



Butler University
Digital Commons @ Butler University

Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection

Undergraduate Scholarship

2019

Reengaging Readers: How Choice Reading Promotes Lifelong Literacy

Breanna Zoepfel
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ugtheses>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zoepfel, Breanna, "Reengaging Readers: How Choice Reading Promotes Lifelong Literacy" (2019).
Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection. 465.
<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ugtheses/465>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

BUTLER UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM

Honors Thesis Certification

Please type all information in this section:

Applicant Brenna Elise Zoephel
(Name as it is to appear on diploma)

Thesis title Reengaging Readers: How Choice Reading Promotes Lifelong Literacy

Intended date of commencement May 11, 2019

Read, approved, and signed by:

Thesis adviser(s) *Susan Adamson* 4/17/19
Date

Reader(s) *Andrea Humby* 4/15/19
Date

Certified by _____
Director, Honors Program Date

For Honors Program use:

Level of Honors conferred: University _____
 Departmental _____

Reengaging Readers: How Choice Reading Promotes Lifelong Literacy

A Thesis

Presented to the College of Education

and

The University Honors Program

of Butler University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for Graduation Honors

Abstract

For instructional purposes, teachers often use an informal reading inventory, among other assessments, to sort students into like-ability groups. While undoubtedly beneficial in terms of planning and small group work, it appears in some classrooms that informal reading inventory (IRI) data sometimes becomes the driving force in literacy-related curricular decisions – including using IRI data to limit the books students have access to. With this observation as a starting point, this research attempts to answer the questions – What is the correlation, if any, between the text difficulty of books students self-select and the amount of reading growth they experience? The research conducted over the last year examines how children’s literacy growth is effected in a classroom context where readers are making their own decisions about what books to read during daily independent reading time.

This research was conducted in a second grade classroom in an urban school in the Midwest. Informal reading inventory data was collected at the beginning and end of this study providing a measure of students’ reading ability, and book logs kept by students in their book totes were collected each week to track book choices of individual readers for the duration of the study. A wide range of professional texts both in favor of and against students having the opportunity to self-select books regardless of reading level were also consulted.

Introduction

Famed children's author Dr. Seuss wrote, "The more that you read, the more things you will know. The more that you learn, the more places you'll go." As a pre-service teacher with a passion for literature, it is my goal to see all children become engaged with reading and experience the ways it can change their lives. I believe it is through reading and its related processes that so much growth occurs – intellectually, emotionally, and socially.

In schools across the country, students are being sorted into reading levels through the use of an informal reading inventory (IRI) such as a running record. While undoubtedly useful in determining the path small group instruction should take, one has to wonder how often this data is being used as a guideline for building reading instruction and how often it turns into a mandate about the books students are able to choose to read. According to the *Reading A to Z* resources shared on their website, the scores students achieve on running records and comprehension quizzes should be used "to inform [...] instruction in addition to placing students and monitoring their progress" (*Reading A to Z*). While initially this seems to suggest that IRI data should not be used to dictate the books students are able to select for independent reading, *Reading A to Z* also suggests that students "choose books below their instructional level for independent practice" (*Reading A to Z*). Does limiting students' book selections to those below their reading level benefit their growth, as *Reading A to Z* would suggest? Or on the contrary, would allowing for more choice in terms of independent reading books provide any benefits to students?

During my practicum and student teaching experiences at Butler University, I have been able to see two different instructional approaches. In the fall of 2017, I completed a practicum experience in a second grade classroom. One student I worked with in particular was a curious, deep thinker, and loved to read. As I prepared to work with this student more, I asked his teacher which books would be an appropriate level to use for instruction. His teacher emailed to inform me that this student should be reading level H books. Sitting down with this student during reading the next week was disheartening. I presented him with the carefully selected level H books suggested by his teacher. Instead of the enthusiastic reaction I had hoped for, I was met with a sigh from this student, saying, "Oh. I was really hoping I would be allowed to read something else. None of the H books are exciting. I wanted to read a J book". The sadness in this student's voice, the same voice that the previous week had raved to me about books by Mo Willems, *Captain Underpants*, and *Dogman*, made me wonder how much reading books strictly based on his assigned level was actually benefitting him.

