is that the students in the study did not have traditional classroom accountability measures placed upon them. Student reading behaviors may alter and change when these demands are placed on them by teachers.

Myrow (1979) evaluated the relationship between learner choice and task engagement. All students involved in the study participated in both an activity where they were provided choice on the topic that they wanted to read and study about and an activity where no choice was provided. The texts used were all informational texts on a variety of topics, and students were provided with 25 multiple choice questions about the topic that they either selected or the topic that they had been assigned. To measure affective orientation (connection and involvement with the text), the researcher utilized a personal causation scale, an affective measures scale, a measure of continuing motivation, and a measure of time spent studying. To measure verbal ability, a standardized vocabulary test was used. These assessments were given to approximately 200 eleventh and twelfth grade students at an urban high school (Myrow 1979).

Results of this study revealed that choice was not a factor for student retention, but there was an effect of choice on affective measures Additionally, choice affected continuing motivation. When students were able to choose the topic that their

assignments would be over, they were much more likely to spend more time on the passages and the assignments. When an item on the assessment became difficult, students provided with choice were much more willing to work through those frustrations. Myrow (1979) noted that student choice seemed to directly affect student motivation to read and engagement in the task. Even though the relationship between choice and many other assessed factors such as retention and vocabulary were weakly related, engagement was the factor that choice did impact. One especially interesting aspect of this study is the distinction between topic and text. Students in the study were reading the same type of text, but all on different topics. Apply this logic to a secondary English classroom, if students can select a book of choice from a list of teacher-selected texts, then teachers can control the text while allowing students to choose a topic that interests them. The implications of this concept have potential for teachers to use controlled choice in reading to address a variety of topics throughout the year while still allowing for student choice in text.

Most recently, Allred & Cena (2020) investigated the impact of student choice and class time on reading motivation in a high school setting. Two eleventh grade English classes in a public school in the western U.S, one with 28 students and the other with 25 students, were the focus of this study. As noted in the initial field notes, most of the students in the study indicated that they did not enjoy reading for class and did not read for pleasure often. Field notes, daily quick writes, and anecdotal notes from classroom occurrences were all collected as qualitative data sources while a reading motivation questionnaire (Pitcher et al., 2007) was administered at the beginning and end

of the study as well. The questionnaire explored students' self-concept as a reader as well as the values that they placed on reading.

A unit was introduced to student participants in which they were able to select a book to read based on interest. Students were then placed in book groups (literature circles) where all students in the same group were reading books within the same genre. This allowed students to discuss the commonalities amongst their books despite the books themselves being different resulting in a shared experience. Students were given time to read and asked to set goals, create summaries, find important lines, examine characters, and discuss their books with their literature circle groups. The book group process repeated three different times for a total of 18 instructional days. At the conclusion of the 18-day unit, students were given the reading motivation questionnaire again. (Allread & Cena, 2020).

Statistical analysis for the reading motivation questionnaire administrations was completed including descriptive analysis and a *t*-test. Upon completion of the instructional book group unit, Allred & Cena (2020) note higher student reported scores on reading self-concept and reading value. The mean reading self-concept scores were 29.87 at the onset of the study and ended at 31.47 with a *t*-test indicating these differences were statistically significant. Similarly, the average reading value scores prior to the instructional unit were 19.47 and ended at a mean of 20.45. The reading value score different was also found to be statistically significant. The qualitative data, after being coded and categorized, revealed higher student opinions about reading, higher self-concepts for reading, higher reading volume, and increased beliefs regarding the motivation to read (Allred & Cena, 2020). Some of the student responses from the

informal interview when asked about what teachers could do help students enjoy reading were as follows: "Don't force us to read a certain book," "I like picking my own book. Then it's not boring." These responses, along with a great student demand for time to read in class seemed to be the most likely explanation for increased student self-concept and reading values.

Allread & Cena (2020) along with each of the studies in the review of literature points to a positive relationship between student choice in reading and the motivation for students to read. While not all researchers have pinpointed the same exact constructs for reading motivation, they all concede that student choice is positively related to student motivation and interest. The benefits of choice as displayed in these studies upholds the central tenants of CRP in that student background and interest was valued and levered to allow them an accessible avenue to academic success (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Further research should be completed to look more closely at the exclusive affect that choice in reading has on student motivation to read in English classrooms.

Drawbacks to Lack of Choice in the Classroom Regarding Motivation

When students are assigned a novel without any consideration of student interest, motivation to read often decreases. Tatum (2008) investigates the notion that white students are often overserved regarding the literature that they read, yet one white student reading *A Tale of Two Cities* failed to make connections with the text let alone understand the rationale for reading the 19th century novel. In fact, the white female claimed that she had not read a single book all year that she viewed as relevant and meaningful. If students are unable to read literature that they can make connections with, the motivation to read significantly decreases. Tatum (2008) states, "It is time that we

begin to take stock of the types of texts that adolescents find meaningful and significant and how we can mediate texts in effective and meaningful ways" (p. 83). Allowing students choice in what they want to read and opening the door to texts that are personally and culturally relevant could be a potential catalyst toward motivation to read.

Tatum (2008) suggests that the literature that students read should allow them to generate questions that matter to them in addition to building connections to their adolescent identities. All students are unique and bring various background information and schema into the classroom. This is idea reiterates the notion of CRP in the classroom and using relevant texts to help build students' sociopolitical consciousness to examine and challenge the realities of the world in which they live (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Teachers should not expect that a one size fits all approach regarding literature can allow students to bring their expertise to the new information they are reading about. Tatum (2008) also suggests that the texts that influence students the most will be ones that allow students to walk away with a greater understanding of who they are, ones that challenge who they are, and ones that motivate them to act in society. As Gallagher & Kittle (2018) state regarding the need to increase reading motivation, which will increase reading amount, "Increasing the volume of reading helps prepare students to navigate a changing world as well as to develop empathy and understanding. Readers are important in a democracy" (p. 14). Allowing students the choice to select a book that is likely to create these ideals is the best way to accomplish this educational goal.

Gallagher & Kittle (2018) make the claim that readers are people who read often and a lot. Success in reading is built from the motivation to read, which in turn can lead to an increased volume in reading. The reading that occurs too frequently in adolescent

classrooms consists of fake reading or skimming the text without being able to really

tackle the complexity of a text. Often, students give up on the reading process in general

as they fail to see the relevance and meaning in reading. Gallagher (2009) coined the term

"readicide," in which he describes the systematic murder of the joy that should

accompany reading often enforced by the approaches and practices so often used in

schools across the globe.

    Merga (2014) conducted a study completed with qualitative and quantitative data

on West Australian adolescents and the reasons those students presented for choosing not

to engage in free reading: reading for enjoyment, on a person's own time, and with no

accountability measures enacted. Merga selected students for the study who claimed that

they read for recreational purposes outside of school once a month or less. The

participants of the study included 520 students from 20 different West Australian schools

that were all between the ages of 13 and 16. The adolescents were given a survey to

complete that consisted of 41 questions about their reasons for why they do not engage in

recreational reading outside of school. Adolescents could choose as many reasons as

they wanted for why they chose not to engage in the recreational reading of books.

    Looking at the results of the quantitative study, 185 of the 520 students

considered themselves infrequent readers in that they read for recreation once a month or

less. These students selected their reasons for choosing not to engage in recreational

reading from the close-ended survey administered by Merga (2014). The data presented

by Merga (2014) in a table shows that a majority of students chose not to participate in

recreational reading due to not having the time to read (28%), not being able to find

interesting books (39%), finding the activity of reading boring (45%), wanting to read

another type of text (magazine, social media, etc. 44%), and wanting to spend free time engaged in other activities (78%).

The qualitative aspect of the study allowed students to provide the researcher with other options as to why they chose not to read frequently outside of school. The students who provided the researcher with information for this portion of the survey stated that they would prefer to spend their time outside of school participating in other activities (Merga, 2014). Several students also responded by saying that they felt as though they did not have access to a variety of books that they found interesting or engaging. Merga (2014) concluded that students should be provided with access to a variety of interesting and age-appropriate books as well as being equipped with strategies and a plan on how to select a book that is a good match for them. This suggests that these same students may be more motivated to read in a school environment when they are provided with the time to read the books of their choice as they would have access to these books at a school library.

A major strength of this study is presented in that even though some West Australian adolescents are choosing not to spend their free time reading, the factors that are hindering them from doing so are factors that can be easily dissolved if more reading time was incorporated into the classroom on a regular basis. The lack of access to books and wanting to do other things with their time would be voided if these same students were provided with independent reading time in a classroom where they had access to a variety of books to meet their needs as learners and readers.

Merga (2014) claims that these various hindrances to reading can be combatted in school to help reduce the 'Matthew Effect.' Students who do not feel as though they are

good at reading or those that do not enjoy reading in school just continue to fall further behind with reading achievement while those who excel continue to achieve thus increasing the gap between the two groups. Providing choice of texts to students while they are still in the classroom may help to encourage students who are not interested in reading to pick up more books outside of the classroom once they find some texts they are interested in, can relate to, and are motivated to read. Culturally relevant practices can help to bridge the academic achievement gap by appealing to students sense of culture as an avenue to garner motivation to read (Sharma & Christ, 2017).

Even when students are provided with the time to read in a classroom environment, there can still be some factors that prevent academic growth regarding reading achievement. Enriquez (2013) completed a case study on an individual student who was considered an avid reader yet found himself struggling in the Language Arts classroom due to limitations placed on his reading time and choice. Enriquez (2013) interviewed and tracked the reading habits of an eighth-grade African American boy, Derrick, at an urban middle school, City School, located in the Northeast U.S. in an ethnically and socioeconomically diverse working-class area. Derrick's Language Arts teacher taught using a writing and reading workshop method designed to where each student would ideally have independent time to read and write with the tools or texts of their choosing (Enriquez, 2013).

In opposition to what was originally explained to Derrick about the way his Language Arts class would work, he was not able to read any text of his choosing, which stifled his love of comic books, magazines, and graphic novels. The focus of independent reading time was to be spent reading novels, short stories, or poetry

collections in a very linear fashion by all students. This meant that students were to continue to read one book until they had finished it before starting another book. Even though Derrick loved to read novels as well, he was often reprimanded for his choice of graphic novels and his ability and desire to read multiple texts during the same setting (Enriquez, 2013).

Even more challenges arose for Derrick when he was asked to complete assessments in Language Arts class over a specific novel, and Derrick used his personal novels instead. Because of this confusion, Derrick's academics grades began to suffer along with his enthusiasm he had about reading in class (Enriquez, 2013). Many mixed signals continued to be sent to Derrick and his classmates about the way independent reading time would be spent in the class setting, indicating an issue with instructional approaches to reading. Not only was Derrick stifled by the limits put on his choice of texts, but as standardized testing approached, less and less class time was devoted to reading. Writing and reading of the texts that would be seen on standardized tests became the common tool used for students to learn (Enriquez, 2013). Additionally, Derrick would be criticized for reading his books in other content areas when he had finished the work the teacher had assigned (Enriquez, 2103). He had been told he could read a book of his choice, but limitations were put on him when he thought choosing to read would be the best option.

Based on Derrick's reaction to being provided with time to read in class, it was clear that he was enthusiastic about having a choice of reading what he wanted to read. This clearly shows that students should be allowed to choose the books they want to read in to facilitate an environment most conducive to motivation reading behaviors. Had

Derrick's desire to read the texts of his choosing been embraced by his teachers, his experience with reading and the impact it had on his life could be drastically different, potentially altering the entirety of his academic trajectory. Ladson-Billings (1995) emphasizes the use of CRP with those of minorized communities such as Derrick in this case. Had Derrick's teachers implemented the notions of CRP and fostered his love of graphic novels, the impact on his academic success and critical consciousness could have been monumental.

Cooper (2014) conducted a study looking at the contributing factors to high school student engagement in the classroom. One thousand one hundred and thirty-two students at Riley High School in Riley, Texas, were given surveys to fill out for each of their classes. Students at Riley High School represent a diverse group of students that is representative of the changing demographics of the state of Texas as a whole. The surveys asked students to evaluate their teachers and the content that they were learning in each class and how motivation and engaged they felt regarding their learning in each class throughout the school day. In addition to the student surveys, case study classes were observed by the researchers with respect to academic activities, teacher-student interactions, and behavioral observations. Field notes were recorded about the researchers' observations in each case study classroom. Follow up interviews were conducted with students from case study classes selected by random sampling. Teacher and administrator interviews were also conducted to gain the most comprehensive understating of teaching practices at Riley High School.

Cooper (2014) conducted regression analyses to gather information from the data about the determining factors most important to student engagement in addition to coding

observation and interview transcripts. Results of the data revealed that all students equated connective instruction, academic rigor, and lively teaching to increased levels of engagement in the classroom. Levels of engagement were higher in elective classes than those of core content areas, including English. However, connective instruction was the highest predicting factor of student engagement in the classroom, the connection being seven times stronger than that of academic rigor and lively teaching (Cooper, 2014). Cooper (2014) states that connective instruction "is comprised of teaching practices that emphasize the uniqueness of individual students by integrating connective elements of student-teacher relationships (care, understanding, affirmation, and humor) with connective elements of instruction (relevance and self-expression)" (p. 393).

The individualized notion of connective instruction leads to the connection of choice of text in the classroom. If connective instruction is about appealing to what the individual needs, and this idea is shown to increase student engagement, then allowing students a choice helps to meet that individual need. In turn, if a student sees the connection in what they are learning to their lives outside of school, they will find more buy in with the content. This can be achieved by allowed students to select a text that they will be able to connect with and learn from with the goal of academic success.

Many expert educators in the field have documented the struggle that occurs in the classroom when students are not provide with choice in what they read. Kittle (2013) reflects on what causes a child's love for reading to diminish significantly once they enter middle and high school. During these formative years, the demand on assigned readings increases exponentially, and students struggle when the book is too challenging, too uninteresting, or not applicable to their background, culture, and experiences (Kittle,

2013). As students enter their secondary years and the amount of required reading increases, so does the ability for students to learn to fake read. Roberts (2018) discusses the surface level discussions and obligatory quizzes and reading checks to hold kids "accountable" for their reading. The amount of time it takes to read one book as class text is too long to hold students' attention and does not consider the varying levels and paces at which kids read.

Additionally, the ability to transfer skills from one novel to the text is difficult for students. So often class novel instruction is based on teaching the text instead of teaching the skills when in reality, if educators teach the skills, ideally while students are reading a text of their choice, those skills become easier for student to generalize to other texts and eventually other readings outside the English classroom (Roberts, 2018).

The goal of providing students with a choice of text in the classroom is an increase in interest, self-efficacy, and autonomy all resulting in greater motivation to read. The above-mentioned studies reveal the gains that are associated with provided adolescents with a choice in reading as well as the potential drawbacks for failing to do so. Ideally, contexts that support autonomy, competence, and relatedness are the most conducive to nurturing greater internalization and incorporation of motivated behaviors (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The ideal classroom environment that incorporates choice also functions with the alignment of CRP principals to promote educators in valuing students' skills and abilities to channel them in academic ways. (Ladson-Billings, 1995). These ideas guided the research study in looking at the role of choice in student reading motivation.

Chapter III

Methods

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the methodology used to conduct this research study investigating the effect of choice in reading on student reading motivation. A triangulated mixed-methods approach to this study allowed for a deeper look at the various perspectives on the role that choice plays in student reading motivation levels (Gay et al., 2012). Student self-reported reading motivation levels in combination with teacher perspectives on student reading motivation provided a deeper understand of the nuances that influence student reading motivation. The researcher's role, design choice, participants and sample, measures and instruments, and procedures used are all discussed in depth in this chapter.

Hypothesis

Students in secondary English classrooms display higher levels of reading motivation when they are provided choice in novels compared to having no choice.

