Spring 2017

Achievement And Engagement With The Workshop Model In The High School Literature Classroom

Sara Stensaas
Hamline University

ACHIEVEMENT AND ENGAGEMENT WITH THE WORKSHOP MODEL IN THE HIGH SCHOOL LITERATURE CLASSROOM

by

Sara Marissa Stensaas

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

May 2017

Primary Adviser: Dr. Jean Strait

Secondary Adviser: Katy Carthey

Peer Reviewer: Karen Terhark

To Brian and Paige
the loves of my life,
my constant sources
of encouragement and grace.

To my parents
roots of strength,
providers of wings,
proving the journey
is the reward.

To Dr. Strait, Katy, and Karen
committee of the punctilious,
shapers of words and thoughts,
grateful for your guidance.

To my “tribe”
for pushing me to start
and sustaining me
to finish.

To my students
my study here,
my constant study
always.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

There are a few things we know to be true in the study of literature and becoming a more skilled student in the field of English. The literature must be read carefully, processed by the student through a variety of lenses including reader response, and the outcome of that processing should be presented in discussion, presentation, and/or writing. To become a better writer, one must read to sharpen vocabulary, style, and understanding as well as having a plentitude of opportunities to write. Writing and reading are essential actions, inseparable from each other in the process of learning the art of language.

Similarly, there are also a few things we know to be true in the study of education and helping young people become more skilled students. The material must be of interest to the learner, either through the experienced choice of the teacher or, preferably, through the choice of the student based on a personal interest or a meaningful question. Inquiry is a positive predictor for meaningful engagement (Wiggins & Wilbur, 2015). To become a more adept learner, one must engage in the material in some meaningful way so as to produce growth and get feedback from the instructor for improvement.

The workshop model is one of the most efficient methods for combining what we know to be effective instruction and the study of English Language Arts (Bullock, 1998). Combining collaboration, choice, inquiry, and a constant feedback loop, the workshop model allows for productive struggle with text in reading and writing. Reading and writing are naturally developed on an individual timeframe, lending more credence to the use of workshop.

Workshop model seems to be a natural fit for the goals of the English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum but is not implemented in many classrooms both for discussion purposes (classwide discussion can go more smoothly when everyone is at the same point in the piece under study) and because it can be time consuming to allow for more choice. I myself have been reluctant to implement the workshop model in my Advanced Placement© Literature and Composition (AP© Literature) classroom for these reasons. Ironically, I struggle with connecting my experience with the power of the workshop model in teaching writing-intensive and remedial reading courses and the literature-based curriculum I now teach. With what we know about how students learn best, why the disconnect between known best practice and actual classroom implementation? What would be the benefit to letting go of the hesitancy to implement the workshop model? These questions gave rise to my research question: *Does the use of the workshop model improve engagement and achievement in an honors senior level literature classroom?*

Rationale

For eight of the twelve years of my career I taught AP© Language and Composition to juniors in the high school where I still teach. Focused on nonfiction writing and rhetoric, the workshop model instantly made sense when developing writing ideas, drafting, conferring, and revising. During most of this time, I also taught a striving reader course in the reading workshop model to move students toward meeting state expectations in reading achievement based on the skills they needed to strengthen while raising their overall reading ability. Workshop allowed me time to build the relationships with my students that I depended on when giving critical feedback, allowed my students some measure of freedom to choose the path of their learning,

and allowed for a variety of learning combinations where students formed relationships with each other based on curricular goals. I have firsthand knowledge of the power of the workshop model and feel quite comfortable in that classroom environment, which makes my reluctance to transfer that knowledge to AP© Literature more confusing and frustrating.

Two years ago, I was offered the chance to teach AP© Literature to seniors. Feeling as if a switch was good and necessary for professional growth, I jumped in. The challenge was that while I personally loved digging into text and discussing its possible applications, I knew I would have to try to instill this kind of intensive literature study in my students. I fell back on the literature education I had received in high school and college, a steady stream of assigned readings, discussions, assignments, and literary analysis papers. Using my past experience to guide my teaching, issues with student engagement, time allotment for writing, and parallel text (e.g. *Sparknotes.com* and *Shmoop.com*) reading quickly arose in the first year. The second year was better, but I was still not satisfied, partly because of students like Adam (name changed).