As I began reading existing literature, I noticed that much of the research was in favor of choice reading because of the benefits relating to students' intrinsic motivation. The argument against students being able to self-select texts was primarily the challenge it created for teachers in terms of planning and fitting one more activity into the day. By examining each perspective, I was able to formulate my own questions, "How does choice reading relate to student growth?" and "Is there a way to integrate choice reading time into the already existing reading block without it feeling like additional strain on teachers?" I used these questions to determine my methodology and research design.

If we are truly to promote authentic literacy in classrooms and encourage children to have meaningful relationships with books, should we be limiting students to books only on their reading level? What is the correlation, if any, between the appropriateness of books students self-select and the amount of reading growth they experience?

Literature Review

Whether because of more distractions due to technology's ever-growing presence in our lives or general lack of interest, the rate of Americans reading for fun is on a steady decline. A 2007 study from the National Endowment for the Arts showed that over the course of ten years – 1992 to 2002 – adults reading for fun showed an overall decline of about seven percent, and students showed an approximately five percent decline (Fuglei, 2017). According to a study completed by high school teacher and author Steve Gardiner, “children’s enjoyment of reading affects their reading success through all grade levels and into adulthood” (Gardiner, 2005, p. 23). As a pre-service educator and citizen seeing other nations boost reading scores while those in the United States are slipping (Camera, 2017), this data is concerning.

Studies related to the practice of choice reading in the classroom have lent themselves to the wide belief that the benefits outweigh any negative effects that may occur as a result of students choosing their own books.

First, it is essential to discuss the belief that students should be reading books at their individual reading level rather than at grade level in order to make progress. Timothy Shanahan, professor at the University of Illinois and author, states that there is no evidence to back up this claim. Shanahan says that students actually learn more from “reading texts that are considered too difficult for them – in other words, those with

more than a handful of words and concepts a student doesn't understand" (Wexler, 2018, para. 17). Allowing students to read books that are too hard for them aids in the development of strategies students will likely have to use when faced with daunting passages on standardized assessments. Marilyn Jager Adams, a cognitive and developmental psychologist at Brown University furthered this belief, as quoted by Natalie Wexler during a panel discussion convened to discuss how reading is being taught, in stating "giving children easier texts when they're weaker readers [...] serves to deny them the very language and information they need to catch up and move on" (Wexler, 2018, para. 18). Readers should not be limited in their book selection by their current ability level. It is through choice in books that students will develop the drive and inquiry skills that educators long to instill in their students.

A research project conducted by Julie P. Fraumeni-McBride, of St. Catherine University, focused on the effects of choice reading on both engagement and comprehension in students. Fraumeni-McBride's research indicated that students had higher levels of comprehension when they were able to choose their own books. Beyond comprehension growth, Fraumeni-McBride noted that "student choice in learning enhances determination, ownership, motivation, and involvement" (Fraumeni-McBride, 2017, p. 20). Are those four traits – determination, ownership, motivation, and involvement – not words educators would use to describe the way we want students to feel as a result of our guidance in the classroom? These are characteristics of empowered learners, lifelong learners who will not stop seeking out information even as they enter adulthood.

Further benefits of choice reading are discussed in *Learning to Choose, Choosing to Learn* by Mike Anderson, an independent education consultant. In this piece, Anderson breaks down how allowing for choice to be a part of classroom culture can help overcome two barriers teachers face daily: differentiation and apathy. Differentiation is a buzzword in the education community. How are the needs of all learners being met? As Anderson writes, some educators perceive this need for differentiation as the need to have five separate lesson plans, one for each ability-level group in the class, such daunting preparation that they give up on differentiation completely. That is where choice comes in. Introducing choice in the classroom allows for students to self-differentiate. Students are able to determine what texts are of interest to them and begin to hone their ability to recognize what they are able to read and comprehend. This benefits the students ten-fold by beginning the gradual release of responsibility of their own learning (Routman, 2003), but also allows the teacher a moment of hands-off differentiation (Anderson, 2016).

In his research, Anderson also addresses the benefits choice reading can have on the apathy students tend to have when presented with anything mandatory. Most, if not all, teachers have heard a student groan, “Do we *have* to do this?” What if it was not like that, though? What if reading was presented to students in such a way where they were eager to dig into a book every day? Anderson believes that choice reading is the obvious first step in addressing the apathy many students have, specifically towards reading. By tapping into students’ interest, they will become happier and more invested in their learning (Anderson, 2016).