Research Questions

This study investigated the answers to the following questions: (RQ1) When students are provided with a choice in novels, is student reading motivation affected? (RQ2) What is the difference in student reading motivation levels when students are provided with choice in novels versus having no choice in novels? (RQ3) What are teacher perceptions of student reading motivation when students are provided with a choice in novels?

Research Design

The research design for this study was a mixed method (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006) quasi-experimental design in which student reading motivation was measured with 9th grade English I students. Specifically, a triangulation mixed-methods approach to this study allowed the researcher to examine both student and teacher reactions to student reading motivation in concurrent fashion (Gay et al., 2012). The quasi-experimental quantitative aspect of this research study provided the researcher with the ability to have objective data to represent student reading motivation levels. Objectivity in research allowed the researcher the ability to produce reliable results with the aim of generalizing information to a wider audience (Hoy & Adams, 2016). The qualitative aspect of this study, the semi-structured teacher interviews, allowed the researcher the ability to understand teacher perceptions in depth regarding student reading motivation. A qualitative approach was most appropriate for this aspect of the study due to the ability to examine the behaviors and understandings of motivated student reading behaviors within the context of the study site (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Critical analysis of both quantitative and qualitative findings concurrently allowed the researcher the potential to come to a stronger conclusion with the considerations that concurrent data analysis helped to eliminate potential weaknesses of the contrasting data approach (Gay et al, 2012).

Student participants were provided with controlled choice in novels for one unit of study as opposed to being assigned a class novel without a choice for another unit of study, a literary analysis unit. The two student groups in the student were created due to the enrollment of students in different levels of English I courses. Because the formation

of these groups is not something that could be manipulated by the researcher, the quasi-experimental design is most appropriate (Spatz, 2017). To reduce order effects, one group of student participants was provided with controlled novel choices in English class during the first unit of the Fall semester and then read, as a class, a teacher-assigned novel in the second unit, a literary analysis unit. This second unit stretched from the Fall semester into the beginning of the Spring semester. Another group of student participants followed the same process during the Fall semester, but in reverse order: all students read the same teacher-assigned novel for the first unit of study, followed by controlled choices in novels for the second unit of study.

For the qualitative measures of the study, eight English I teachers of the 9th grade English I students were recruited to participate in a semi-structured interview aimed at understanding the teachers' perceptions of student reading motivation. A designated campus administrator sent a consent form electronically to all the teachers which was returned by four of the eight teachers. Teachers completed the semi-structured interview in February of the Spring semester upon completion of both units and survey administrations by both groups of students. A follow-up focus group interview was conducted in April to further investigate teacher perceptions of student reading motivation and how teachers understood the impact that COVID-19 had on their students' reading motivation at the time of the study.

Novel Context and Background

When completing the controlled choice unit, students were provided choices from a set of novels, anywhere from six to eight, that all fell within the same genre or centered around a similar topic. The first group of participants in the study to complete the

controlled choice unit were able to select novels from a list of eight dystopian novels. All novels were selected for students to choose from because of the common dystopia genre and existence of relevant societal issues in each novel. The eight novels included: *Scythe* by Neal Shusterman, *Flawed* by Cecelia Ahern, *Children of Blood and Bone* by Tomi Adeyemi, *Nemesis* by Brendan Reichs, *Dread Nation* by Justina Ireland, *Dry* by Neal & Jarrod Shusterman, *Rot & Ruin* by Jonathan Maberry, and *This Mortal Coil* by Emily Suvada. Students were introduced to each book with the title and a brief synopsis by their English I teacher. Students also had the ability to read a sample of the book if they wished before selecting one to read for the unit of study. Students could purchase their own books, check them out from the school or community library, or borrow a copy from their English I teacher's classroom library. Most students opted to read a paper copy of the book while a smaller number of students read electronic books (e-books) on their phones or laptop computers. The controlled choice unit for this group of students took place from October to November of the Fall semester.

The second group of students to complete the controlled choice unit had six novels from which to choose. These six novels were selected because of a shared theme of loss or grief in each one. The six novels included: *House Arrest* by K.A. Holt, *Monster* by Walter Dean Myers, *Goodbye Days* by Jeff Zentner, *Legend* by Marie Lu, *Flawed* by Cecelia Ahren, and *Salt to the Sea* by Ruta Sepetys. Just as the other group of students were exposed to their choices for novels before the unit, this group of students was provided with a cover and synopsis for each novel as well as the opportunity to read a sample of the book before making their decision on which novel to read for the class unit. Students could choose to purchase their own book, read a copy from the school or

community library, or borrow one from their English I teacher's classroom library. Nearly all the students in this group chose to read their books in a hard copy or paper format. The controlled choice unit for this group of students took place from November to December of the Fall semester.

Reading assignments during the controlled choice unit were completed using the student's chosen book. Assignments for this unit for both groups were centered around general reading skills, habits, and practices. Students were regularly asked to confer and conference with their teacher about their book as well as complete assignments centered around the following skills: understanding the plot of the book, understanding and making connections to characters, looking for thematic ideas and patterns, finding and explaining text evidence indicative of the author's writing style, and finding evidence from the book to support understanding, inferences, and connections made.

For the literary analysis unit where all students read teacher assigned novels, assignments were directly related to the book the class read together. While this unit encompassed many of the skills students practiced in the controlled choice unit, the addition of more in-depth literature analysis skills was included such as plot analysis, literary devices and figurative language, and in-depth analysis of literary elements. Students completed the teacher assigned novel unit in opposite orders, so the group of students who first started the academic year with controlled choice, read their teacher-assigned novel, *To Kill a Mockingbird* by Harper Lee, from December to January. The group of students who completed the controlled choice unit second, had already completed their teacher assigned novel unit, *Ghost* by Jason Reynolds, in October of the Fall semester before selecting books for the controlled choice unit.

The culminating assignment for each unit was a one-page paper where students were able to display their understanding of the book based on a set of criteria required by the teacher. Some of the requirements of the one-page paper assignment included the following: a character trait for the main character and text evidence to support the trait, a thematic idea from the novel and evidence for the chosen idea; an example of figurative language and the author's purpose for using the language, etc. While all units included some form of test and/or quizzes throughout the duration of the unit, the one-page paper assignment was the culminating assignment for both groups for both units.

The two groups of students completed the units of study described above in opposing orders due to the assigned level of the course in which they were enrolled. Students in the group who completed the teacher-assigned novel unit first, hereafter referred to as group one, are labeled as on level academic students. The students in the group who started the academic year with the controlled choice unit, hereafter labeled as group two, are enrolled in an English I course labeled as advanced. For students to qualify for the advanced level English I course, they had to have made an 85 or higher in their 8th grade Language Arts the school year prior.

Reading Time During Units

For both the controlled choice and teacher-assigned novel units, students regularly had ten uninterrupted minutes of independent reading time at the beginning of class each day. During this time, students were only asked to focus on reading their book to monitor their own understanding. Occasionally students would have a posted focus question on the board to think about while reading, although this was never a formal assignment.

During the controlled choice unit, the designated independent reading time was always used for reading; however, during the teacher-assigned novel unit, students were able to use the first ten minutes of class to work on any missing work that they may have had from the previous day's assignments. Students were provided with reading schedules for both units. These reading schedules gave students deadlines for when they should be finished with various parts of the book they were reading. All books for the controlled choice unit were divided into five sections, and reading schedules were created to ensure students finished each section of their book by the stated deadline. The reading schedules for the teacher-assigned novels were organized by chapter rather than book section as all students were reading the same book.

For the controlled choice unit, any reading time students were given in addition to the first ten minutes of independent reading each day was also to be silent independent reading. In contrast, during the teacher-assigned novel unit there were reading days where teachers would read chapters out loud to their students together or play the audio of the chapter for students to follow along.

Researcher's Role

As the researcher is an employee at the site of the study, it is important to consider potential bias. There have been various steps undertaken to account and counteract potential bias due to researcher role including secure data collection and member checks.

To avoid potential conflict with student data collection, all student parental permission forms and teacher recruitment documents were sent to selected participations by a campus administration designated by the district research office. This alleviated the

pressure participants may have felt to participate in the study. Additionally, all consent forms were returned electronically to avoid being handed back to the researcher as well as for safety procedures in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Because the teacher participants who volunteered to participate in the study were co-workers of the researcher, member checks were completed upon finalization of the individual interviews in order to ensure that no potential bias due to previously established relationships was included in the interpreted interview results.

Participants

Participants in this study were ninth grade English I students and teachers at a public high school in Southeast Texas. All demographics were found on the district website. Approximately 115,070 students were enrolled in the district involved in the study as of October 30, 2020. Fifty-five percent of students in the district were labeled as economically disadvantaged. The high school in which the research study was conducted had 3,240 students enrolled in October of 2020. Twenty-five percent of students at the high school involved in the study were labeled as economically disadvantaged. All students participating in the study were enrolled in English I and categorized as 9th graders at the time of the study. Due to lack of district approval, no ethnicity information was gathered for the student study sample.

A small group of English I teachers was also included as participants in the study. There was a total of 206 teachers at the school study site during the 2019-2020 school year. Of these 206 staff members, 60.6% hold a bachelor's as their highest degree while 35.9% possess a Master's. English I teachers, the target population for this study, were

100% white and 100% female. Demographics for students at the district and school level

as well as all teachers at the school are included in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Demographics for Study Site

Ethnicity	District Student Percentage	School Student Percentage	School Teacher Percentage
Hispanic	45	27	11
White	22	48	78
African American	19	11	6
Asian	9	11	2
Multi-racial	3	3	2
American Indian	.5	.2	1
Pacific Islander	.1	.1	0

Purposeful convenience sampling was implemented to recruit student participants

enrolled in an English I course at the selected study site (Creswell, 2013). Because all

student participants invited to participate in the study were below the age of 21, parental

permission forms were sent out to parents of approximately 750 9th grade students

enrolled in English I at the study site by a designated administrator. The parental

permission form was accessible in English or Spanish. Due to safety procedures in place

because of the COVID-19 pandemic, parents were able to return the signed consent form

electronically. Only students whose parents returned the consent form were able to

participate in the survey administration process. Of the 750 potential contacts for student

participants, 210 parents returned the consent form for participation in the study. Of the

210 students who received the child assent form to participate in the study, 194 took the

first survey administration of the reading motivation survey and 190 initially responded

to the second survey administration. After removing responses for students who did not

assent to participate in the study and incomplete responses, a total of 172 students

successfully completed both reading motivation survey administrations. This, with a

margin of error slightly above 6%, is enough responses to provide a significant sample

size. As students had the ability to skip any questions they did not understand, there are

some questions that do not have data from the full sample size of 172. The sample of 172

students who completed both administrations of the ASRMQ successfully is reported by

gender and age in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Gender and Age for Student Participants Successfully Completing ASRMQ

Age	Male	Female	Other	Total
14	51	62	1	114
15	32	24	0	56
16	1	1	0	2

Group one, the group of students who completed the no choice unit first,

consisted of 17 students while group two, the group of students who completed the

choice unit first, contained 155 students. As outlined by Taherdoost (2017), five to 10

respondents are needed per item on the scale; for a 25-item survey, approximately 125 to

250 participants would be enough to ensure a sufficient sample size. The 172 total

participants in this research study are indicative of a sufficient sample size.

Eight teachers employed at the selected study site were teachers of an English I

course. Again, purposeful convenience sampling was appropriate here due to the need for

English I teachers that were teachers of record for the sampled student participants

(Creswell, 2013). All eight of these teachers were invited to participate in the qualitative

aspect of the study which consisted of one 30 to 45-minute semi-structured interview and a follow up focus group interview of 45 minutes to 1 hour. Teachers were electronically sent a consent form to participate in the study, which included background information on the purpose of the study, by a designated campus administrator. Due to safety procedures in place because of the COVID-19 pandemic, teachers were able to sign and return the consent form to the designated administrator electronically.

Four of the eight English I teachers agreed to participate in the study, and all four participants successfully completed both the semi-structured interviews and the follow-up focus group interview. Teacher participants were assigned pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. The four participants were referred to as Sally, Samantha, Audrey, and Maria. Table 3 details the demographics and characteristics for the four participants.

Table 3

Teacher Participant Demographics & Characteristics

Participant	Ethnicity	Years of Experience	Teacher Certification Route	Highest Degree Earned
Sally	White	2	Alternative	Bachelors
Samantha	White	28	Traditional	Masters
Audrey	White	21	Traditional	Masters
Maria	White	6	Traditional	Bachelors

All teacher participants were female, and all had been working together on the same team for the past two years. Samantha and Audrey both had master's degrees, but only Samantha's masters was in Educational Administration while Audrey's masters was in Community Counseling.

Measures and Instruments

   This section provides detailed information on the adapted reading motivation

survey used to collect student responses regarding reading motivation levels as well as

information on the structure and questions for the individual and focus group interviews.

Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire

   Student participants whose guardians gave parental consent were administered a

reading motivation scale adapted from the Adolescent Motivations for School Reading

(AMSR) scale and the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI). The survey consisted of 25

Likert-scale items measuring the motivational constructs of self-efficacy,

interest/intrinsic motivation, and autonomy (See Appendix A). The justification of the

selection of these constructs stemmed from the study's theoretical framework of self-

determination theory. To measure motivation, competence must be measured, but unless

accompanied by sense of autonomy cannot result in true motivation (Ryan & Deci,

2000). Items measuring the constructions of self-efficacy and interest were taken from

the AMSR. Cronbach's alphas for the self-efficacy and interest items on the original

survey were .89 and .92, respectively (Coddington, 2009). Items measuring constructs of

self-efficacy, interest, and autonomy were taken from the IMI scale. All items on

subscales in the IMI have a factor loading of at least 0.6 and no cross loadings above 0.4

(McAuley at al., 1987).

   The adapted survey used for this research study included 10 items measuring the

construction of self-efficacy; four items were adapted from the AMSR and six items were

adapted from the IMI. For the construct of intrinsic motivation/interest, eight items were

adapted from the AMSR while two items were taken from the IMI, 10 items in total. The

final construct of autonomy/perceived choice had all five items adapted from the IMI.

The 10 items for the self-efficacy construct were divided to assess self-efficacy when

reading the novel during the unit and self-efficacy while working on reading related

assignments during the unit. Six items assessed self-efficacy while reading while four

items assessed self-efficacy for the reading related assignments.

Pilot Study – Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire

This adapted reading motivation survey was piloted with a small group of

teachers and adolescents in September, prior to the first survey administration, to ensure

clarity in item and response wording. Teachers who provided feedback to the researcher

on the wording of the items and responses were able to identify key words in various

question that were unclear, vague, or misleading. The adolescents who took the survey as

part of the pilot study were not students who would be part of the research sample, but

participants close in age and familiar with the notion of choice in reading in the English

classroom. These adolescents provided feedback that encouraged the researcher to

shorten the wording of the Likert-response items to ensure clarity and conciseness for

student use. Scale reliability statistics were analyzed upon completion of survey

administrations for the student participants in the study and can be found in Chapter IV.

Carle, Jaffee, Vaughan, and Eder (2009) stated that when questions in a survey

are created to measure only the construct that they seek to measure, validity and

reliability is high. Therefore, the adapted survey only aimed to measure the reading

motivation constructs of self-efficacy/competence, interest/intrinsic motivation, and

autonomy. All 25 items on the survey were closed-ended questions answered with a 4-

point Likert-type scale for responses. The Likert response options were as follows: 1 =

Not at All True; 2 = Somewhat True; 3 = Mostly True; 4 = Very True. The titled used for the reading motivation scale in this study was the Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire (ASRMQ).

Teacher Interview Measures

The teacher interviews conducted in this study were semi-structured as the researcher aimed to explore teacher perceptions of student reading motivation during the two units in comparison for the study. For this reason, the individual interview questions (see Appendix B) only served as a guide as questions were adjusted, skipped, and added as the interview occurred (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). All individual teacher interviews were conducted via a video conferencing tool, and only recorded audio was used for the transcription and data analysis process.