Adam read only one of the pieces of literature for my class - the first one. The rest he read on Sparknotes. And he did well grade wise - passing most of the tests and essays assigned in the course. Of course, this did not sit well with me as a reflection of his engagement with the material in my class. By third trimester, it was a joke with his friends that he never read the literature. I found myself trying to craft assessments that he would not be able to cheat on - that would require intensive reading, and he still did well without doing the reading. Constantly struggling to make sure that the work students did in my class was authentic and having this rather glaring example of how a student could avoid the work was frustrating to say the least. With grades done and graduation near, I asked him why he had not engaged in the text. His

response was pretty simple: time. Close reading and digging into text required more time out of class than he was willing to put in. Perhaps Adam was a gifted underachiever, but the point he made was valid. Intensive reading is a difficult process without a concrete answer, unlike doing practice math problems or filling in a worksheet. A workshop model wouldn't cure the time crunch, but it might help. Inquiry and choice certainly would encourage more personal investment in the content. Would a workshop model give him more incentive to do the work or just more time to avoid work saying that he is "self-pacing"? This question is a risk but certainly one worthy of investigation.

My personal investment in the workshop model is admittedly not altogether independent. My school district has moved to Literacy Collaborative, a professional development and instructional framework that encourages the reading workshop model in the ELA classroom as well as other subjects. Learners are coming up through the middle school, soon to be high schoolers, who have experienced the workshop model in multiple subject areas. High school teachers will need to figure out how to teach students who have grown up in an inquiry environment in which they start together, have "managed independent learning" time, and an end together (The Ohio State University, 2014). To assist in this process, last year the district asked every ninth grade English teacher to use a community unit of inquiry in the workshop model. As with most district directives, it was not taken too well, especially when accompanied by a bin of children's books meant to be used with freshly minted high schoolers who are trying desperately not to be seen as children. Several veteran teachers perceived it as an insult. Younger teachers were more willing to give it a shot either because the method aligned with their teaching

philosophy or in an effort to please administration or both. I do not believe the unit was at all intended to have a negative effect, but it did illustrate that workshop model needs to be organic.

One of the fundamental joys of the art of teaching is using one's hard-earned pedagogical toolbox to figure out how best to to teach the learning targets of the subject to students in the room. Using the workshop model is useful in a multitude of scenarios, but not all. I believe there are days when other methods are more useful to the learning target and a better use of time.

I found myself in a personal and professional conundrum. The workshop model is powerful and, when applied in the correct setting, can move students ahead quickly and profoundly. But it is not the only model. The crux of my issue lies in Vygotsky's Social Development Theory (Ozer, 2004). Reading and writing are individual endeavors. However, understanding literature is a social development with readers bringing their interpretations to discussion, being challenged and encouraged by others. My students need to be able to engage in meaningful talk which requires that other people in the room need to be reading the same literature in order to have differing opinions about the text under study. Literature circles address this need. Reading a whole class novel is certainly not off limits in a flexible model like the workshop, but it does not encompass choice in vision of a true workshop.

Purpose

As our building ELA lead teacher, it is not enough for me to try to counsel fellow teachers into using the model when I do not use it myself. I need to try it in a more traditional curriculum and collect effectiveness data. If the data shows that it boosts achievement above our current curricular model, perhaps it will inspire more teachers to use the workshop. Most of the high school teachers do not know how the workshop model plays into the Literacy Collaborative,

why we are moving to it in the high schools, or what impact it will have on our learners in the future.

The honors senior class was a favorable group to focus on for this research because it is a writing intensive course while teaching literary analysis. The increase in maturity could mean that seniors are better equipped to handle managed independent learning time effectively. I wondered if their novelty seeking brains would find a daily workshop to be monotonous or if they will feel that it is liberating to be more in control of their learning. I was on the lookout for benefits to time and task management, relationship building, and face-to-face social interaction.

Summary

Traditional methods of teaching literature were not consistently producing the thoughtful grappling with text that I wanted to see in my honors seniors. Inquiry and the collaborative nature of the workshop model could have brought my students deeper into their text investigations and writing. My intention was to experiment with this change using a literature workshop model and a reading workshop model in two different sections to monitor what changes were occurring in my classroom and to determine whether the differentiation in structure led to differing results. Another section acted as a control section. This mixed method design will help answer the question: *Does the use of the workshop model improve engagement and achievement in an honors senior level literature classroom?* In the next chapter I will examine the research behind the workshop model, ways it has been adapted for the secondary ELA classroom, and how the effectiveness of the model compares to the effectiveness of other teaching strategies.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction and Preview.