While it appears clear cut that choice reading is the path to higher student engagement, it is not without naysayers. Well-known educator and author with a focus on children's reading and writing development Lucy Calkins also believes that it is important for students to be reading on their independent reading level. In her *10 Essentials of Reading Instruction*, Calkins writes that "readers need to read increasingly complex texts appropriate for their grade level" (Calkins, 2015, p. 2). Acknowledging that not all students are actually reading on grade level, Calkins notes that it is the role of the teacher to provide more complex grade level texts to the students who are quickly accelerating and to scaffold instruction to provide below grade level readers with access to the texts. Despite these hurdles, Calkins is a firm believer that in order for children to grow in their reading abilities they should be reading grade level texts rather than self-selecting "just right" books.

In an article titled *The Impact of Assigned Reading on Reading Pleasure in Young Adults*, assistant professor of Library and Information Science at the University of Southern Mississippi, Stacy Creel voices another factor to consider. While acknowledging that the theme of student dissatisfaction is connected to required reading and that the dissatisfaction is linked to an overall decline in reading, Creel is concerned for the teachers involved. Finding time for students to read self-selected texts during a reading block is "difficult in light of time required for skills teaching and preparing students for statewide tests, as well as the pressure on teachers to increase students' scores on these mandatory tests" (Creel, 2015, p. 5). Under ever-increasing pressure for their students to demonstrate growth on assessments, is integrating

student choice into the school day important enough to add to the workload of teachers?

Teachers in Wentzville School District in Missouri would argue yes, choice should be given in reading because of several key benefits they unpack in an article published in *English Leadership Quarterly*. The cohort from Wentzville writes that by allowing student choice, students are being empowered. Valuing student choice shows students that they are valued at school. Choice leads to meaningful conversations, deepens relationships, and creates opportunities for independence (Skeeters, 2016). Adding choice into the classroom does not come without challenges, however evidence suggests that allowing students the freedom to self-select books is a best practice that should be integrated into classrooms.

Methodology

Loris Malaguzzi, founder of the Reggio Emilia educational philosophy, wrote in *Your Image of the Child: Where Teaching Begins* that we, as teachers, “must see ourselves as researchers [...] It requires a shift in the role of the teacher from an emphasis of teaching to an emphasis on learning, teachers learning about themselves as teachers as well as teachers learning about children” (Malaguzzi, 1994, 3). As a teacher researcher, I used both quantitative and qualitative data to give myself many data sources I could begin to learn from.

Research Context

During the fall of 2018, I had the opportunity to student teach at a choice school in a large urban district in the Midwest. I was present every school day for the entire fall semester in this second grade classroom.

The participants in this study were twenty-five second-graders, who were all six or seven years old. The students' participation did not include any work outside of the normal school activities. Once at the beginning of the school year and then at the end of each semester, students are given an informal reading inventory (IRI) consisting of a running record used to track number and type of miscues in a reading passage, as well as a short comprehension assessment. Parents gave permission for me to use students' reading data by signing a letter of consent. Student names were removed from the data and the data table was kept in a secure file.

Research Design

The research conducted was completed during a single semester in the fall of 2018. The study itself fit naturally into the routines established by the teacher in this classroom. The primary data collected came from student assessments that were determined by the classroom teacher. All other data was anecdotal.

At the beginning of the semester, each student in the class was given an IRI. The IRIs used were taken from the Reading A-Z toolkit, the program used to track the reading progress of all students at the school where this research was conducted. These assessments were used to assign students to an independent reading level. In the first month of school, the classroom teacher taught students how to use their reading level to find independent reading books and the five-finger rule for finding "just right" books, books that stretch a child but not so far as to frustrate them. Following those lessons students were able to freely select books from the classroom library to keep in their personal book totes, which they exchanged each week. During the week, I conferred with each student about the selections they had made for their book tote and

recorded whether or not the majority of the books in their book tote were at their assigned independent reading level. This process continued throughout the semester. Follow-up IRIs were given to students at the end of the first semester in order to track students' reading growth. These results were then compared to the reading levels of the books students were self-selecting to determine any correlation.

Beyond the data tables created to document growth in students' independent reading levels, a data table was created to track the number of weeks in each quarter that students self-selected books at their independent reading level. This data is used to determine correlation, if any, between growth in independent reading level and types of books being read. I also collected anecdotal data, notes jotted down that described what I saw happening in the classroom each day.