Upon completion of the data analysis and member checks on individual teacher interviews, teacher participants were invited to participate in a focus group interview to elaborate on some of the themes and ideas that emerged from the individual interview, most notably, the effect that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on student reading motivation. All teachers agreed to participate in the 45 minute focus group interview which was also semi-structured due to the researcher's need to respond to the responses mentioned in the focus group and the new ideas on the topic that emerged (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). See Appendix C for a list of guiding questions for the semi-structure focus group interview.

Procedures

Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire

Identifying information from parental consent forms was coded prior to the first survey administration to prioritize student confidentiality. All student names were assigned a code to ensure no identifying information would be attached to the participants' survey responses. Parental consent forms and coding keys were kept separately from all collected data as well as being accessible only through password protected software. Once codes were assigned and survey administrations were completed, the identifying information was deleted. Once students were assigned a code, all student participants received a paper through their English I class with their unique code, a link to the survey, and a QR code for accessing the survey as well (See Appendix D). Due to district safety and learning procedures in class for the COVID-19 pandemic, some student participants were exclusively online learners. In this case, these students received their unique coded survey instructions paper electronically through an online learning platform in use at the school site. This process was repeated in the same manner for the second survey administration. Students received the same code, but the link and QR code for the survey was changed to reflect a duplicate survey for the second demonstration. Both survey administrations and data collection procedures were completed using Qualtrics. Prior to answering entering their codes or answering any questions about their books, students read a child assent form and agreed to participate in the study. If students did not agree to participate, no further questions were displayed to them. Students had the ability to skip any questions they did not understand or did not feel comfortable answering.

The data collection process for the first survey administration took place upon completion of the first unit of study in the Fall semester of 2020. Both groups of students, group one and group two, completed their first survey administration on the week of November 9th – November 13th as both groups of students finished their first novel unit at the same point in time. Students were given their survey papers in English I by their English I teacher on Monday, November 9th. While most students completed the survey during the first 10 minutes of class that day, students had the option to complete the survey at any point during that week with a deadline of Friday, November 13th. Group one was instructed to answer the survey questions about their teacher assigned novel while Group two was instruction to answer the survey questions about their controlled choice novel. The instructions for this aspect of the survey were included on the paper with the code and survey link. Students gave these papers back to their teachers upon completing the survey, and papers were destroyed to retain student confidentiality. Student papers that were uploaded online were individually assigned to students so that no other students would be able to see the survey information.

The second survey administration data collection process took place at two different points in time for the two different groups of students. Group one completed their controlled choice novel unit in mid-December of 2020. These students were administered the second survey administration in the same manner as the first. Students received a new paper with their same code and second survey administration link and QR code on Tuesday, December 15th. While most students in Group one completed this survey administration in the first 10 minutes of class on Tuesday, December 15th, they had until the end of the week if they needed. Group two finished their teacher-assigned

novel until at the end of January 2021. This group of students completed their second survey administration on January 27th, 2021. While most students completed the survey on either January 27th, 28th, or 29th, they had until February 3rd of the following week to complete if needed. No more student responses were accepted after this date. Students in both groups gave their survey papers back to their teachers upon completing the survey, and papers were destroyed to retain student confidentiality. Papers for online students were individually assigned so that only the student participant had access to their survey information.

Teacher Interviews

Once institution IRB and district IRB were granted, the researcher had an approved district administrator distribute an adult consent form electronically to all English I teachers on the selected campus site. Teachers who were interested in participating in the study returned the consent form to the designated administrator, who then shared the consent forms with the researcher. Teacher participants were contacted at the end of January upon completion of the final survey administration for students to set up a date and time to participate in the semi-structured individual interview. All individual interviews took place from February 1st – February 8th of 2021 between the consenting teacher participants and the researcher.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all interviews were conducted virtually through an online conferencing platform. Each interview lasted approximately 30-45 minutes. The interview content was centered around the teacher's perceptions of student reading motivation. Sample interview questions can be found in Appendix B; however, due to the semi-structured nature of the interview itself, not all questions were asked of all

participants; the nature of the interview was specific to each individual's responses and new topics or ideas that emerged during the interview as is the nature of a semi-structured interview (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2013). All interviews were transcribed using NVivo software. Recordings of all interviews were destroyed upon completion of transcription.

Upon completion of transcription of the individual interviews, member checks were completed to ensure internal validity and credibility of qualitative data in this study. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) describe member checks to solicit feedback on the preliminary and emerging findings of interviews to lessen researcher bias. All data sent to teacher participants was the researcher's interpretation of what was discussed in the individual interview. Participants had the opportunity to delete, correct, or elaborate on any of the information presented to them in the preliminary findings. Edits were made by the researcher as necessary. This was the only access participants had to the interview data as they were not privy to the analysis and coding schemes of the researcher.

Based on emergent themes from individual interviews, it was determined that a focus group interview of all four teachers would be beneficial to explore in more depth the effect that the COVID-19 pandemic had on student reading motivation at the school site. Gay et al. (2012) supports the approach that focus groups can allow researchers to gain a collective understanding of a particular issue or topic based on the responses of shared individuals.

All four teacher participants were contacted via email by the researcher to gain consent to participate in the focus group; all four teacher participants agreed to a 45-minute focus group. The focus group interview was conducted two months after the

individual interviews, in early April of 2021, via an online video conferencing platform, but only the audio recording was used for transcription purposes. A semi-structured approach was taken for the focus group to allow the responses of the participants to drive the researcher's questions (Merriam & Tisdell 2016; Creswell, 2013). Nvivo software was used to transcribe the audio of the focus group, and the recording of the focus group interview was deleted upon transcription.

Data Analysis

This data analysis section is organized by first presenting the data analysis process for the quantitative aspect of the study, the ASRMQ followed by the data analysis process for the qualitative aspect of the study, the teacher interviews and focus group.

Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire

Data analysis took place upon completion of both survey administrations by both groups of students. Data from student ASRMQ responses were entered into an SPSS dataset. Coding for the responses was as follows: 1 = Not at All True; 2 = Somewhat True; 3 = Mostly True; 4 = Very True. Six of the 25 items on the scale were reverse coded in SPSS before running any statistical procedures. Reliability, Cronbach Alpha, of the ASRMQ was calculated for the overall scale as well as each set of constructs to determine internal consistency.

Additionally, descriptive statistics were run using SPSS to examine the means for each item, construct, and overall scale responses from students in each group for both the choice novel unit and the teacher-assigned (no choice) novel unit. To determine if the difference in means between the choice and no choice survey administrations was statistically significant, a paired samples *t*-test was run using *SPSS*. The *p* value was

examined to determine if the null hypothesis could be rejected. If the null hypothesis were rejected, this would indicate that choice in novels had a significant impact on student reading motivation.

Teacher Interviews

Individual teacher interviews were transcribed and initially coded using directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) to establish similar categories and then coded for themes. Directed content analysis allowed the researcher to code for themes that align with the theoretical framework of self-determination theory and the lens of culturally responsive pedagogy. The justification for this approach was that the responses of teacher interviews aim to validate and extend the established theoretical framework of the study (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

Initial coding for each interview transcript was completed in the order in which interviews were conducted. All coding was completed by hand without the aid of any software or coding system. Within the interview transcripts, responses were identified and highlighted that aligned with the codes determined by alignment the theoretical framework and lens: established interest, perceived choice/autonomy, and social-contextual events (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Any noteworthy responses not covered under these categories were highlighted and established with a new code. Trustworthiness of this approach was implemented in that all noteworthy interviews responses were highlighted before assigning any code. This ensures that the relevant responses were included in analysis even if they did not fit an initial code established (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The coding process was iterative, and when codes were established, they were compared to existing codes and responses to ensure connections and relationships among

the data were aligned (Urquhart, 2013). This theoretical coding process was repeated with the focus group interview responses.

Results from quantitative and qualitative data sources were compared and triangulated to increase the validity of the triangulation mixed methods design. (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006). The research design and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data concurrently upon completion of data collection allowed for critical analysis to determine similar findings (Gay et al. 2012). Statistical trends from the survey responses were compared to the qualitative themes emergent from the interviews. After combination and triangulation of the two data types allowed for increased reliability of the conclusions.

Ethical Concerns

This study was a minimal risk study in that all English I students and teachers at the school site participated in each described unit regardless of whether they choose to participate in the study or not. IRB permission was granted prior to seeking district permission. District permission was obtained prior to reaching out to potential subjects for the study. Parental permission was obtained prior to child assent, teacher consent was gained, and no student or teacher was required to participate in the study. All participants could withdraw consent at any time during the study and were not pressured to complete the survey administrations.

All consent forms adhered to U.S. federal guidelines and included "a fair explanation of procedures, descriptions of risks reasonably to be expected, a description of benefits reasonably to be expected, an offer of inquiry regarding the procedures, and instruction that the person is free to withdraw" (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008,

p. 75). All confidential information was kept securely for the duration of the study and will be destroyed upon completion of study analysis and subsequent writing, not to exceed the next five years.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a guide to the research process that was followed to collect and analyze data that answered the research questions. The research design, participant information, measures, procedures, and data analysis steps were all outlined in this chapter. A triangulation mixed methods design approach, guided by the theoretical framework of SDT and the lens of CRP provided a direction for the data analysis steps to gain a well-rounded, in-depth understanding of student reading motivation from both student input and teacher perspectives. Chapter IV will provide the relevant findings based on the previously outlined methodology.

Chapter IV

Findings

This purpose of this chapter is to present the analyzed data from both qualitative and quantitative data sources. The findings are organized by quantitative and qualitative data collection. This also aligns with the research questions presented in the study. (RQ1) When students are provided with a choice in novels, is student reading motivation affected? (RQ2) What is the difference in student reading motivation levels when students are provided with choice in novels versus having no choice in novels?; (RQ3) What are teacher perceptions of student reading motivation when students are provided with a choice in novels? Research questions 1 and 2 are addressed by the findings in the quantitative section of the findings while research question 3 is addressed by the qualitative teacher interviews. All findings are presented using the framework of SDT as well as through the lens of CRP.

Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire

This section outlines the findings for the quantitative data collection process including reliability analysis, descriptive and inferential statistics.

Reliability Analysis

As the ASRMQ was adapted from two different reading motivation surveys, reliability analysis was run using SPSS to determine the overall accuracy of the scale. Table 4 contains the Cronbach Alpha for the overall scale when administered for the choice unit administration for both groups as well as the Cronbach Alpha for each construct on the scale.

Table 4

Cronbach's Alpha for ASRMQ

	Self-Efficacy for Books	Intrinsic Motivation	Autonomy	Self-Efficacy for Reading Assignments	Overall Scale
Choice Unit	.80	.88	.65	.87	.91
No Choice Unit	.78	.91	.72	.91	.92

The Cronbach Alphas for each construct in the ASRMQ were lower than the reported Cronbach Alpha for the overall scale. The construct of Autonomy had the lowest Cronbach Alpha each survey administration at .65 and .72 respectively. Three of the five items assessing this construct were worded reversely and needed to be reverse coded to run any statistical analyses. This could attribute to the lower reliability results for this construct. Despite the slight differences between the choice and no choice unit, both numbers are significant indicators for internal consistency and reliable results. The differences in these reliability measures could be attributed to unbiased student responses to items regarding the teacher-assigned (no choice) novel unit. Overall, the scale is a highly reliable instrument to use to assess reading motivation.

Descriptive & Inferential Statistics

Descriptive statistics were reported for the items on scale for the after-choice unit as displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for All Items on ASRMQ for After Choice Novel Unit

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Std.		Std.
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Error	Statistic	Error
1. I was good at remembering the plot of the book I read in this unit.	172	3.27	.764	-.814	.185	.188	.368
2. I easily understood what was happening when I read the book for this unit.	172	3.46	.687	-1.001	.185	.209	.368
3. I felt like I was a successful reader (understood the book, could answer questions easily about it) for English class during this unit.	172	3.39	.753	-1.115	.185	.796	.368
4. I could read the book in this unit without too much difficulty.	172	3.57	.650	-1.622	.185	2.953	.368
5. After reading the books in this unit for awhile, I felt skilled at reading.	172	2.78	.966	-.134	.185	-1.087	.368
6. I couldn't read the book for this unit very successfully.	172	1.23	.573	**2.792**	.185	**7.880**	.368
7. I enjoyed reading the book for this unit.	171	3.37	.805	-1.057	.186	.214	.369
8. I enjoyed reading the book in this unit because it made me think.	171	2.62	.928	-.021	.186	-.878	.369
9. When I had extra time in English class, I enjoyed reading my book for this unit.	171	2.88	1.069	-.365	.186	-1.216	.369
10. I felt successful when reading my book for this unit.	171	2.90	.886	-.421	.186	-.561	.369
11. I enjoyed the challenge of reading during this unit.	171	2.71	.956	-.200	.186	-.905	.369
12. I enjoyed finding a new book to read for English during this unit (if I finished my first book)	171	2.65	1.124	-.102	.186	-1.390	.369
13. Reading the book during this unit was boring.	171	1.43	.767	1.852	.186	2.844	.369
14. Reading the book during this unit was a waste of time.	171	1.22	.602	**3.144**	.186	**10.195**	.369
15. I would describe the book in this unit as interesting.	171	3.31	.746	-.746	.186	-.230	.369
16. While I was reading the book in this unit, I was thinking about how much I enjoyed it.	171	2.71	.968	-.170	.186	-.969	.369
17. I had a choice about what book I read during this unit.	171	3.62	.737	-1.940	.186	2.967	.369
18. I didn't really have a choice regarding what book I read during this unit.	171	1.20	.527	**3.351**	.186	**13.119**	.369
19. I read the book in this unit only because I no choice in what book to read.	171	1.18	.539	**3.312**	.186	**11.239**	.369
20. I read the specific book for this unit because I wanted to read it.	171	3.27	.958	-.983	.186	-.329	.369
21. I finished reading the book in this unit because I had to, not because I wanted to.	171	1.77	.914	1.123	.186	.485	.369
22. I think I was successful at the book activities in this unit	171	3.35	.723	-.928	.186	.520	.369
23. Compared to other students, I think I did well on the book activities during this unit.	170	3.02	.920	-.682	.186	-.338	.370

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
24. I am satisfied with my performance on the book activities during this unit.	171	3.27	.810	-.732	.186	-.495	.369
25. I was successful at the book activities during this unit.	171	3.35	.730	-.823	.186	-.007	.369
Valid N (listwise)	170						

Note: Skewness higher than 2 and kurtosis higher than 7 are shown in bold.

The descriptive statistics above provide the number of participants who answered each question, the mean response for that item, the standard deviation, the skewness, and kurtosis for all items upon completion of the controlled choice novel unit. In Table 5, the skewness and kurtosis levels are within normal ranges for all items except for items 6, 14, 18, and 19. The level of skewness for these items is bigger than two while kurtosis is above seven. This indicates that the data for these items is negatively skewed. This indicates that these items received many of the same or similar responses from participants. For example, as the mean response on item 6 was 1.23, many participants did not agree with this statement. This is the same trend observed in the responses for items 14, 18, and 19.