Twelve years ago, the district I teach in started moving all elementary schools to a balanced literacy framework. Coaches were hired to provide job embedded professional development and coaching. Five years ago, the district began using the Literacy Collaborative model to incorporate the many literacy interventions that were already in place. Within the last five years, the elementary and middle schools have moved to using a workshop model for all literacy classes. The request from the district administration to try the workshop model in the high school two years ago brought to the surface a few beliefs in my fellow teachers and some valid issues they have with this method. Several teachers did not try the model, believing that it was too time consuming, too elementary feeling, too free form, and too difficult to manage with 38 or more students in 46-49 minutes. I began to wonder what was the best way to teach these students who had learned reading and writing in the workshop model.

The workshop model is often used at my high school for writing instruction. A typical lesson is a mini-lesson on part of the writing assignment (e.g. idea invention, grammar, development, sentence structures, etc.) followed by time to write and confer with the instructor and/or fellow writers. The development of students' critical reading ability using the workshop model is currently much less common in the regular ELA classes. However, the students coming up through our district now have experience with inquiry-based, constructivist, investigative learning in multiple disciplines, including reading. How do we best meet them where they are in terms of reading and writing?

In this chapter, I will explore the research around the key areas of the question for this Capstone: *Does the use of the workshop model improve engagement and achievement in an honors senior level literature classroom?* First, I will explore the background and rationale for the workshop model in general then various workshop models. The literature will show the constructivist beginnings of the model and its effect on achievement at various grade levels. I will outline several readers/literature workshop models.

Next, because I will be using the workshop method in AP© Literature, we will examine the requirements of that course from the College Board, seeking to establish the appropriateness of the workshop model to that curriculum. Then I will profile the published research about student engagement with literature, in and out of the workshop model. Finally, I will examine what the literature shows us as educators about literate proficiency, the ultimate goal of all literacy education. If we see the trajectory of K-12 ELA work with literature proficiency as the end-goal, the research around methodology becomes more clear and lends purpose to exploring the background information for my research question.

The Workshop Model.

Development.

In 1987, Nancie Atwell published *In the Middle: Writing, Reading, and Learning with Adolescents*. Her seminal work outlined the use of a new, constructivist model of engaging adolescents - middle schoolers in her case - with text in reading and writing: the workshop model. Atwell recounts her first experience with the basic tenants of the workshop model, a meeting with researchers who were experimenting with engagement methods in elementary children:

> Children in the Atkinson study learned how to write by exploring the options available to real authors. These included daily time for writing, conferences with the teacher and peers during writing, pace set by individual writers, and opportunities for publication - for their writing to be read. Most significantly, Atkinson students decided what they would write about….Atkinson Academy sounded a lot like Camelot. (Atwell, 2015, p. 10)

Atwell's methods were not wholly original, but she systematized them into a model that could be replicated by documenting methods extensively. The model advocated the teacher acting as the model, echoing Vygotsky's theory of the more knowledgeable other (Sundararajan, 2010), and for teachers to move students forward in their ELA learning through coaching. Authenticity of experience, rather than contrived lessons, is a constant theme in Atwell's book - teaching students to be real readers and real writers. The model is a vehicle for this work. As Atwell (1998) describes it, "the predictable structure of a writing and reading workshop has given [teachers] a stable, authentic context in which to observe and theorize [about their students]" (p. 53). Writing workshop and reading workshop are structured separately, but each should inform the work of the other. The model is flexible and able to be altered to meet the needs of students in the class and the time constraints given (Swift, 1993). Below I look at three different structures of the workshop model.

Structure of Workshop Model.