To analyze the data, I created a series of charts in order to look for trends. I looked for similarities and differences between students who read primarily on their independent reading level and those who did not. I also looked for similarities and differences between students reading below, on, and above grade level. I used this data to determine the conclusions of this study.

Findings and Implications

Finding 1: Allowing for Student Choice in Reading Increases Engagement

Giving students choice during independent reading was beneficial in several ways. First, students were able to become self-sufficient in identifying texts at their independent reading level. While overseeing students exchanging the books in their tote bags at the end of the week, I was able to collect anecdotal data regarding student growth. On September 13th, I observed as one group of students selected new books

for their tote bags. One student, an emerging reader, began placing chapter book after chapter book into her bag. Knowing these were “not yet” books for her, I was interested to see what would occur. During independent reading time that week, the student sat quietly at her desk flipping through the chapter books. When it came time for her to select books the following week, I noticed a shift in her selections. Although there were still a couple chapter books in her book tote, she had also selected several picture books. On November 1st, I noted that this student had only one chapter book in her tote, the rest were comprised of picture books of varying levels. The picture books selected by this student were still above her independent *Reading A to Z* level determined through the IRIs, however she was able to begin the process of identifying books that both interested her and fit her needs as a reader. While not all students were successful the majority of the time, all students were given the opportunity to begin to hone their skills in this area – a skill they will continue to have the opportunity to develop for the rest of their lives.

Beyond developing the ability to self-select text at their independent reading level, students were far more engaged as a result of having the ability to choose their own independent reading texts. On September 6th, I noted that during the twenty minutes of independent reading time there were thirteen different students who got up and did things unrelated to reading (sharpening pencils, getting hand sanitizer, hanging up their coats). On October 2nd, approximately one month later, I noted that during the twenty-five minutes of independent reading time, only five students left their reading to complete an unrelated task. When the same data was collected again on November 14th, the number of children disengaged during independent reading had shrunk to four.

Often while students were exchanging their books at the end of the week they would explain whether or not the books they had chosen for themselves were an easy read, too challenging, or just right. As the semester progressed, students were able to better recognize whether or not the books they were choosing to read were appropriate and held their interest. We reflected on this during class meetings, when my mentor teacher or I would begin the conversation by asking students to think about their own engagement during independent reading time. It became clear that the students were growing in their ability to notice patterns in regards to their chosen books and engagement as a result of being able to choose their own texts and reflect, both individually and as a class, on their ability to stay engaged during independent reading.

When children are told they can only choose from certain level books, it is easy for them to work their way through the available texts quickly and then become bored. When students are told they can choose any text they are interested in reading, staying engaged is more likely because students are reading high-interest books. Additionally, this process helps students begin to recognize their own growth and keep reaching for more suitable texts as they grow. If students are confined to a particular level, they may not develop the ability to self-monitor and select texts that challenge their progressing ability to decode and comprehend. By setting students up to make their own reading choices, the vast majority of students spent independent reading time doing just that, reading.

Implications.

When thinking about what independent reading time will look like in my classroom, it is important to consider that even though students may be reading books

that are above their reading level and presumed to be too hard to comprehend (or the opposite – reading books that are not pushing them), if they are engaged in reading then that is a victory in terms of literacy development. Teacher and author Donalyn Miller writes that “although [she enjoys] digging through the library to help students find books, [her] aim is to help them develop self-confidence in choosing books for themselves” (Miller, 2014, p. 73). I want my students to enjoy reading and allowing them the freedom to select their own books is the first step in this process.

Finding 2: Some Choice Reading Drives Student Growth

In examining the graph in Appendix E, there are fourteen students who grew between two and four reading levels regardless of the number of weeks the majority of their self-selected texts matched their independent reading level. Due to the small sample size, a definitive conclusion on whether or not allowing students to self-select books increases student growth can not be reached. From the data, however, it is clear that allowing students to have freedom to choose their own books certainly does not harm their reading development.

Implications.

Although a firm conclusion cannot be drawn as to whether or not reading growth improves when students are allowed to choose their own books, and it is clear that it does not hinder growth either. For this reason, choice reading will be a staple in my own classroom. Students will read particular texts when they correspond with a lesson, but during independent reading time students will be free to choose texts that are of high-interest to them. I would like to collect further data to add to this graph as I begin my

teaching career. It is my hope that as more data gets added a more conclusive trend can be seen.