The same descriptive statistics were reported for the items on scale for the no choice unit. These descriptive statics can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for All Items on ASRMQ for No Choice Novel Unit

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
1. I was good at remembering the plot of the book I read in this unit.	172	3.08	.768	-.454	.185	-.315	.368
2. I easily understood what was happening when I read the book for this unit.	172	3.08	.780	-.432	.185	-.436	.368

	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Skew	SE	Kurt	SE
3. I felt like I was a successful reader (understood the book, could answer questions easily about it) for English class during this unit.	172	3.03	.841	-.473	.185	-.508	.368
4. I could read the book in this unit without too much difficulty.	172	3.26	.805	-.907	.185	.290	.368
5. After reading the books in this unit for awhile, I felt skilled at reading.	172	2.67	.937	-.112	.185	-.888	.368
6. I couldn't read the book for this unit very successfully.	172	1.45	.846	1.922	.185	2.727	.368
7. I enjoyed reading the book for this unit.	170	2.88	.966	-.399	.186	-.866	.370
8. I enjoyed reading the book in this unit because it made me think.	170	2.48	1.033	.145	.186	-1.130	.370
9. When I had extra time in English class, I enjoyed reading my book for this unit.	170	2.25	.942	.246	.186	-.848	.370
10. I felt successful when reading my book for this unit.	170	2.64	.933	-.065	.186	-.886	.370
11. I enjoyed the challenge of reading during this unit.	170	2.52	.980	-.050	.186	-.991	.370
12. I enjoyed finding a new book to read for English during this unit (if I finished my first book)	170	2.41	1.024	.074	.186	-1.118	.370
13. Reading the book during this unit was boring.	170	1.77	.930	1.100	.186	.327	.370
14. Reading the book during this unit was a waste of time.	170	1.34	.745	**2.403**	.186	5.144	.370
15. I would describe the book in this unit as interesting.	170	2.99	.904	-.512	.186	-.599	.370
16. While I was reading the book in this unit, I was thinking about how much I enjoyed it.	170	2.25	.991	.284	.186	-.961	.370
17. I had a choice about what book I read during this unit.	169	1.24	.659	**2.719**	.187	6.440	.371
18. I didn't really have a choice regarding what book I read during this unit.	169	3.46	1.017	-1.594	.187	.958	.371
19. I read the book in this unit only because I no choice in what book to read.	169	2.67	1.158	-.138	.187	-1.458	.371
20. I read the specific book for this unit because I wanted to read it.	169	1.79	.858	.756	.187	-.364	.371
21. I finished reading the book in this unit because I had to, not because I wanted to.	169	2.32	1.104	.332	.187	-1.210	.371
22. I think I was successful at the book activities in this unit	168	2.98	.837	-.276	.187	-.841	.373
23. Compared to other students, I think I did well on the book activities during this unit.	168	2.82	.939	-.237	.187	-.926	.373
24. I am satisfied with my performance on the book activities during this unit.	168	2.90	.970	-.392	.187	-.917	.373
25. I was successful at the book activities during this unit.	168	2.98	.854	-.421	.187	-.568	.373
Valid N (listwise)	168						

Note: Skewness higher than 2 are shown in bold.

The descriptive statistics above provide the number of participants who answered each question, the mean response for that item, the standard deviation, the skewness, and kurtosis for all items upon completion of the teacher-assigned (no choice) novel unit. In Table 6, the skewness and kurtosis levels are within normal ranges for all items except for items 14, and 17. The level of skewness for these two items is bigger than two while kurtosis is in the normal range. This indicates that the data for these two items is negatively skewed. While most participants realized that the book for this unit was one that they did not have a choice in reading, as indicated by the mean responses on item 17, they still felt as though reading the book was not a waste of their time as revealed on the skewed responses for item 14.

To analyze the differences most efficiently in scores from the after choice and no choice novel survey administrations, all responses for each construct were totaled together to create a sum for each construct. These sums were used to compare the means and run paired samples *t* test on the constructs and survey total between both administrations. The descriptive statistics for these sums can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for After Choice and No Choice Administrations by Construct

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
After Choice – SE Book	172	1.50	4.00	3.3731	.52166
No Choice – SE Book	172	1.00	4.00	3.1105	.57005
After Choice - IM	171	1.30	4.00	3.0491	.62227
No Choice – IM	170	1.00	4.00	2.7318	.69584

After Choice - Autonomy	171	1.40	4.00	3.5485	.48910
No Choice – Autonomy	169	1.00	4.00	1.9183	.66741
After Choice – SE Assignments	171	1.00	4.00	3.2456	.67762
No Choice – SE Assignments	168	1.00	4.00	2.9182	.79975
After Choice Total	172	1.88	4.00	3.2550	.46075
No Choice Total	172	1.32	3.72	2.6887	.52867

Note. SE = Self-Efficacy; IM=Intrinsic Motivation

Upon completion of the analysis of descriptive statistics, various paired samples *t* tests were run using SPSS to determine if the differences in means for the survey results were statistically significant between the after choice and the no choice survey administrations. Table 8 displays the results of the *t* tests for each construct of the scale as well as the scale total. Both groups one and two are included in the results of this analysis.

Table 8

Paired Samples T Test for After Choice and No Choice ASRMQ Responses

Construct		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Self-Efficacy of Reading Novel	After Choice – No Choice	.31686	.54958	.04190	.23414	.39958	7.561	171	.000
Intrinsic Motivation	After Choice – No Choice	.29941	.67581	.05199	.19678	.40204	5.759	168	.000

Autonomy	After Choice – No Choice	1.45357	1.06518	.08218	1.29133	1.61582	17.688	167	.000
Self-Efficacy of Reading Assignments	After Choice – No Choice	.38323	.66642	.05157	.28142	.48505	7.431	166	.000
Scale Total	After Choice – No Choice	.54621	.54157	.04129	.46470	.62772	13.227	171	.000

The results indicated that the mean for the construct of self-efficacy when reading their novel during the controlled choice unit ($M = 3.37$, $SD = .52$) was significantly greater than the mean for self-efficacy when reading their novel during the teacher-assigned novel unit ($M = 3.11$, $SD = .57$), $t(171) = 7.56$, $p < .01$. The construct of intrinsic motivation for the after-choice unit ($M = 3.05$, $SD = .62$) was significantly higher than the construct results for the no choice unit ($M = 2.73$, $SD = .70$), $t(168) = 5.76$, $p < .01$. The autonomy construct had the highest difference in mean from the after choice unit ($M = 3.55$, $SD = .49$) to the no choice unit administration ($M = 1.92$, $SD = .67$), $t(167) = 17.69$, $p < 0.1$. Self-efficacy for reading assignment units was also higher for the after choice unit ($M = 3.25$, $SD = .68$) than it was for the no choice unit ($M = 2.92$, $SD = .80$), $t(166) = 7.43$, $p < 0.1$.

For the overall scale total, the after-choice administration ($M = 3.26$, $SD = .46$) was found to be significantly higher than the no choice administration ($M = 2.69$, $SD = .53$), $t(171) = 13.23$, $p < 0.1$.

While the overall results of the paired samples t test produced statistically significant results for each construct as well as the scale overall, it was necessary to examine the comparison of survey administrations for each respective unit by groups. Examining the results by group would allow the researcher to be able to determine if

order of unit administration plays at potential factor in the results. Additionally, because the two groups were also different levels of English I courses, any differences in the results would need to be considered with this factor in mind as this is something over which the researcher had no control.

Group one (n=17) completed the no choice survey administration first at the time that group two (n=155) completed the after-choice survey administration. Then each group moved on to a new unit of study, opposite of the other group, and completed the second administration of the survey about 6 weeks apart from each other. The descriptive statistics for the group comparison by administration can be found in Table 9 below.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for ASRMQ Administrations by Group and Construct

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Group 1	After Choice -SE Reading	17	1.67	4.00	2.9706	.64344
	No Choice - SE Reading	17	2.67	3.67	3.2451	.31246
	After Choice - IM	17	1.60	3.90	2.9824	.57362
	No Choice – IM	16	1.50	3.70	2.9187	.67451
	After Choice – Autonomy	17	2.20	4.00	3.5294	.48446
	No Choice – Autonomy	16	1.20	4.00	2.5625	.85235
	After Choice – SE Assignments	17	1.50	4.00	2.8529	.70743
	No Choice – SE Assignments	16	2.00	4.00	3.1875	.62249

25

	After Choice Total	17	2.32	3.96	3.0685	.44406
	No Choice Total	17	2.08	3.48	2.9667	.41756
Group 2	After Choice -SE Reading	155	1.50	4.00	3.4172	.48920
	No Choice - SE Reading	155	1.00	4.00	3.0957	.59031
	After Choice - IM	154	1.30	4.00	3.0565	.62872
	No Choice – IM	154	1.00	4.00	2.7123	.69727
	After Choice – Autonomy	154	1.40	4.00	3.5506	.49113
	No Choice – Autonomy	153	1.00	3.60	1.8510	.61023
	After Choice – SE Assignments	154	1.00	4.00	3.2890	.66244
	No Choice – SE Assignments	152	1.00	4.00	2.8898	.81263
	After Choice Total	155	1.88	4.00	3.2755	.45932
	No Choice Total	155	1.32	3.72	2.6582	.53175

Note. SE = Self-Efficacy; IM=Intrinsic Motivation

After splitting the dataset in SPSS to compare the descriptive statistics for both groups, paired samples *t* tests were run for each construct and for the survey overall to examine the differences in means for each of the respective groups. The results of the paired samples *t* tests can be referenced in Table 10.

Table 10

Paired Samples T Test for After Choice and No Choice ASRMQ Responses by Group

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Group 1	Self-Efficacy of Reading Novel	-.27451	.48211	.11693	-.52239	-.02663	-2.348	16	**.032**
	Intrinsic Motivation	.06250	.50050	.12512	-.20420	.32920	.500	15	.625
	Autonomy	.95000	.81486	.20372	.51579	1.38421	4.663	15	**.000**
	Self-Efficacy of Reading Assignments	-.34375	.74652	.18663	-.74154	.05404	-1.842	15	.085
	Scale Total	.10186	.45397	.11010	-.13155	.33527	.925	16	.369
Group 2	Self-Efficacy of Reading Novel	.32151	.55768	.04479	.23302	.41000	7.177	154	**.000**
	Intrinsic Motivation	.33725	.68180	.05512	.22835	.44616	6.119	152	**.000**
	Autonomy	1.70658	.71573	.05805	1.59188	1.82128	29.397	151	**.000**
	Self-Efficacy of Reading Assignments	.38742	.65998	.05371	.28129	.49354	7.213	150	**.000**
	Scale Total	.61729	.50280	.04039	.53751	.69707	15.285	154	**.000**

Note. P values less than .05 are shown in bold.

The results of the paired samples *t* test as shown in Table 10 vary from the paired samples *t* tests that were run not accounting for the two separate groups. All the paired samples *t* tests for each construct for group two remained statistically significant, all with *p* values less than .001. However, the only constructs that reported statistically significant results for group one were self-efficacy of reading novel and autonomy. Self-efficacy of

reading novel for after choice ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 6.43$) reported significantly lower

responses than the no choice administration ($M = 3.25$, $SD = .31$), $t(16) = -2.35$, $p < .05$.

This was a noted difference in all other paired sample t test for this construct, as group

one participants rated self-efficacy of reading novel higher when completing the teacher-

assigned (no choice) unit. Autonomy results for the after-choice administration ($M =$

3.53, $SD = .48$) differed significantly from the no choice administration construct

responses ($M = 2.56$, $SD = .85$), $t(15) = 4.66$, $p < 0.01$.

In order to determine which construct on the ASMRQ had the largest difference

in scores between the after choice and no choice administrations, effect sizes were

examined by construct and separated by each group administration. Table 11 below

displays the results of Cohen's d effect size.

Table 11

Effect Sizes for Paired Samples T Test by Group and Construct

				Point	95% Confidence Interval	
			Standardizer[a]	Estimate	Lower	Upper
Group 1	Self-Efficacy of Reading Novel	Cohen's d	.48211	-.569	-1.076	-.048
		Hedges' correction	.49379	-.556	-1.050	-.047
	Intrinsic Motivation	Cohen's d	.50050	.125	-.369	.615
		Hedges' correction	.51346	.122	-.360	.599
	Autonomy	Cohen's d	.81486	**1.166**	.513	1.796
		Hedges' correction	.83597	**1.136**	.500	1.750
	Self-Efficacy of Reading Assignments	Cohen's d	.74652	-.460	-.970	.063
		Hedges' correction	.76585	-.449	-.946	.061
	Scale Total	Cohen's d	.45397	.224	-.261	.703

		Hedges' correction	.46497	.219	-.254	.686
Group 2	Self-Efficacy of Reading Novel	Cohen's d	.55768	.577	.406	.746
		Hedges' correction	.55904	.575	.405	.744
	Intrinsic Motivation	Cohen's d	.68180	.495	.326	.662
		Hedges' correction	.68349	.493	.325	.660
	Autonomy	Cohen's d	.71573	**2.384**	2.071	2.695
		Hedges' correction	.71752	**2.378**	2.066	2.689
	Self-Efficacy of Reading Assignments	Cohen's d	.65998	.587	.413	.759
		Hedges' correction	.66164	.586	.412	.757
	Scale Total	Cohen's d	.50280	**1.228**	1.018	1.435
		Hedges' correction	.50403	**1.225**	1.015	1.432

Note: Effect sizes with a strong effect (>1.00) are in bold.

The results of the effect sizes for each construct by group as displayed in Table 11 reveal that the relationship between choice and autonomy is extremely strong (Muijs, 2011) as the Cohen's d for autonomy in both groups was above one. The effect sizes for other scale constructs in group one were weak while the results for the effect sizes by construct other than autonomy and the scale total in group two were modest (*d* = 0.21 - 0.50) or moderate (*d* = 0.51 – 1.00) with self-efficacy (*d* = .577, .587) having a higher effect size than intrinsic motivation (*d* = .495).

Overall, the ASMRQ proved to be a reliable scale used to measure student reading motivation using the constructs of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and autonomy as laid out in SDT framework (Ryan & Deci, 2000). As a whole sample, both groups included, participants' responses on the after choice ASMRQ were significantly higher than their responses on the no choice ASMRQ which addresses the first research

question of this study. However, when separated by group, group one only revealed

statistically significant results on the constructs of self-efficacy in reading and autonomy

while group two displayed a significant difference in all constructs and overall when

taking the after choice ASMRQ as compared to the no choice ASMRQ administration.

To interpret these results through this theoretical framework and within the lens of CRP,

qualitative data will be analyzed, and Chapter V will build a case for the connection and

triangulation of the data collected through the theories established.

Teacher Interviews

The four individual teacher interviews conducted with English I teachers served

as the primary source of qualitative data along with a follow-up semi-structured focus

group interview with all four English I teachers and the researcher. After the individual

interviews were completed, they were transcribed and coded using directed content

analysis for themes and patterns that align with the theoretical framework. Sample

interview questions for both the individual interviews and the focus group can be found

in Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively.

All transcriptions were hand coded, identifying themes that align with the

theoretical framework of SDT including intrinsic motivation or interest and socio-

contextual factors such as collaboration and discussion. (Ryan & Deci, 2000). After

applying SDT codes to all text identified as relevant, additional codes were added to the

relevant pieces of transcript. This process was iterative as new relevant text was noted in

each individual interview. These themes were then categorized to match the sections of:

Relevant and Established Interest, Shared Experiences and Collaboration, and COVID-19

Impacts on Reading Motivation.

To improve the reliability of the individual interview analysis process, member checks were completed upon completion of transcribing, categorizing, and coding interviews. Merriam & Tisdell (2016) outlines members checks as a method to ensure coding and themes are free of bias and researcher personal preference. As part of the focus group interview process, member checks were a part of the question asking process. The researcher asked for confirmatory responses after summarizing ideas brought up and discussed by the focus group. Both measures ensured reliable interview analysis results.

Motivated Reading Behaviors

While not a theme derived from the transcript, it is important to note the observed reading behaviors that teachers deemed as motivated behaviors. The behaviors noted by the teacher participants in the study align with SDT's description of authentic motivation in that those who are authentically motivated display "interest, excitement, and confidence, which in turn is manifest both as enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity" (Deci & Ryan, 1991; Sheldon, Ryan et al., 1997). Three of the four participants gave explicit examples for what they would categorize as motived reading behaviors in their classroom. Sally commented that she noticed during the first 10 minutes of independent reading day that students need less reminders to read when they are able to choose their books "Most of them already have their novels out from home and they're eager and ready to read…it's not telling them over and over to get out your novel."