Atwell taught on a block schedule in which both a writing and reading workshop could be held every day (Atwell, 2015, p. 32). For teachers who have sixty minutes or fewer with their students every day, Atwell proposes the following structure:

Writing Workshop on the same three or four days each week

- A five-minute spelling study at the start of writing workshop on two of the writing days
- A writing mini-lesson each day, followed by time for independent writing and individual conferences with the teacher
- A standing homework assignment of an hour's worth of writing every weekend

Reading Workshop on the other one or two days of the week

- At the start of reading workshop, the reading and unpacking of a poem, and then either a reading minilesson or booktalks, followed by independent reading time and individual conferences with the teacher
- A standing homework assignment of half an hour's worth of independent reading, seven nights a week, at least twenty pages per day (p. 33)

Notice that each of the structures includes both time for direct instruction and individual work. Central to both is the idea that independent reading and writing are based on choice of book and topic respectively. This requires the teacher to act as a guide and to have access to a wide variety of books. In a review of Atwell's 1998 edition of *In the Middle*, Peter Rorabaugh (1999) asked a similar question to the one my colleagues asked at the beginning of last year: "Can discovery-driven learning and alternative assessment, as [Atwell] describes them, work in public schools?" (p. 109). Atwell anticipated some of the concerns, and the book she wrote gives an exhaustive outline for how to implement the workshop model. However, Atwell's book was

written with middle school in mind - no mention of high school or secondary. The question remains - can the workshop model be translated to the high school ELA classroom?

Sheridan Blau and Cris Tovani both wrote books on how to implement the workshop model in high school. Tovani, in the book *So What Do They Really Know? Assessment That Informs Teaching and Learning* (2011), outlines how the reading workshop model helps her to assess student progress and encourage engagement with text in reading and writing. Tovani proposes the following structure:

> - The opening is an opportunity to share the day's learning targets and set the stage for the day.
> - During the mini-lesson the teacher provides direct instruction for the whole class.
> - During the work time, students get to dig in and practice the learning. This is the most important part of the workshop and therefore must be the longest part of the period. I try to give students the bulk of the class period to work, practice, or apply what has been taught during the mini-lesson.
> - As students work, I confer with individuals or small groups….
> - Catch-and-release occurs during the work time and can be either a planned or an unplanned part of the workshop….
> - The debriefing occurs at the end of the workshop and give students an opportunity to be metacognitive as they synthesize, reflect on, and name what they have learned for the day. (p. 39-40)

Tovani's reading workshop model follows the tenets set forth by Atwell in her development of the workshop model but is tailored to the high school setting. Tovani is a

high school ELA teacher herself and proves that this structural change is workable in the time most high school teachers are given. She discusses at length how the workshop provides rich data for helping students along in reading and writing development. Direct instruction and feedback have a daily place in Tovani's model, which may help with implementation. She treats reading and writing as skills with the same pedagogical structure, rather than delineating reading workshop and writing workshop as Atwell did. However, for the purposes of this study, I refer to her model as the reading workshop since it most closely resembles Atwell's work.

Blau's book, *The Literature Workshop: Teaching Texts and Their Readers* (2001), is filled with examples of focused workshop lessons, but they are all different. Blau argues that the teacher must guide students through "experiments," inquiry-based forays into literature to develop their independence as readers (p. 23). Each class period contains four to seven sections - starting with a reading, followed by writing or small group discussion, and ending with the whole class discussion. Blau focuses on the literature aspect of the secondary ELA classroom and treats writing as a natural complement to reading. Students read and write in every sample lesson he shows. Here is one sample given:

> Step 1: Three readings with notes and questions (10-12 minutes) [teacher gives three options for reading in the beginning of the class - all students will eventually read the others]
>
> Step 2: Group work (12-15 minutes) [after rereading and clearing up some anticipated misconceptions]

Step 3: Completing the experiment and noticing what happened (10 minutes) [class discussion of how readings developed with analysis]

Step 4: Collecting the data from the experiment (5 minutes) [Central questions of the day: how many readings did it take before the poem made sense? What interpretation did you decide on?]

Step 5: Drawing conclusions from the experiment - essential principles to guide and sustain the teaching and learning of literature (15-20 minutes) [students discuss the validity of interpretations and come to consensus] (p. 36-43)

While there are several possible structures to the workshop model, the common thread among these three are some form of student choice, teacher modeling and/or coaching, independent time, and whole group sharing, also known as student voice. In all three, the influence of constructivist pedagogy is evident. Students are active learners and the teacher is "focused on outcomes - what the learner becomes and understands" (Cronje, 2006, p. 387). Of course, educators know that this kind of learning only works when the students buy into the model.