Finding 3: Intentional Instructional Time is Just as Important as Choice

From the data it is evident just how important instruction is to students' reading growth. In studying Appendix C, a possible trend stands out. Students 1, 2, 15, 17, and 22 had the lowest end of semester *Reading A to Z* levels. Of those students, three – 2, 15, and 22 – showed high levels of growth over the semester, growing 3, 4, and 3 levels respectively. Because these five students were reading below the expected benchmarks for second grade, they received tailored phonics instruction, such as vowel sounds and blends, and small group or individual guided reading with my mentor teacher, a volunteer, or me several times each week. These students also received instruction in the whole group setting.

On the other end of the spectrum, students 3, 8, 11, 23, 24, and 25 had the highest end of semester *Reading A to Z* levels; each reading independently at a P or higher. These students also showed high levels of growth over the semester, growing 2, 3, 5, 3, 2, and 3 levels respectively. While these students did not receive deliberate phonics instruction, they received instruction primarily through conferring focused on developing critical thinking skills in order to continue to grow as readers. This group of students also received whole group instruction.

It is interesting to look at the data for the students who are reading “on grade level.” At the end of the first semester, five students were reading at a level M in *Reading A to Z*, students 4, 14, 16, 18, and 19. These students grew by 3, 2, 2, 2, and 2 levels respectively during the first semester of second grade.

Although there are outliers in each of these groupings, one conclusion that can be drawn from the data set is how important intentional instruction is to all students, regardless of ability level. The students with the lowest reading levels grew significantly during the first semester. These students also received substantial individualized or small group instruction in order to advance their skills to the next level. The students with the highest reading levels also grew significantly during the first semester. Again, these students also received substantial instruction in order to ensure they were being adequately challenged in terms of building comprehension and critical thinking skills. The students reading “on grade level” seemed to have the least amount of growth. The students in this group also received the least amount of instruction outside of the whole group lessons, likely because there was “nothing to worry about.” While this may have been the case, perhaps it wasn’t. Maybe there is something to worry about. It would be interesting to see how the students in this mid-level reading group would have grown had they received the same tailored instruction that their peers on each end of the spectrum received.

Implications.

In some classrooms, IRI data is used loosely. Teachers use the data to group students in a way that will place students with similar reading instruction needs together, but do not let the data dictate books students are able to read on their own, such as the classroom this research was conducted in. In other classrooms, IRI data seems to be the driving force behind the vast majority of the decisions made in regards to reading instruction. Although beneficial in terms of tailoring instruction, one has to wonder if

allowing data to determine the books students are allowed to read leads to suppressed desire to engage with text.

When designing the reading block in my own classroom, I need to plan intentional time with each group of students in the class. Yes, it is important to work with the struggling readers to develop foundational skills and to confer with the high-ability students to ensure they are being adequately challenged. I do not, however, want to neglect to dedicate a similar amount of instructional time to the “on level” students. With intentional instruction, this group of students is just as capable as any other ability group of making tremendous growth.

Finding 4: The Students Reading on or Above Grade Level Received the Lowest Comprehension Scores

When considering the table in Appendix C, there is an interesting trend in data concerning the students’ accuracy and comprehension, especially for students reading at or above grade level. For second graders, grade level reading using the *Reading A to Z* assessment tools equates to a J or K. For the purposes of this data analysis, I considered both J and K to be on grade level.

The table in Appendix D shows that eighteen of the twenty-five students in the classroom were reading on or above grade level at the end of the first semester of second grade. Of these eighteen students, however, only four scored 100% on the comprehension assessment following the reading passage. In fact, seven of the eighteen scored an 80% or lower on this comprehension assessment. Are students being pushed to higher reading levels because they are able to decode the text accurately but without much concern for understanding what they have read? Teachers

are so often under pressure to demonstrate the student's growth in their classrooms. I wonder if this need to show student progress causes teachers to advance students to the next independent reading level prematurely.

In contrast to the eighteen students reading on or above grade level are the seven students reading below grade level. Of these seven students, all seven scored 100% on the comprehension assessment following the reading. While the questions are more concrete and less about critical thinking at the lower levels, it is still interesting to notice this trend in the data.

Implications.

Reading is the combination of decoding and comprehension. Just because students are able to decode text does not mean that it is at their independent reading level. Much like I could decode a medical textbook but not understand any of it, students are seemingly being pushed into reading levels that do not truly match their ability to comprehend but instead their high ability to decode. In my own classroom, not only will it be important to use this knowledge when considering results of IRIs for my students but also for lesson planning. Students should be taught that being able to read the words is not the same as being able to comprehend the text.