Audrey provided quite a few different examples of what she saw in her students when asked "When you say you think they're more motivated to read, what does that

look like in your classroom?" She mentioned phones being put away instead of being used during independent reading time, remembering to bring their book instead of forgetting it at home, and making progress in the book they are reading rather than being on the same page for multiple consecutive days. She also added an additional characteristic of reading motivation in her students.

> *And my personal favorite is when you call their name and ask them something, and they completely don't hear you. It's not because they have Airpods in, it's because they're so into the book that they don't hear what's going on.*

Maria noticed that her students exhibited more excitement over reading during the controlled choice unit. She attributed the excitement that she saw to the fact that other students in the class were reading the same book and they were able to talk about their books with each other (Mercurio, 2005) Maria made an addition to the motivated reading behaviors she sees during the controlled choice unit in that she knows students are motivated to read when "even though we're not talking about the books as a whole class, they finish their books in a week and a half when we have five weeks for the whole unit." These observed motivated behaviors speak to the central tenants of CRP in that they allow teachers a pathway to help students access skills that that can benefit them academically (Ladson-Billings, 1995). In these situations, all teachers who commented on motivated reading behaviors mentioned they appeared more regularly during the controlled choice unit.

Shared Experience & Collaboration

One theme that occurred repeatedly throughout the coding process was the idea of shared experiences to what teachers deemed motivated reading and the success of a

literature unit. These shared experiences manifested in a variety of ways in teachers' classrooms, some through small group discussion and excitement over shared books as noted in Maria's response earlier, but also in the shared experience that comes with conferencing with students one on one as well as a whole class shared experience (Mercurio, 2005). Ladson-Billings (1995) places emphasis on a community of learners as demonstrated in teachers proficient in implementing CRP which can help students create a bond, learn collaboratively, and eventually teach each other and hold each other accountable.

Sally shared that when she can read with her students, that a sense of teacher enjoyment follows as well as being to hold students accountable. "I personally enjoy reading with them just so that I know that they're reading, but also we get to talk about it." Sally referenced this same idea again when talking about the teacher-assigned novel that group one read at the beginning of the academic year. "I think that the fact that we read it together made a bigger difference. Shared reading is what seemed to keep them motivated rather than the content of the book itself." A response from Maria also supported this idea of a shared experienced when asked about her two favorite texts to teach, *The Crucible* and *Romeo and Juliet*. "The common thread between those two is that we read them together. They were plays and shared experience." While this concept Sally and Maria discussed referred to the idea of a class text, Sally also reiterated this idea when it came to the controlled choice unit for both groups one and two.

> *Some of them have asked me if I've read this book or what happens next or they*
> *want to give something away, or they just want to talk about it after class. And so*
> *those, I think, are things that tell me that they're actually enjoying reading.*

This idea of a shared experience that helps motivate students to read is a component of SDT in that "social-contextual events that conduce toward feelings of competence during action can enhance intrinsic motivation for that action" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 70). Mercurio (2005) emphasizes the role of shared experiences in building students reading motivation. Students are likely to enjoy a text more and in turn be motivated to read the text when they can discuss with those around them.

Shared experiences between student and teacher is another component of choice in reading that Samantha emphasized as being important in that a teacher should have read a book that they want to teach to be able to facilitate conversation with students regarding the book. This could be done either with a whole class, small groups, or individuals reading various books, but an established relationship between teacher and student must be present as Samantha shared.

> So then you can have conversations as a whole class where you've built trust between the individual student and the teacher. Now, you can build trust as a community about where they feel comfortable, where they can share their ideas and they can talk about what they've read.

The trust needed to be able to have true shared experiences is an example of CRP practice being implemented in classrooms. Ladson-Billings (1995) states that teachers versed in CRP "encourage students to learn collaboratively, teach each other, and be responsible for each other's learning" (p. 163). Even though Samantha stressed the importance of shared conversations as a class, she did not that shared experience with a teacher-assigned novel does not always equate to true motivated reading. She said the following in response to a question about shared experiences during group two's *To Kill*

a Mockingbird unit. "Let me tell you what you read yesterday. You tell me if I'm right or wrong." The focus of the shared experience during this unit for Samantha was really about accountability rather than a true collaborative experience with mutual feedback and input from teacher and student.

Regarding the controlled choice unit, Samantha connected the idea of shared experiences with students and teachers to a more personal one-on-one connection. She stated for this experience to be meaningful and for her to really connect with her students that she "has read probably 80% of the books" on her shelf. These were the books that students were also reading during the controlled choice unit, and she was able to carry out shared, personalized conversations with her students that can foster true motivation.

> *And that's the thing that I notice the most, is when I love a book and I share it , there's always at least one kid in every class period who's like that sounds like a good read, and so they'll take it and read it . And then the fact that I read it and they read it and we can talk about it, that's really significant.*

Audrey's responses regarding shared experiences echoed many of those made by other participants include those personal connections that can be made when students are choosing which book they want to read for class. Audrey mentioned that teacher motivation affected student motivation as the shared experience should be a mutual collaboration between teacher and student. "I feel like if you're teaching something you're not totally invested in then you're just getting through it and they just get through it as compared to when you're excited about it or you're interested in it." The idea of well prepared and purposeful instructional discourse can pave the way for students to be engaged in the reading that they do in the classroom (Nystrand & Gamoran, 1991).

A response provided by Maria further expanded on Audrey's idea of teacher interest affecting student interest. Maria's response came after she explained how students select books to read when they are able to have choice "I might say, oh I think you might really like *Crash* and you really might like any other books by this particular author or particular genre." For teachers to recommend books that students will enjoy, the connection to student background should be taken into consideration. Teachers who can use students' backgrounds an avenue for discourse and learning are implementing necessary components of CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

While the importance of shared experiences was emphasized with teachers as a factor for motivate reading, it is important to note that these shared experiences can be present with a teacher-assigned novel or student chosen novel. The motivation of a shared experience is not exclusive to student choice; however, Ryan & Deci (2000) state that "people can be motivated because they value an activity or because there is strong external coercion" (p. 69). This supports that the complex notion of reading motivation cannot be defined and determined by one experience or characteristic alone.

Relevance & Established Interest

The most prominent theme that emerged from a variety of relevant transcript pieces was the idea that the literature that students read should be relevant to their lives. This idea is grounded in SDT as Ryan & Deci (2000) state "Choice, acknowledgement of feelings, and opportunities for self-direction were found to enhance intrinsic motivation beyond they allow people feel a greater sense of autonomy" (p. 70). Additionally, acknowledging students' backgrounds and feelings and using those to guide students towards academic success in a crucial component of CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

This theme of established relevance was common across all participants and across both teacher-assigned and controlled choice novel units. Teachers discussed the importance of establishing relevance for teacher-assigned novels for students to motivated to complete the reading for these units. Regarding the teacher-assigned novel for group two participants, *To Kill a Mockingbird*, students can make the connection to the idea of racial injustice. All participants stated that they were able to build some relevance for this unit because of current social unrest in our country regarding the Black Lives Matters protests and the murder of George Floyd. Sally stated, "Now we are getting back into racial injustice, and so they are finding [To Kill a Mockingbird] more relatable." However, Sally also acknowledged that there was a time when she felt that the teacher-assigned text was not relatable to students, but it is on the shoulders of the teachers to build that connection and relevance. "Like that's a text that needs some sort of teacher guidance for them to be able to get the most out of it."

Samantha also reiterated the idea of building relevance with students in teacher-assigned novels.

> *I think to take a book that's a classic and make it relevant and interesting and fun for the kids, you know, it's fun to me, but it's important to have kids who really bought into it and read the whole book. And I think what's important is finding what's relevant even in classic literature and connecting it to the kids' daily lives.*

Audrey's comment regarding this topic showcased a different perspective on the idea of relevance in teacher-assigned novels. "Now, can you build interesting activities to try to build engagement with the whole class novel, etc? Yes, but is it true engagement? I'm not sure I can say it is because they're not the ones deciding." This echoes the idea

that SDT presents that motivation can manifest because of "strong external coercion" or "fear from being surveilled" (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The notion of forced relevance is something to be considered for established relevance in teacher assigned texts. Audrey elaborated on this point.

> *It defeats the point you had mentioned earlier, like building a connection with text. Right. If you are trying to force the connection, and they aren't able to grasp on to the other end, what's really the point?*

However, teacher participants repeatedly mentioned that the appeal of choice is students' ability to choose a book in which they can see themselves, a true sentence of established relevance. Sally noted that when students are assigned a book, they "get home and don't read it simply because someone is telling them to do it." For the autonomy to be present, students need to be able to see themselves in the text they are reading. All participants mentioned that when students can choose a book on their own, they often choose from dystopian genres. When Sally was asked why she thought this was she stated, "I think that's pretty much because they are all relatable." Samantha stated "They love dystopia. Students should be reading those just so they can see themselves on those pages." Audrey echoed the sentiment by stating "I want to make sure they understand the literature and they can find themselves in literature at some point."

Samantha also made a point that it much easier to for students to find relevance in a text when they can choose the text they are reading.

And I think with choice, that's a whole different matter. You can find all kinds of

books that are open to the kids. I think we've done a pretty good job with our kids

of finding literature or finding texts that they can invest in.

Audrey elaborated on the idea that building readers and building interest

meanings reading relatable literature.

I feel like too when you're picking a novel, you're trying to build interest, to build

readers, lifelong readers. And when all you're reading is old dead white guys,

that's kind of difficult because not everybody sitting in your classroom is an old

dead white guy.

The idea that Audrey mentioned here is grounded in SDT theory and the ability to

build wide reading in students that is generated from intrinsic motivation to read, one

construct measured in the ASMRQ (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). "Academic achievement

and cultural competence can be merged" (Ladson-Billings, 1995), and Audrey

continually emphasized this point. "It's like if they're not seeing themselves ever in

literature, then how are they ever going to connect and think, hey, I can do that; I could

write or I can read and relate."

Maria emphasized her desire to teach students teacher-assigned novels based on

student relevance rather than forcing or creating relevance. "I want to work with they

would like to read." She goes on to discuss how she would assign student texts after

getting to know them and what they would like to read. The potential to build students'

interest and excitement can lead to authentic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Maria also

presented the idea that all literature units, choice and teacher-assigned alike, could be created to center around student relevance.

> *So, I think in a perfect world scenario, I would incorporate novel choice based on students' interests and a whole class novel that I thought was representative of the readers that I had in my room.*

A true example of implementing the components of CRP, Maria made it clear that "I want to get to know my students" as a means of making plans for what they should read. She also explained that for teachers and students to have a shared experience, the text should center around what students see as relevance because teachers can build their plans and excitement on student interest, but it is much harder to build student interest from teacher interest.

> *So I think that goes back to finding texts that are engaging and relevant to your students because that's going to make my job so much easier and I'm so much happier, and I enjoy my job so much more.*

The idea of established relevance and interest in a book can be generated for a teacher-assigned novel from the teacher's end; however, participant responses speak to the ease and authenticity of considering student interest in a text first in order to build on students' unique backgrounds to create a true sense of investment and autonomy. This allows teachers to access content and strive for academic success.

COVID-19 Impacts on Reading Motivation

After analysis and coding of individual interviews took place, one theme that was mentioned in all participants responses was the idea that this school year was not normal

or one that was truly representative of student experiences that they had experienced in the past. Despite the varied teaching backgrounds among participants, they all came together on this point, the COVID-19 pandemic drastically affected how they teach literature. To dive deeper into the factors behind the effects that COVID-19 has had on teacher participants and their perception of students' reading motivation, the researcher invited them to participate in a 45-minute focus group interview to examine the topic in more depth. All participants agreed to participate in the focus group which was held in early April of 2021. The sample focus group questions can be found in Appendix C. Upon completion of the focus group interview, the conversation was transcribed, and relevant responses were coded using directed content analysis to determine the role that COVID-19 had on students reading motivation as perceived by teachers.

The central theme to emerge from the focus group was the idea of lack of personal connections and distractions from electronic devices, specifically cell phones. All teachers agreed that this year, students were using cell phones in class much more frequently than years past which proved a difficult fight for teachers regarding students' reading motivation. Maria was the first to voice her concerns how COVID-19 has affected her teaching this year. "I definitely feel like I don't know my kids and I feel like they don't know me like I have in years past." Other teachers agreed and added that they feel a sense of consistently being overwhelmed with tasks and paperwork on top of teaching in a virtual and face to face environment simultaneously. When teachers were asked to reflect on this impact on their students and their students' reading motivations, they overwhelmingly agreed that cell phones were the biggest obstacle to students being truly motivated to read this school year. Sally stated, "They are real used to being on their

phones for months at a time, that just this simple, put your phone away for forty five minutes, just give me forty five minutes, is like pulling teeth with them."

Audrey elaborated on this notion that the constant use of student phones was affecting students regarding classroom and reading.

I feel like their grit is gone. Like their ability to keep pushing if they don't achieve it immediately is gone. That instant gratification is most important; there is no grit left. Like they're not resilient enough to keep working at something.

Samantha made a point that she thought student cell phones had become a sort of coping mechanism during the pandemic, and students are unable or unwilling to detach from them.

It's like a coping mechanism, like whether they're using it as a distraction because they don't want to go and do the work, or they're stressed, or they use it a distraction from the work. It's become this coping mechanism, oh, I don't want to do this, or I can't do this. So, here's my phone and I can watch YouTube or TikTock, and so, it's become a crutch.

When the researcher asked more specific questions about how this distraction of cell phones affected student reading motivation, the point was brought up that teachers have been unable to model good reading habits because of the need to spend independent reading time ensuring that students are not on cell phones. Sally noted, "I think I'm spending more time telling them, put your mask on, put your phone away during independent reading time, get a book out and read than I did last year." Samantha pointed out that this not only affects kids who are on phones when they are supposed to be

reading, but all the kids in the classroom. "How much reading did other people get done because they were distracted by the fact that some people around them were on their phones or being told to put their phones away."

While it is important to note that some students were reading e-books on their phones as approved by the teacher, the students being discussed during the focus group were students who were hiding phones behind their books instead of reading. Samantha noted "They're hiding behind the mask. They're hiding behind the shield. They're hiding behind the phone and behind the Chromebook. We've got all these layers that are separating them from us and from each other." Teachers acknowledged that phones could be used as an educational device, but that's not how it was being used in these circumstances. Maria emphasized that students feel "…this is a fun device to me where I could be distracted and not an educational device."

When asked what could be done to remedy the cell phone distractions in order for students to achieve higher levels of reading motivation, teachers responded with the notion that there must a be a campus wide vision of what cell phone use in the classroom looks like and that those standards must be upheld and enforced by everyone on a particular campus.

> *Teachers should have support for their efforts in the classrooms in terms of the technology. As long as the school lets the kids have unfettered access to a cell phone, then there's really nothing I can do right now (Samantha)*

In closing the focus group conversation, Samantha redirected the conversation to the overall purpose for why teachers should be working toward building students who are

motivated to read and why this conversation about removing the distraction of cell phones matters.

> *Oh, yeah. It's all interconnected, and the skills that are developed in reading and critically discussing, whether it's self-selected or shared experience, those skills are the ones that are necessary for success in life. The critical thinking, the problem solving, the time management, all the things that any employer looks for in a good worker are the skills that we learn by reading, you know, being able to pay attention, finish a task and see something through to an end. All of this means that reading teaches so much more than, hey, this is a good book, but what happens is when you become a reader in school and you learn all those other skills, then you're a lifelong reader and you're continuing still, not to mention developing a sense of empathy and a sense of understanding about the world beyond us. I just think that it's that the concept of reading is kind of the foundation of democracy and that if people don't read then we have no democracy.*

This idea presented by Samantha aligns with the notion that teachers who implement CRP in the classroom aim to build students' critical consciousness in the hopes that they can critically analyze the world around them and create change.