Efficacy of the Model.

Several articles have looked into the effect of the workshop model on elementary students in relation to academic and standardized testing achievement (Sipe & Rosewarne, 2005; Reutzel & Cooter, 1991). Middle level and high school student achievement in relation to the workshop model have been studied mostly in relation to increased number of books read and increased time spent writing. High school efficacy studies have mostly focused on at-risk students or struggling readers (Klietzen & Hushion, 1992; Gulla, 2012). Intervention strategies

and dramatic changes with the lowest achieving students makes sense. My own experience supports the workshop model with struggling readers. I remain, however, in search of an efficacy study that looks at on-level or advanced high school readers.

AP© Literature and Composition.

The AP© Literature and Composition standards lend themselves to the workshop model. All AP© teachers must create and submit a syllabus that carefully details how he or she plans to address the standards throughout the year. No two are the same, but they are based on the same framework. According to the College Board's *AP© Literature and Composition Course Description* (2014, p. 7-10), there are seven reading goals and seven writing goals. I include them here to make clear the curriculum guidelines in which this study took place:

Reading Goal 1: The student reads works from several genres and periods - from the sixteenth to the twenty-first century.

R2: The student understands a work's thematic meaning and recognizes its complexity.

R3: The student analyzes how meaning is embodied in literary form.

R4: The student engages in close reading involving

a) the experience of literature (precritical impressions and emotional responses).

b) the interpretation of literature (analysis to arrive at multiple meanings).

c) the evaluation of literature (assessment of the quality and artistic achievement as well as consideration of their social and cultural values).

R5: The student makes careful observations of textual detail, establishes connections among observations, and draws from those connections a series of inferences learning to an interpretive conclusion about a piece of writing's meaning and value.

R6: The student demonstrates an understanding of Biblical and Classical mythology and how the concepts and stories have influenced and informed Western literary canon.

R7: The student participates in thoughtful discussion of literature in the company of fellow students.

Writing Goal 1: The student produces writing that focuses on the critical analysis of literature and includes expository, analytical, and argumentative essays.

W2: The student composes pieces in response to well-constructed creative writing assignments that allow students to see from the inside how literature is written.

W3: The student develops and organizes ideas in clear, coherent, and persuasive language.

W4: The student attends to matters of precision and correctness in writing.

W5: The student produces writing with stylistic maturity, characterized by

a) A wide-ranging vocabulary, using words with denotative accuracy and connotative resourcefulness.

b) A variety of sentence structure, including appropriate use of subordinate and coordinate constructions.

c) Logical organization, enhanced by specific techniques of coherence such as repetition, transitions, and emphasis.

d) A balance of generalization with specific illustrative detail.

e) An effective use of rhetoric, including controlling tone, maintaining a consistent voice, and achieving emphasis through parallelism and antithesis.

W6: The student engages in numerous opportunities to write and rewrite, producing writing that

a) Is informal and expository, allowing students to discover what they think in the process of writing about their reading.

b) Involves research, perhaps negotiating differing critical perspectives.

c) Entails extended discourse in which students develop an argument or present an analysis at length.

d) Encourages students to write effectively under the time constraints they encounter on essay exams in college courses in many disciplines.

W7: The student prepares for the essay questions of the AP© English Literature exam through exercises analysis short prose passages and poems and through practicing with “open” analytical questions.

This outline may seem surprising to those who believe that AP© Literature is a series of whole-class novel readings, discussion, and literary analysis papers. As with writing practice and development, the College Board has recognized that reading and writing are symbiotic and skill-based disciplines. Notice that nowhere in the structure does it assert that whole-class texts must ever be used, if not to create a common experience upon which students can build rich discussion.

AP© teacher Pat Monahan struggled with discussion in the high school classroom; it had devolved into question and answer sessions. Monahan squared with the idea that she would need to teach students to become better readers rather than teach the book (Monahan, 2008, p. 98). Starting with rereading, she sought to reinforce good reading habits in her students, and it ended up looking like a workshop model. Monahan writes, "for me, the fundamental principle is student independence and control - efficacy. Each of the lessons described could have been a lecture or a teacher-led discussion" (p. 103).