Conclusion

The research conducted aims to answer the question - What is the correlation, if any, between the appropriateness of books students self-select and the amount of reading growth they experience? Through the research process, I discovered that allowing for choice in reading not only aids in growth but boosts student engagement. By collecting student assessment data and observing in the classroom each day, I was

able to conclude that while self-selection of texts did not magically transform the lowest readers in the classroom into above grade level readers, it certainly benefits those feeling apathetic about the reading block.

While this research answered one question, it also inspired several more. Through my research, I noticed that one student continually selected texts far above her independent reading level. While she was unable to accurately decode the text, she sat for the entire independent reading time and was engaged with her books, creating her own stories to go along with the illustrations. Although completely engaged in this time of silent reading, this student did not make any growth during the first semester. At that point is there still benefit in allowing this student, and those in similar situations, to self-select? There is a fine line between risking a child's passion for literature but knowing that on-level support may also be necessary.

My observation of this student led me to another question – Is there benefit in a mix of self-selected texts and required reading? How would reading growth look if students were asked to take a particular number of texts on their independent reading level for their book tote each week, but the remainder of the tote was theirs to fill with whatever texts they desired? Julia Fraumeni-McBride of St. Catherine University believes that limiting choice would positively impact the reading block stating that “participants reported greater satisfaction with their selections when their original set of options had been limited [...] This research supports the idea that a reasonable number of choices improves the likelihood that participants associate enjoyment with their decisions” (Fraumeni-McBride, 2017, p. 20). I wonder how student engagement and growth would look if students had a more limited number of choices available – if the

smaller number of books to self-select would make the process less overwhelming and thus benefit students, or if they would feel cheated out of being able to read certain texts, much like the concern I had when beginning this project.

Questions like the ones above continue to challenge me and push my thinking more deeply as I consider how I will apply this knowledge to my first classroom. As I begin my career as an educator, I am eager to learn more about how to support students in reading, not just in terms of growth but in engagement and enjoyment. My beliefs in how best to serve students will likely adapt as I grow in knowledge and get to know each group of children.

References

- Alter, C. (2014). Common sense media report: kids reading for fun less than ever. Retrieved from <http://time.com/94794/common-sense-media-reading-report-never-read/>
- Anderson, M. (2016). *Learning to choose, choosing to learn: The key to student motivation & achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Assessing a Student's Level. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.readinga-z.com/learninga-z-levels/assessing-a-students-level/>
- Calkins, L. (2015). *Units of study for teaching reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Camera, L. (2017, December 5). U.S. fourth-graders lag behind other countries in reading. Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/articles/2017-12-05/other-countries-surpass-us-students-in-international-reading-comprehension-test>
- Creel, Stacy. [The impact of assigned reading on reading pleasure in young adults](#). *Journal of Research on Libraries & Young Adults* 5 (2015): n. page. Web. <13 March 2019>

Cregar, E. (2011). Browsing by numbers and reading for points. *Journal of the American Association of School Librarians*, 39(4), 40-45. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org>

Dickerson, K. (2015). Reimagining reading: creating a classroom culture that embraces independent choice reading. *Urban Education Journal*, 12(1). Retrieved from <http://www.urbanedjournal.org>

Fraumeni-Mcbride, J. (2017). The effects of choice on reading engagement and comprehension for second- and third-grade students: an action research report. *Journal of Montessori Research*, 3(2), 19. Retrieved from <https://journals.ku.edu/jmr/article/view/6453>

Fuglei, M. (2017, November 14). Why students who read for pleasure are stronger academically. Retrieved from <https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog/classroom-resources/how-reading-for-pleasure-helps-students-develop-academically/>

Gardiner, S. (2005). *Building student literacy through sustained silent reading*.

Heatherton, Vic.: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Malaguzzi, L. (1994). *Your Image of the Child: Where Teaching Begins*. Child Care Information Exchange, 3.

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

<https://ila.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/TRTR.01109>

Miller, D., & Kelley, S. (2014). *Reading in the wild: The book whisperer's keys to cultivating lifelong reading habits*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Miller, D., & Anderson, J. (2011). *The book whisperer: Awakening the inner reader in every child*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc.