Summary

This chapter presented the significant findings from the ASMRQ administered to students as well as teacher interviews. Student responses on the ASMRQ answered research questions one and two: When students are provided with a choice in novels, is student reading motivation affected? What is the difference in student reading motivation

levels when students are provided with choice in novels versus having no choice in novels? Student responses on the after choice ASMRQ administration revealed a statistically significance difference (M = 3.26, SD = .46) than those responses from the no choice administration of the ASMRQ (M = 2.69, SD = .53), t(171) = 13.23, p < 0.1.

An additional significant and unexpected finding to address the research question was that when divided into two groups based on course level and order of reading unit, only the paired samples *t* tests for group two (n=155) was determined to be statistically significant. This significance was true for all constructs and the overall scale for group two. Group one (n=17) only displayed statistically significant results on the constructs of self-efficacy for reading and autonomy and not on intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy for assignments, or the scale total. Based on the results of these statistical analyses, the hypothesis of students in secondary English classrooms display higher levels of reading motivation when they are provided choice in novels compared to having no choice is supported and should be accepted.

Research question three, what are teacher perceptions of student reading motivation when students are provided with a choice in novels, was answered through the four individual teacher interviews. Teachers noted the ideas of established relevance and interest as an advantage to reading motivation when students can choose the books they read, as well as the idea of shared experiences contributing to motivation. Some of these elements were present in teacher-assigned novel units as well, but teacher responses consistent with these themes were more frequent when discussing the options of choice in book during a reading unit.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, unexpected themes of this school year being a misrepresentation of teaching emerged during individual interviews. This topic was examined in more depth during a researcher-conducted follow up focus group interview. The focus group revealed significant themes of disconnection and distraction due to the increased reliance on cell phones by students. All the above findings, including potential issues and explanations are described in Chapter V.

Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this triangulation mixed methods study was to examine the effect that choice in reading had on student reading motivation. This chapter includes a discussion of the significant findings for both quantitative and qualitative data as well as how the theoretical framework of SDT and the lens of CRP relate to the merged findings of both sources of data. Also included in this chapter is a discussion on the implications of the results, limitations of the study, areas for future research, and a conclusion.

The research questions that served to guide the study were as follows:

(RQ1) When students are provided with a choice in novels, is student reading motivation affected?

(RQ2) What is the difference in student reading motivation levels when students are provided with choice in novels versus having no choice in novels?

(RQ3) What are teacher perceptions of student reading motivation when students are provided with a choice in novels?

The hypothesis aligned with the first two research questions was as follows: Students in secondary English classrooms display higher levels of reading motivation when they are provided choice in novels compared to having no choice.

Review of Findings

The key findings reported in Chapter IV that sought to answer the study's research questions are that when students are provided with choice in novels ($M = 3.26$, $SD = .46$) their overall reading motivation levels are higher than when provided with no choice in novels ($M = 2.69$, $SD = .53$), $t(171) = 13.23$, $p < 0.1$. This result was

statistically significant for all paired samples *t* tests except for group one's (n=17) overall scale total and the constructions of intrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy for reading assignments for which no significant difference was found. As a triangulated mixed methods design (Gay et al., 2012), the qualitative data from teacher interviews supported the quantitative findings of significant differences in reading motivation when students are provided with choice in reading. Teachers identified higher levels of established relevance for reading when students were able to choose a book as well as the ability to collaborate and have shared experiences with peers and teachers. The effect that the COVID-19 pandemic had on student reading motivation was unexpected and was examined further in a focus group interview which presented the idea that student reading motivation was thwarted by student distraction through the use of cell phones during independent reading time in the classroom.

Interpretation of Findings

Self-determination theory guided the study in that student motivation was measured by the constructs of self-efficacy, autonomy, and interest, all of which were measured by the adapted motivated reading survey, the ASMRQ (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Fisher, 1978; Ryan, 1982). As perceived autonomy is necessary for self-efficacy, these two constructions could not be separated, and both needed to be included as part of the administration. Interest, the essential component of overall motivation, was the third construct assessed through the ASMRQ. These constructs also emerged as support for the quantitative methodology in the qualitative teacher interviews (Gay et al., 2012). Each quantitative survey construct and its connection to the qualitative findings through the lens of CRP is described in detail in the following sections.

Self-Efficacy & Perceived Competence

Ladson-Billings (2006) discusses the notion that for students to have the confidence to strive for academic success they need teachers to work with their backgrounds and cultures instead of against them to ensure equitable access to learning. Student responses on the ASMRQ in the construct of self-efficacy were higher for students after completion of the choice unit (M = 3.37 for Self-Efficacy in Books; M = 3.25 for Self-Efficacy in Assignments) as compared to the no choice unit (M = 3.11 for Self-Efficacy in Books; M = 2.92 for Self-Efficacy in Assignments), p < .001. This aligns with teachers' perceptions of building student confidence in reading. Sally noted that when students can choose their books, they are finishing books at a quicker rate than teacher-assigned novel units and moving on to read new texts of their choosing. "Some of them are grabbing books from the back of the room and finishing their book from the night before." This same behavior was not mentioned as occurring during teacher-assigned novel units.

One unexpected finding occurred in a paired sample *t* test for group one who had completed their no choice novel unit first before completing their controlled choice unit. The findings revealed that for the construct of self-efficacy in reading, these students actually experienced a statistically significant higher level of responses for the no choice unit (M = 3.25, SD = .312) than they did for the after choice unit (M =2.97, SD = .643), $t(16)$ = -2.35, p < .05. A potential explanation for this unexpected finding could be the content of the book that this group was given for the teacher-assigned novel. The novel *Ghost* by Jason Reynolds tells the story of a Black teenage boy who feels as though he does not fit in with the world around him. He runs from his problems and makes poor

decisions that he must learn to grapple with. This novel is the epitome of accessible and relevant for the level of course for which group one students were enrolled. The book dealt with a topic that students could relate to, as compared to the novel *To Kill a Mockingbird,* which was the teacher-assigned novel for group two. The idea of valuing student experiences and channeling them to make texts accessible for students is a key component of CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1995), which likely attributed to the unexpected findings in this area.

To further triangulate the quantitative data (Gay et al. 2012), teacher responses supported the idea of increasing self-efficacy and competency for the students in group one for the teacher-assigned novel. Sally stated, "We read many chapters with them, and yet they enjoyed the book a little bit more than our above level kids." Audrey even noted that students seemed to produce higher quality assignments during the controlled choice unit.

> *I felt like in the controlled choice unit, like maybe [one page assignments] were higher quality and we didn't have really that cheating escapade that you would have when it's the same novel and they're kind of like, I'm going to throw down some quotes I found online or on Snapchat and, you know, things like that . I didn't see much cheating on the one pager assignments during the choice unit. They were all great.*

The support and scaffolding provided to these students seemed to directly affect their self-efficacy as indicated with the responses on respective construct of self-efficacy with assignments on the ASMRQ which was significantly higher for the after choice

administration (*M* = 3.25, *SD* = .68) than the no choice administration (*M* = 2.92, *SD* = .800), *t*(166) = 7.43, p < .01.

Autonomy & Perceived Choice

Audrey stated that when considering whether or not to incorporate choice in the classroom regarding reading, she always considers: "They're more apt to read it and try to put their best foot forward if they have choice in it, and that's just something I've always believed in and have always provided, you know." Not only does this response support the idea that self-efficacy increases when students are provided with choice, but the idea of choice itself is enough autonomy to provide students with the incentive to read. "The trick of culturally relevant teaching is to get students to 'choose' academic excellence" (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

This idea is supported and aligned with the results of the quantitative data as well. The construct of autonomy on the ASMRQ was the only construct to produce statistically significant results in favor of the after-choice unit for both groups one and two. Students were overwhelming aware that their after-choice unit provided them with a level of perceived choice that was nonexistence in their no choice novel unit. The strong effect sizes for both groups one (*d* = 1.17) and two (*d* = 2.38) for the construct of autonomy suggest that choice has a significant effect on a student's sense of autonomy more so than any other construct measured by the ASMRQ. As students were provided with choice in novels for the after-choice unit as compared to the no choice unit, this explains the strong effect sizes for the implementation of choice and autonomy. SDT theory cautions that authentic motivation cannot truly be observed unless a sense of autonomy is also included in contextual supports provided by teachers (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The construct

of autonomy and perceived choice was clearly established in the classroom as reported by both teachers and students on both data collection tools, the ASMRQ and the teacher interviews.

Interest & Intrinsic Motivation

Ryan & Deci (2000) describe intrinsic motivation as being essential to both cognitive and social development as it represents a principal source of enjoyment and vitality in life. The idea of relevance permeated all teacher responses in all individual interviews conducted. All teachers interviewed, when discussing the need for relevance in the literature that kids read in the classroom, agreed that the best opportunity for students to experience relevant literature to allow them choice in what they area reading. Maria emphasized the crucial component of interest in her response.

> *Never in a million years, though, would I pull out what I learned in mythology class, because I loved it, and just teach it from start to finish the way that my teacher did, because I would lose my kids. My answer is my favorite unit to teach is whatever I could get my kids behind.*

Maria's response echoes the ideas of Ryan & Deci (2000) in that when students are interested in what they are reading, that is where enjoyment will follow. CRP acknowledges that student interests should be used a catalyst to open the door to learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Not only were the teacher responses indicative of this, but the statistical results supported this idea as well. Overall, the paired samples t test for the construct of intrinsic motivation reported higher results from the after choice unit ($M =$ 3.05, $SD = .62$) as compared to the no choice unit ($M = 2.73$, $SD = .70$), $t(168) = 5.76$, p < .01. The results from the intrinsic motivation construct when separated by group revealed

that no significant difference was identified in the results from group one. This can possibly be attributed to the previously mentioned content of the teacher-assigned novel for group one. The teacher-assigned novel was selected for use for students in group one due to the accessible nature and relatability of the novel's topics. It made sense that these students were interested in the teacher-assigned novel under these considerations.

All findings and interpretations were triangulated with data from the contrasting field to gain a deeper understanding of the idea of reading motivation when students are provided with choice in reading. The alignment with the theoretical framework of SDT and the lens of CRP provides a clearer understanding of how these constructs work together to increase reading motivation overall and support the practice of CRP in secondary English classrooms. The established and reported sufficient reliability of the adapted reading scale, the ASMRQ, with a Cronbach Alpha of .92 for the no choice administration and .91 for the after choice administration proved a reliable scale to use to assess the constructs of motivation as guided by SDT while the teacher interviews examined and provided a greater depth to the understanding of reading motivation in the classroom. The themes of relevance and shared experience not only complement the guiding principles of SDT but also support the practices that conceptualize culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Implications

As reinforced by the cohesiveness of the quantitative and qualitative data as part of the triangulated mixed methods design (Gay et al., 2012), the support for the incorporation of choice in reading in the secondary English classroom is prevalent. The

ideas of building on student's self-efficacy, autonomy, and interest in the classroom using choice in reading suggests that students reading motivation significantly improves.

Specifically, student cultural competence and background should be the driving force for the selection of the literature used in secondary English classrooms. Educators, administrations, and curriculum developers should be advocating and supporting the use of diverse texts in the classroom for students to be able to make meaningful connections with in order to establish relevancy and interest (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gallagher & Kittle, 2018; Roberts, 2018; Allred & Cena, 2020). The most prominent and supported way to do this as evidenced by the findings of this study is through student choice in reading.

While these implications still hold true, the themes emerging from the focus group data analysis cannot be ignored. Students should be provided a learning environment in they are free from the distraction of social media and their cell phones. Lundell & Higbee (2002) establish that all students deserve access to a classroom where they can learn on an equitable playing field with their peers. The classroom challenges raised by the cell phones as discussed in the focus group should be established in all classrooms where true motivation to read is being observed.

Limitations

The main limitation of this study was that all data collection and analysis took place during a global pandemic. Due to the nature of various safety protocols in place, instruction in the classrooms were the study was captured was not fully indicative of a typical school year teaching literature. Teacher participants mentioned this drawback repeatedly throughout their individual interviews to the point that a follow up focus group

was conducted to further examine the pandemic's effect on students' reading motivation. Because of this, it would be beneficial to conduct a similar study once the pandemic has subsided and teachers feel as though they can teacher literature and reading as they feel is truly appropriate for their students. Teacher responses on the use of technology in the classroom should also be examined in order to determine if the technology is more of a hindrance or a helpful tool.

Additionally, due to the self-reporting measures of ASMRQ, there scope of data collected by the quantitative aspect of this study is limited. If the researcher were to use more open-ended data collection tools such as observations, open-ended surveys, or anecdotal records, there is the potential to capture more data regarding motivated student reading behaviors and patterns that cannot be fully captured through a self-reported measure such as the ASMRQ.

Due to the nature of quasi-experimental research (Spatz, 2017), the researcher was unable to manipulate the two groups of students that were part of the study. While the sample size for group two (n = 155) was sufficient to examine and provided reliable results, the same size for group one (n = 17) was not large enough to be considered a significant sample size. If the study were to be reproduced, it is recommended that the sample size for group one be increased.

Lastly, the types of literature, while out of control of the researcher for this study, should be equivalent between groups. For example, the teacher-assigned novel for group one was *Ghost* by Jason Reynolds, a short, contemporary, easily accessible young adult novel while the teacher-assigned novel for group two was *To Kill a Mockingbird* by Harper Lee. This may be the cause of the unexpected results in the statistical analysis for

group one. Additionally, the factor of each group being a different level of course could have played a role in the results for group one as well. This should be examined in further studies as well as using comparable books for the teacher-assigned novel units as well as the controlled choice units for each group to avoid any potential skewness of the data results.

Areas for Future Research

Based on the current findings, the researcher recommends a follow up study to expand the sample size of groups and therefore, the power of analysis. This would allow for the potential study to be more likely applicable to a wider audience. Additionally, the teacher sample size could be adapted to include more teachers from minoritized backgrounds. This would provide a more well-rounded and in-depth qualitative aspect to the study that this study was unable to provide. To do this, the sample population for the study could be expanded to incorporate more courses than English I, if other courses incorporate choice and no choice literature units.

As teacher participants mentioned the notion of providing choice to students outside the realm of literature, future research into the effects of choice in other aspects of curriculum and instruction would be helpful in order to understand the potential impact that choice has on student motivation and potentially academic success outside of the use of choice in literature. Future research endeavors could examine the role of choice in the learning process, on product creation, or in content outside the realm of literature. This research could expand beyond the English and Language Arts classroom to be applicable to other content areas as well.

An area of research to extend would be a qualitative study to examine the incorporation of CRP practices in teaching literature and how teachers use the components of CRP to increase student motivation to read. While this was the lens that the researcher analyzed the findings through, there were no direct questions asked of participants regarding the components or practices of CRP in the secondary English classroom.

Conclusion

Garcia & Weiss (2017) state that "persistently large achievement gaps between high-social class and low-social-class children in America, and the disparities in opportunity that drive these achievement gaps, threaten the very notion of the American Dream" (p. 1). Upon closer examination, these achievement gaps are most notable in the core content areas, including math and reading (Kevelson, 2019). Wigfield & Guthrie (1997) outline that general intrinsic motivation is the number one predictor of wide reading in students. To address the students who are leaving high school without a breadth of reading under them, adjustments in the teaching of English in secondary classrooms must be made. The findings of this study help to establish a step in the right direction regarding increasing this motivation in the classroom. Choice in reading appears to increase student reading motivation which in turn can not only increase student breadth of reading, but also reading achievement (Wang & Guthrie, 2004).