Routman, R. (2003). *Reading essentials*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Skeeters, K., Campbell, B., Dubitsky, A., Faron, E., Gieselmann, K., George, D., Wagner, E. (2016). The top five reasons we love giving students choice in reading. *English Leadership Quarterly*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/ELQ/0383-feb2016/ELQ0383Top.pdf>

Wexler, N. (2018, April 13). Why American students haven't gotten better at reading in 20 years. Retrieved from

<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/04/-american-students-reading/557915/>

Appendix A

Statement of Consent for Research

Dear families:

I am a student teacher from the College of Education at Butler University, Indianapolis, IN and am currently working in Mr. Agee's classroom. I am pursuing a senior thesis project by researching the impact free choice of texts has on literacy learning in the general education classroom. It is my hope that you will support me in this effort by offering your consent to use documentation from your child's daily routine during reading and writing time at school. Your consent will help me deepen my own understandings and hopefully offer insights within educational communities and the general public about best practices for literacy teaching.

In order to be a part of the research, no additional time or effort will be required of you or your child outside the normal requirements for the school. Rather, I would use your child's Reading A to Z level information that is collected three times each semester as part of the normal progress monitoring routine in the classroom.

The benefit of this study includes identifying aspects of literacy learning that might inform the field of elementary teaching. I would like to contribute to the professional literature and share my research at local, state and national conferences. Because of this, there is a slight risk that your child may be identified in presentations or publications where her/his work and/or words are used. In this case, a pseudonym will be used to protect your child's identity.

If you give your consent for your child to be a participant in this research, please sign and return the form below to Mr. Agee or myself. If the form is not returned, I will assume you do not give your consent for your child's schoolwork to be used in my research. I will be available at school if you have questions about the research, or you can contact me at 630-210-2104 or bzoepfel@butler.edu. You may also contact the Butler University Institute for Research and Scholarship at 317-940-9766 or my thesis advisor, Dr. Susan Adamson at sadamson@butler.edu or 317-940-9080.

Thank you,

Brenna Zoepfel

Please include my child in this research study.

Child's name (please print): -

Parent/Guardian's name (please print):

Parent/Guardian signature

Date

Appendix B

Beginning of Year (BOY) Reading A to Z Levels

Student Number	Level	Accuracy	Comprehension
1	B	88	90
2	A	98	100
3	O	96	80
4	J	91	100
5	M	100	85
6	D	88	80
7	D	93	90
8	Q	98	85
9	H	93	80
10	K	89	80
11	P	98	90
12	K	93	100
13	J	93	100
14	K	95	80
15	B	94	100
16	K	90	90
17	A	93	100
18	K	90	100
19	K	92	100
20	O	99	70
21	G	94	100
22	A	95	100
23	N	95	85
24	N	94	60
25	O	97	80

- Accuracy and comprehension scores are percentages out of 100.
- When scores are above 92/80, students demonstrated frustration at the next level up.

Appendix C
End Quarter 2 Reading A to Z Levels

Student Number	Level	Accuracy	Comprehension	Levels of Growth (Since BOY)
1	C	86	100	1
2	D	93	100	3
3	Q	97	80	2
4	M	91	100	3
5	O	98	90	2
6	I	92	100	2
7	J	93	90	3
8	T	100	90	3
9	K	99	80	3
10	O	99	90	4
11	U	100	80	5
12	O	94	100	4
13	L	92	100	2
14	M	99	90	2
15	F	91	100	4
16	M	92	90	2
17	A	95	100	0
18	M	94	80	2
19	M	96	100	2
20	P	100	80	1
21	K	94	100	4
22	D	88	100	3
23	Q	97	80	3
24	P	99	70	2
25	R	99	90	3

- Accuracy and comprehension scores are percentages out of 100.
- When scores are above 92/80, students demonstrated frustration at the next level up.

Appendix D

Student Number	Number of weeks (out of 14) majority of books in tote bag matched Reading A to Z Level	Reading A to Z Level Growth
1	5	1
2	5	3
3	12	2
4	9	3
5	13	2
6	8	2
7	8	3
8	14	3
9	8	3
10	12	4
11	13	5
12	8	4
13	6	2
14	12	2
15	4	4
16	7	2
17	2	0
18	7	2
19	7	2
20	9	1
21	5	4
22	6	3
23	14	3
24	11	2
25	14	3

Appendix E