Students in the study indicated that they were more motivated to read when they were provided with choice in reading, and teacher perspectives seemed to support this notion. Choice in reading should not be a novelty for secondary students, choice when combined with independent reading time is a proven indicator for reading motivation

(Allred & Cena, 2020). When these approaches such as choice and time are combined with CRP practices, teachers could help to close the achievement gap for all minoritized students. Building students' academic success, cultural competence, and crucial consciousness are key components that should be implemented in classrooms. Until teachers fully adopt the choice and the components of CRP into their daily teaching habits, minoritized students will continue to fall further behind their white counterparts (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

The teacher interviews in this study echoed the ideas that Ladson-Billings introduced in 1995 and Ryan & Deci in 2000. Teachers should select literature that is relevant for students, and students should have the ability to collaborate and share their experiences with others. These were the two largest themes to contribute to what teachers deemed motivated reading behavior. Institutions that are perpetuating systemically racist policies that favor white over their minoritized peers should take up the use of diverse and multicultural literature that can appeal to the interest and relevance of students of color in their classrooms in the hope that we can make a change to provide more equitable classroom practices and teachers. The diversity that our schools possess is what gives our school systems the potential to excel and change the world; however, they can only remain strong if we vow to continue searching for the best practices to create truly equitable classrooms.

References

Adeyemi, T. (2018). *Children of blood and bone.* Henry Holt and Company.

Ahern, C. (2016). *Flawed*. Feiwel & Friends.

Allred, J.B. (2016). *Cultivating a desire for reading through student choice and reading time in class.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Weber State University.

Allred, J. B., & Cena, M. E. (2020). Reading motivation in high school: Instructional shifts in student choice and class time. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,* 1-9. http://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1058

Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 297-308.

Au, K.H. (1997). Social constructivism and the school literacy learning of students of diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Literacy Research, 30*(2), 297-319.

Au, K. (2006). Multicultural issues and literacy achievement Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 1-26.

Berliner, D. C. & Biddle, B. J., (1995). The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Carle, A.C., Jaffee, D., Vaughan, N.W., Eder, D. (2009). Psychometric properties of three new national survey of student engagement based engagement scales: An item response theory analysis. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(8), 775-794.

Center for Self Determination Theory. (2020, Sept. 25). *Theory overview.* *https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/theory/*

Chapman, E. (2003). Alternative approaches to assessing student engagement rates. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation. 8*(13), 1-7.

Chapman, J. W. & Tunmer, W. E. (1995). Development of young children's reading self concepts: An examination of emerging subcomponents and their relationship with reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*, 154-167.

Ciampa, K. (2012). Electronic storybooks: A constructivist approach to improving reading motivation in grade 1 students. *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(4), 92-136.

Ciecierski, L., & Bintz, W. (2015). Using authentic literature to develop challenging and integrated curriculum. *Middle School Journal, 46*(5), 17-25.

Coddington, C. S. (2009). The effects of constructs of motivation that affirm and undermine reading achievement inside and outside of school on middle school students' reading achievement (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland). Available from ProQuestion Dissertations and Theses database. (ProQuest document ID 1974135421)

Cooper, K. (2014). Eliciting engagement in the high school classroom: A mixed-methods examination of teaching practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(2), 363-402.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design* (3rd ed). Sage.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Literacy and intrinsic motivation. *Research Library Core*, *119*(2), 115-140.

Dabrowski, J. & Marhsall, T. R. (2018). Motivation and engagement in student assignments: The role of choice and relevancy. *The Education Trust.* Edtrust.org

Dahl, R. (1994). A democratic dilemma: System effectiveness versus citizen participation. *The Academy of Political Science*, *109*(1), 23-34.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). The color line in American education: Race, resources, and student achievement. W. E. B. DuBois Review:Social Science Research on Race, 1(2), 213–246.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future.* Teachers College Press.

Davis, M.H., Tonks, S.M., Hock M., Wang, W., & Rodriguez, A. (2018). A review of reading motivation scales. *Reading Psychology, 39*, 121-187. 10.1080/02702711.2017.1400482

Deci, E.L, & Ryan, R.M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19,* 109-134.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol 38. Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237-288). University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation in education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26*, 325-346.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal, LIV* (3), 77-80.

Enriquez, G. (2013). "But they won't let you read!": A case study of an urban middle school male's response to school reading. *Journal Of Education*, *193*(1), 35-46.

Finn, J. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(2), 117-142.

Fisher, C.D. (1978). The effects of personal control, competence, and extrinsic reward systems on intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 21*(3), 273-288.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2012). Motivating boys to read: Inquiry, modeling, and choice matter. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*(7), 587-596.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences.* (7th Ed). Worth Publishers.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P.C. and Paris, A.H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59–10.

Fulmer, S.M. & Frijters, J.C. (2009). A review of self-report and alternative approaches in the measurement of student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*(3), 219-246.

Gallagher, K. (2009). *Readicide: How schools are killing reading and what you can do about it.* Stenhouse Publishers.

Gallagher, K. & Kittle, P. (2018). *180 days: Two teachers and the question to engage and empower adolescents.* Heinemann.

Gambrell, L.B. (2015). Getting students hooked on the reading habit. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(3), 259-263.

García, E., & Weiss, E. (2017). Reducing and averting achievement gaps. Retrieved from the Economic Policy Institute website https:// www.epi.org/publication/reducing-and-averting-achievement-gaps/

Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications.* Pearson.

Gilmore, B. (2011). Worthy texts: Who decides?. *Educational Leadership*, *68*(6), 46-50.

Ginsberg, M., & Wlodkowski, R. (2019). Intrinsic motivation as the foundation for culturally responsive social-emotional and academic learning in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 46*(4), 53-66.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and Motivation in Reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (3rd Ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K.C., Taboada, A., Davis, M.H…. Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(3), 403-423.

Hawley, W. D., & Nieto, S. (2010, November). Another inconvenient truth: Race and ethnicity matter. *Educational Leadership, 68(3)*, 66-71.

Holt, K.A. (2015). *House arrest*. Chronicle Books.

Hoy, W.K. & Adams, C.M. (2016). *Quantitative Research in education: A primer* (2nd ed.) Sage.

Hsieh, H. & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15,* 1277-1288.

Ireland, J. (2018). *Dread nation.* Balzer & Bray.

Ivey, G., & Johnston, P.H. (2013). Engagement with young adult literature: Outcomes and processes. *Reading Research Quarterly, 48*(3), 255-275.

Ivey, G. & Broaddus, K. (2001). Just plain reading: A survey of what makes students want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(4), 350-377.

Joseph, P.B. (Ed). (2011). *Cultures of curriculum*. (2nd ed). Routledge.

Kevelson, M.J.C. (2019). *The measure matters: Examining achievement gaps on cognitively demanding reading and mathematics assessments.* ETS Policy Evaluation & Research Center.

Kidd, D. & Castano, E. (2018). Reading literary fiction and theory of mind: Three preregistered replications and extensions of Kidd and Castano (2013). *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(4), 522-531.

Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical pedagogy*. Peter Lang.

Kittle, P. (2013). *Book love: Developing depth, stamina, and passion in adolescent readers.* Heinemann.

Kolbas, E. D. (2001). *Critical theory and the literary canon*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006, October). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). It's not the culture of poverty, it's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 104-109.

Lee. H. (1960). *To kill a mockingbird.* Grand Central Publishing.

Lu, M. (2011). *Legend*. Putnam's Sons Publishing.

Lundell, D.B., & Higebee, J. L. (Eds.). (2002). *Exploring urban literacy and developmental education.* Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Maberry, J. (2010). *Rot and ruin*. Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.

Mackey, A. P., Finn, A. S., Leonard, J. A., Jacoby-Senghor, D. S., West, M. R., Gabrieli, C. F. O., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2015). Neuroanatomical correlates of the income-achievement gap. Psychological Science, 26(6), 925–933. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615572233

McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Tammen, V. V. (1987). Psychometric properties of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory in a competitive sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 60,* 48-58.

Mercurio, M. (2005). In their own words: A study of suburban middle school students using a self-selection reading program. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 49*(2), 130-141.

Merga, M. K. (2014). Western Australian adolescents' reasons for infrequent engagement in recreational book reading. *Australian Journal Of Language & Literacy*, *37*(2), 60-66.

Merriam, S.B. & Tisdell, E.J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Miller, D. (2012). Creating a classroom where readers flourish. *The Reading Teacher, 66*(2), 88-92.

Muijs, D. (2011). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS.* (2nd ed.) Sage Publications.

Myers, W.D. (1999). *Monster*. HarperCollins Publishers.

Myrow, D.L (1979). Learner choice and task engagement. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 47*(3), 200-207.

Newman, K. (2020, Jan. 22). *America's most racially diverse big cities.* U.S. News and World Report. https://www.usnews.com/news/cities/slideshows/the-10-most-racially-diverse-big-cities-in-the-the-us?slide=5

Nystrand, M. & Gamoran, A. (1991). Instructional discourse, student engagement, and literature achievement. *Research in the Teaching of English, 25*(3), 261-290.

Olsen, Brie, "I Feel Trapped: Motivation, Engagement, and Text Choice with Struggling Readers" (2017). Education and Human Development Master's Theses. 753.http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses/753

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. & Leech, N.L. (2006). Linking research questions to mixed methods data analysis procedures. *The Qualitative Report, 11*(3), 474-498.

Pitcher, S.M., Albright, L.K., Delaney, C.J., Walker, N.T., Seunarinesingh, K., Mogge, S., Headley, K.N., Genry Ridgeway, V., Peck S., Hunt, R., & Dunston, P.J. (2007). Assessing adolescents' motivation to read. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 50*(5), 378-396.

Reichs, B. (2018). *Nemesis*. Penguin Random House.

Reynolds, J. (2016). *Ghost*. Atheneum/Caitlyn Dlouhy Books.

Roberts, K. (2018). *A novel approach: Whole-class novels, student-centered teaching, and choice.* Heinemann.

Ryan, R.M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere; An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(3), 430-461.

Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Sepetys, R. (2016). *Salt to the Sea.* Philomel Books.

Sharma, S., & Christ, T. (2017). Five steps toward successful culturally relevant text selection and integration. *The Reading Teacher, 71*(3), 295-307.

Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Rawsthorne, L., & Ilardi, B. (1997). Trait self and true self: Cross-role variation in the Big Five traits and its relations with authenticity and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 1380-1393.

Shusterman, N. (2016). *Scythe.* Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.

Shusterman, N. & Shusterman, J. (2018). *Dry*. Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.

Spatz, C. (2017). *Exploring statistics: Tales of distributions* (11th ed.). Conway, AR. Outcrop Publishers.

Spinelli, J. (2004). *Crash.* Random House Publishers.

Suvada, E. (2017). *This mortal coil.* Puffin Books.

Taherdoost, H. (2017). Determining sample size; How to calculate survey sample size. *International Journal of Economics and Management Systems, 2*, 237-239.

Tatum, A.W. (2008). Adolescents and texts: Overserved or underserved? A focus on adolescents and texts. *English Journal*, *98*(2), 82-85.

Tomlinson, C.A., & Allan, S.D. (2000). *Leadership for differentiation schools and classrooms.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tsigilis, N., & Theodosiou, A. (2003). Temporal stability of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 97*, 271-280.

Urquhart, C. (2013). *Grounded theory for qualitative research: A practical guide.* Sage.

Wang, J. H., & Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Modeling the effects of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amount of reading, and past reading achievement on text comprehension between U.S. and Chinese students. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*, 162-186.

Wang, M., Fredricks, J. A., Ye, F., Hofkens T. L., Linn, J. S. (2016). The math and science engagement scales: Scale development, validation, and psychometric properties. *Learning and Instruction, (43),* 16-26.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, A. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 420-432.

Zentner, J. (2017). *Goodbye days: A novel.* First Ember.

Appendix A - Adolescent Situational Reading Motivation Questionnaire

What book did you read for this unit of study in English: _____

For the sake of this survey, "reading activities" can be defined as assignments completed using the book(s) in this unit.

1. I was good at remembering the plot of the book I read in this unit.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

2. I easily understood what was happening when I read the book(s) for this unit.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

3. I felt like I was a good reader (understood the text, could answer questions easily about it) for English class during this unit.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

4. I could read the books in this unit without too much difficulty.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

5. I think I was good at the reading activities during this unit.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

6. I think I did well on the activities during this unit, compared to other students.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

7. After reading the books in this unit for a while, I felt skilled at reading.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

8. I am satisfied with my performance on reading activities during this unit.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

9. I was skilled at the reading activities during this unit.

   4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

10. There were books that I couldn't read very well during this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

11. I enjoyed reading the book(s) in this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

12. I enjoyed reading the book(s) in this unit because they made me think.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

13. I enjoyed reading my book for this unit when I had extra time in English class.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

14. I felt successful when reading books during this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

15. I enjoyed the challenge of reading during this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

16. I enjoyed finding new books to read for English class during this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

17. Reading the book(s) during this unit was boring.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

18. Reading the book(s) during this unit was a waste of time.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

19. I would describe the books in this unit as interesting.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

20. While I was reading the book(s) in this unit, I was thinking about how much I enjoyed it.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

21. I had choice about what book(s) I read during this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

22. I didn't really have a choice regarding what book(s) I read in this unit.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

23. I read the book(s) in this unit only because I had no choice in what book to read.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

24. I read the specific book(s) for this unit because I wanted to.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

25. I finished reading the book(s) in this unit because I had to.

4 - Very true   3 - Mostly true   2 - Somewhat true   1 - Not at all true

Appendix B - Questions for Semi-Structured Interview

(Sample Questions – Questions may vary based on participant responses)

1. Tell me about your experiences teaching literature to adolescents.

2. How do you assign student novels?

3. Walk me through a typical class period of teaching a novel to your students.

4. Describe your students and their behavior while reading.

5. What is your favorite reading unit to teach? Why?

6. What sort of books do you students seem to enjoy reading? Why do you think this is?

7. If the reading curriculum were up to you, what would it consist of? What titles would you use?

Appendix C - Questions for Follow Up Focus Group

- How many years have you been teaching?

- How were you certified?

- Do you have a master's degree?

(Sample Questions – Questions may vary based on participant responses)

1. How is teaching different this year because of COVID?

2. What would you say your biggest challenge is?

3. Biggest success?

4. What effect has COVID had on your students? That you've noticed.

5. What do you notice about students' motivation this year compared to previous years?

6. What about their motivation specific to reading?

7. What has been more difficult about teaching literature this year?

8. Why are we as teachers finding it more difficult to teach anything this year?

9. Why do you feel like this year hasn't been an accurate representation of teaching?

10. How do you feel about free choice versus controlled choice in terms of motivation and shared experiences?

Appendix D – Parental Consent Form

Title of research study: The Effect of Choice on Student Reading Motivation
Investigator: Abbey Bachmann. This project is being conducted as part of a doctoral
dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Laveria Hutchison.

Key Information:
The following focused information is being presented to assist you in understanding the
key elements of this study, as well as the basic reasons why you may or may not wish to
consider regarding your child taking part. This section is only a summary; more detailed
information, including how to contact the research team for additional information or
questions, follows within the remainder of this document under the "Detailed
Information" heading.

What should I know about a research study?
Someone will explain this research study to you and your child.
Taking part in the research is voluntary; whether or not you decide to provide permission
for your child to take part is up to you. In most cases, your child will also be asked for
his/her assent to take part. You can choose not to provide permission for your child to
take part. You can agree to provide permission and later change your mind. Your
decision will not be held against you or your child. You and your child can ask all the
questions you want before you decide and can ask questions at any time during the study.

We invite you to take part in a research study about the effect of choice in books on
student reading motivation because your child meets the following criteria:
English I student at Cypress Woods High School.

In general, your child's participation in the research involves completing a student
reading motivation survey on two different occasions. Each survey administration will
only take 10-15 minutes.

There are no known or foreseeable risks for this study. There is no personal benefit,
however the possible benefit to society may be that teachers would be able to improve
teaching practices that allow students to be more motivated to read literature for English
coursework. Your student will not receive compensation for participation.

Detailed Information:
The following is more detailed information about this study, in addition to the
information listed above.

Why is this research being done?
Keeping students motivated to read becomes an increasingly harder task as students get
older. By the time students are in secondary school, many have already labeled
themselves as either being a reader or claiming that reading is not their strength. For
students to get the most academic benefit out of a particular book or novel, a student must
be invested and motivated to engage with that text. As students become adolescents, it

seems as though practices that are equated with successful reading instruction are set aside in order to allow teachers to teach true literature analysis skills. However, this doesn't have to be a black or white topic. There is room for secondary teachers to provide students with choice in the classroom regarding text choice in order to increase student motivation to read without sacrificing the need to teach students how to approach literary analysis. However, much of the existing research fails to close in on the relationship between student reading motivation and choice in text in the secondary English classroom. This student aims to fill the knowledge gap on this topic and adolescent readers.

How long will the research last?
We expect that your child will be in this research study for 30 minutes total over the course of 3 months.

How many people will be studied?
We expect to enroll about 200 people in this research study.

What happens if I say yes, I want to provide permission for my child to be in this research?
If you agree to provide permission for your child to be involved in this research, your child will be provided with an assent form to agree to participation. If your child assents to participation in this research, they will complete a 25-question survey two times over the course of 3 months. The first administration will take place upon completion of the first unit of study in English (October-November 2020). The second administration of the survey will take place upon completion of the second unit of study in English (December 2020-January 2021). Each survey will only take your child 10-15 minutes to complete. No question on the survey will contain sensitive subject matter. Please see a sample survey question below.

26. I was good at remembering the plot of the book I read in this unit.
A. Very true   B. Mostly true   C. Somewhat true   D. Not at all true

What happens if I do not want my child to be in this research?
You can choose not to provide permission for your child to take part in the research and it will not be held against you or your child. Choosing not to take part will involve no penalty or loss of benefit to which your child is otherwise entitled.
Your child's alternative to taking part in this research study is not to take part.

What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?
You can withdraw your permission (and/or your child may withdraw his/her assent) and leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you or your child.
If you withdraw your permission (and/or your child may withdraw his/her assent), already collected data that still includes your name or other personal information will be removed from the study record.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for my child?

We do not expect any risks related to the research activities. If you choose to provide permission for your child to take part and he/she undergoes a negative event you feel is related to the study, please contact Abbey Bachmann (405-334-1044).

Will I or my child receive anything for being in this study?
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Will being in this study help my child in any way?
There are no known benefits to your child from his/her taking part in this research. However, possible benefits to others include providing educators with research-based best teaching practices for increasing student reading motivation in the English classroom.

What happens to the information collected for the research?
The information your child provides will not be linked to his/her identity. All names associated with survey responses will be assigned a numeric code. The numeric codes linked to names will be stored separately from the survey responses themselves.
We may share and/or publish the results of this research. However, unless otherwise detailed in this document, we will keep your child's name and other identifying information confidential.

Who can I talk to?
If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt your child, you should talk to the researcher, Abbey Bachmann, at the University of Houston (amgagnon@central.uh.edu) or 405-334-1044.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Houston Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may also talk to them at (713) 743-9204 or cphs@central.uh.edu if:
Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
You cannot reach the research team.
You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
You have questions about your child's rights as a research subject.
You want to get information or provide input about this research.

May we contact you regarding future research opportunities?
In the future, our research team may be interested in contacting you for other research studies we undertake, or to conduct a follow-up study to this one. There is never any obligation to take part in additional research. Do we have permission to contact you to provide additional information?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Your signature documents your permission for the named child to take part in this research.

_____
Printed name of child

_____   _____
Signature of parent or individual legally authorized to   Date
consent for the child

_____   ❑ Parent
Printed name of parent or individual legally authorized   ❑ Individual legally
to consent for the child   authorized to consent for
                                                                                         the child

_____   _____
Signature of parent   Date

_____
Printed name of parent

Appendix E – Child Assent Form

ASSENT TO TAKE PART IN A RESEARCH STUDY

PROJECT TITLE: The Effect of Choice on Student Reading Motivation

You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Abbey Bachmann a doctoral student at the University of Houston.

You can say no if you do not want to take part in this study. Adults cannot make you be in this study if you do not want to. If you agree to take part in the study now, but change your mind about it later, you can stop being in the study, and no one will be mad at you.

WHAT IS RESEARCH?

Research is a way to learn information about something. Researchers study different subjects the way you study English or math as a subject in school.

There are many reasons people choose to be in a research study. Sometimes people want to help researchers learn about ways to help people or make programs better.

You should understand why you would say yes to being a research subject. Take the time you need to decide if you want to be in this study. You can ask Mrs. Bachmann or your English I teacher any question you have about the study.

WHY ARE WE DOING THIS RESEARCH?

In our research we want to learn about how a student's motivation to read is affected when they are allowed to choose the book they want to read for English class.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN DURING THE STUDY

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey with 25 questions that should take you only 10-15 minutes to complete. You will be asked to complete this survey two different times: one time after you complete your class novel unit and another time after you complete the unit where you got to choose your book for English class. You will complete the survey on a computer or electronic device.

COULD GOOD THINGS HAPPEN TO ME FROM BEING IN THIS STUDY?

What we learn in this research will not help you now. When we finish the research we hope we know more about if students are more motivated to read a book if they get to pick the book. This may help other children with getting to choose their books for class more often in the future.

COULD BAD THINGS HAPPEN TO ME FROM BEING IN THIS STUDY?

In this study, there are no known bad things that could happen to you. I will not share your information from the survey with your parents or any other teachers or students.

DO I HAVE OTHER CHOICES?

You can choose not to take part in this study, and you can decide you no longer want to be in the study at any time. You may choose to not answer any question that you are not comfortable with. If you choose to stop taking part at any time, you will not be penalized.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?
If you have any questions or worries about the research, you can ask Mrs. Bachmann at abbey.bachmann@cfisd.net before, during, or after the research. Mrs. Bachmann can be found in Room 2606. If you wish to talk to someone else or have questions about your rights as a research subject, call the University of Houston Institutional Review Board at (713) 743-9204.

DOCUMENTATION OF SUBJECT ASSENT

I agree to take part in this study called: The Effect of Choice on Student Reading Motivation

Signature of minor participant: _____

Date: _____

ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING MY RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) AT 713-743-9204. ALL RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT ARE CARRIED OUT BY INVESTIGATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON ARE GOVERNED BY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Appendix F - Student Survey Paper

English I Student,

Your parents have given their consent for you to complete the survey below. The purpose of the survey is to understand your motivation to read during different units in English class. Once you have read all of these instructions, following the QR code/link to complete the survey.

Before you answer the questions on the survey, please think about the unit of study that we completed recently. Think only about the book you read for this unit and the assignments that were related to this book. Don't think back to previous units of study or previous school years. Only answer the questions as you think about your book and unit assignments for English I for the unit we just finished.

Make sure you submit your survey responses once you are finished. Take your time and answer the questions honestly and accurately. Please make sure you complete the survey no later than [Insert survey close date]. ***Survey close date will depend on administration date (students will have a week long window)***

If you have any questions, please ask Mrs. Bachmann. You can find her in room 2606 or email her at abbey.bachmann@cfisd.net

Mrs. Bachmann

Your unique code: _____ (You will be asked for this number at the beginning of the survey)

https://coeuh.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_5mML0dUZM8Ol5wF

Appendix G – Adult Consent Form

Title of research study: The Effect of Choice on Student Reading Motivation

Investigator***: Abbey Bachmann. This project is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Laveria Hutchison.***

Key Information:

The following focused information is being presented to assist you in understanding the key elements of this study, as well as the basic reasons why you may or may not wish to consider taking part. This section is only a summary; more detailed information, including how to contact the research team for additional information or questions, follows within the remainder of this document under the "Detailed Information" heading.

What should I know about a research study?

Someone will explain this research study to you. Taking part in the research is voluntary; whether or not you take part is up to you. You can choose not to take part. You can agree to take part and later change your mind. Your decision will not be held against you. You can ask all the questions you want before you decide and can ask questions at any time during the study.

We invite you to take part in a research study about the effect of choice in books on student reading motivation because you meet the following criteria: teacher of students who are allowed some choice in what books they read for English I class.

In general, your participation in the research involves participation in one 30-45-minute interview to talk about your experiences with student reading motivation when they are provided with choice in books. After the initial interview, participants may be asked to participate in a focus group follow up interview that would last approximately 1 hour.

There are no known or foreseeable risks for this study. However, potential risks may include a discomfort with the pressures of providing or not providing students with choice in books ***which you can compare to the possible benefit of*** receiving clarification of what allows students to become more motivated to read. This could allow you to refine or clarify your own identity as an English teacher and the approach to teaching reading that you display and utilize in your classrooms. You will not receive compensation for participation.

Detailed Information:

The following is more detailed information about this study, in addition to the information listed above.

Why is this research being done?

Keeping students motivated to read becomes an increasingly harder task as students get older. By the time students are in secondary school, many have already labeled themselves as either being a reader or claiming that reading is not their strength, many falling on the latter side of that claim. For students to interact with a text at highest level of Bloom's

Taxonomy, a student must be invested and motivated to engage with that text. As students become adolescents, it seems as though practices that are equated with successful reading instruction are set aside in order to allow teachers to teach true literature analysis skills. However, this doesn't have to be a black or white topic. There is room for secondary teachers to provide students with autonomy in the classroom regarding text choice in order to increase student motivation to read without sacrificing the need to teach students how to approach literary analysis. However, much of the existing research fails to close in on the relationship between student reading motivation and choice in text in the secondary English classroom. This student aims to fill the knowledge gap on this topic and adolescent readers.

How long will the research last?

We expect that you will be in this research study for 2 hours total.

How many people will be studied?

We expect to enroll about 5 people in this research study.

What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?

Timeline of study:

1. January 2021: Interviews will be electronically conducted, recorded, and transcribed.

2. February 2021: Focus group interview will be electronically conducted, recorded and transcribed.

3. March-April 2021: Data will be analyzed, and findings will be reported to schools and subjects.

This research study may include the following component(s) where we plan to video record you as the research subject: Individual interview and follow up focus group interview.

- ☐ <u>I agree</u> to be video & audio recorded during the research study.

    - o I agree that the video & audio recording can be used in publication/presentations.

    - o I do not agree that the video & audio recording can be used in publication/presentations.

- ☐ <u>I do not agree</u> to be video & audio recorded during the research study.

You may still take part in the study if you wish, even if you do not agree to be video & audio recorded.

What happens if I do not want to be in this research?

You can choose not to take part in the research and it will not be held against you. Choosing not to take part will involve no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are otherwise entitled.Your alternative to taking part in this research study is not to take part.

What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?

You can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you.If you decide to leave the research study, it will immediately conclude the study. If you choose to withdraw from the study, the researcher will seek permission to use any data that has been collected at the time of withdrawal to be used for analysis for the study. If you no longer continue with the research, already collected data that still includes your name or other personal information will be removed from the study record.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?

We do not expect any risks related to the research activities. If you choose to take part and undergo a negative event you feel is related to the study, please contact Abbey Bachmann (405-334-1044). The researcher will take initiatives to inform all subjects of data and findings during and at the conclusion of the study. However, potential risks for teachers may include subject discomfort with teaching students with books that students aren't likely to be motivated to read.

Will I receive anything for being in this study?

There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Will being in this study help me in any way?

We cannot promise any benefits to you or others from your taking part in this research. However, individual teacher participants may benefit by receiving clarification of their own pedagogical approaches to teaching reading and providing students with choice in books. This could allow you to refine or clarify their own identity as an English teacher and the approach to providing students with choice of books in the classroom.

What happens to the information collected for the research?

Efforts will be made to keep your personal information private, including research study records, to people who have a need to review this information. Each subject's name will be assigned a pseudonym, which will appear on all written study materials. The list pairing the subject's name to the pseudonym will be kept separate from these materials. We cannot promise complete secrecy. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and other representatives of this organization, as well as collaborating institutions and federal agencies that oversee our research. The sponsor of the research, Dr. Laveria Hutchison, may also review research records upon request.

This study may collect private information including your name. Following collection, researchers will remove all identifying information from the data collection. Once identifiers are removed, this information could be used for future research studies or

distributed to another investigator for future research studies without your additional informed consent.

We may share and/or publish the results of this research. Analysis of findings will be shared with the participants and school administrators. A written summary will be provided to be used to support future pedagogical approaches to teaching reading. However, unless otherwise detailed in this document, we will keep your name and other identifying information confidential.

Who can I talk to?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, you should talk to the researcher, Abbey Bachmann, at the University of Houston amgagnon@cougarnet.uh.edu) or 405-334-1044.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Houston Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may also talk to them at (713) 743-9204 or cphs@central.uh.edu if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You have questions about your rights as a research subject.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

May we contact you regarding future research opportunities?

In the future, our research team may be interested in contacting you for other research studies we undertake, or to conduct a follow-up study to this one. There is never any obligation to take part in additional research. Do we have permission to contact you to provide additional information?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Signature Block for Capable Adult

Your signature documents your consent to take part in this research.

_____   _____
Signature of subject   Date

_____

Printed name of subject

_____   _____

Signature of person obtaining consent   Date

_____

Printed name of person obtaining consent

_____

Printed name of person witnessing consent process

Appendix H - University of Houston IRB Approval

UNIVERSITY of
HOUSTON
DIVISION OF RESEARCH
Institutional Review Boards

APPROVAL OF SUBMISSION

October 9, 2020

Dear Abbey Bachmann:

On October 9, 2020, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title of Study:	The Effect of Choice on Student Reading Motivation
Investigator:	Abbey Bachmann
IRB ID:	STUDY00002566
Funding/ Proposed Funding:	Name: Unfunded
Award ID:	
Award Title:	
IND, IDE, or HDE:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Student Cover Letter - Survey Link , Category: Recruitment Materials; • Parent Cover Letters/Email , Category: Recruitment Materials; • Teacher Invitation Email , Category: Recruitment Materials; • Study Protocol , Category: IRB Protocol; • Sample Teacher Interview Questions, Category: Study tools (ex: surveys, interview/focus group questions, data collection forms, etc.); • Child Assent Form , Category: Consent Form; • Reading Motivation Survey for Students , Category: Study tools (ex: surveys, interview/focus group questions, data collection forms, etc.); • Parental Permission Form , Category: Consent Form; • Teacher Participant Consent Form, Category: Consent Form;
Review Category:	Expedited

Committee Name:	Designated review
IRB Coordinator:	Maria Martinez

The IRB approved the study on October 9, 2020; recruitment and procedures detailed within the approved protocol may now be initiated. Please see proviso below:

- A letter of cooperation from all participating sites must be submitted to the IRB viaa modification prior to research initiation.

As this study was approved under an exempt or expedited process, recently revised regulatory requirements do not require the submission of annual continuing review documentation. However, it is critical that the following submissions are made to the IRBto ensure continued compliance:

- Modifications to the protocol prior to initiating any changes (for example, the addition of study personnel, updated recruitment materials, change in study design,requests for additional subjects)
- Reportable New Information/Unanticipated Problems Involving Risks to Subjects or Others
- Study Closure

Unless a waiver has been granted by the IRB, use the stamped consent form approved by the IRB to document consent. The approved version may be downloaded from the documents tab.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within the IRB system.

Sincerely,

Research Integrity and Oversight (RIO)
OfficeUniversity of Houston, Division of
Research 713 743 9204
cphs@central.uh.edu
http://www.uh.edu/research/compliance/irb
-cphs/