Workshopping the literature class makes sense especially in light of Blau's work. In a review of Sheridan Blau's *The Literature Workshop*, Todd DeStigter (2003) praises Blau's desire to return to traditional literary analysis through "a revision of the culture of literature classes, first, by making them more like process-oriented writing classes, where students are the agents of learning; and second by developing them into communities that foster the skills and habits of mind that will support the student and learning of literature" (p. 81). The kind of grappling with text that is inherent in the AP© Literature standards is not based on teacher-delivered authoritative readings but "a social process of constructing meaning." Certainly, constructivist theory seems to be the preferred aim of the AP© Literature framework.

Engagement.

One of the most important aspects to shifting teaching models to a workshop lies in the availability of choice. That choice may be in the reading chosen, the writing task, or in discussion with a teacher or fellow student. Numerous studies point to the idea that choice increases engagement (Flowerday, Schraw & Stevens, 2004; Assor, Kaplan, & Roth, 2002; Patall, Cooper, & Wynn, 2010). It follows in most of those studies that engagement then leads to heightened awareness and to longer term recall. The Flowerday, Schraw & Stevens study (2007) determined that the engagement gained through choice has a statistically significant increase in learning as well. If our goal is to increase skill and achievement, the choice afforded in a workshop approach seems to have promise for students.

Senior honors students are typically skilled in controlling their behavioral engagement conduct. Cognitive engagement is more elusive, encompassing "how students feel about themselves and their work, their skills, and the strategies they employ to master their work" (Metallidou & Vlachou, 2007, p. 13). Skinner, Furrer, Marchand and Kindermann (2008) sought to outline the connection between intrinsic motivation and the incidence of disaffection. They studied the self reported survey results and observation data of fourth through seventh graders. Their research resulted in going beyond behavior or cognitive engagement and disengagement to include perceived competence, autonomy orientation, sense of relatedness, and teacher support (p. 769-770). These are eight of the nine engagement dimensions I used to code my engagement data. Delineating more dimensions of engagement spoke to my question of how engagement may play into achievement. If I could link part of engagement to achievement, having more categories to compare may lead to a more compelling finding.

Literate Proficiency.

In order to effectively design a path, one must "begin with the end in mind" (Covey, 1990). When all students have completed their ELA courses in K-12 education, we should want them to be able to read and write independently, for pleasure or purpose. Performative literacy is a student's ability to transfer ELA learning outside the ELA classroom, "a set of literate practices without which readers cannot continue to grow in knowledge and literary competence through their reading" (Blau, 2003, p. 19). In Blau's book (2006) performative literacy is outlined as "that kind of knowledge which allows readers to perform as autonomous, engaged readers of difficult texts" (p. 201). Blau goes on in the article "Performative Literacy: The Habits of Mind of High Literate Readers" (2003) to outline seven traits of this end-goal:

1. A capacity for sustained focused attention.
2. Willingness to suspend closure - to entertain problems rather than avoid them.
3. Willingness to take risks - to offer interpretive hypotheses, to respond honestly, to challenge texts, to challenge normative readings.
4. Tolerance for failure - a willingness to re-read and re-read again.
5. Tolerance for ambiguity, paradox, and uncertainty.
6. Intellectual generosity and fallibility; willingness to change one's mind, to appreciate alternative visions, and to engage in methodological believing as well as doubting.
7. A capacity to monitor and direct one's own reading process: metacognitive awareness.

Blau argues that the most effective way to instill this complex form of literacy ability is through the workshop model (Blau, 2003 & 2001).

A student in another study who experienced the workshop model in middle school then the traditional model in high school described the meaningful differences between her two experiences as, "the connection between the work she was doing and real life, choices in writing and reading, shared readings of examples of the kinds of writing students might try, discussion of texts among a community of readers and writers, and a teacher who reads, writes, and shares" (Rush-Levine, 2011). Our goal as teachers then becomes setting the conditions for productive struggle and choice.

Conclusion.

Engagement is encouraged by choice texts and students believing that they are driving their own learning. When considering the question *does the use of the workshop model improve engagement and achievement in an honors senior level literature classroom?*, the answer would seem to be yes from the research in terms of engagement. What the current research cannot provide is strong evidence of achievement gains when using a workshop. The workshop ethos fits the College Board's curriculum requirements. Next, I will outline the methods I used to determine the various workshop models' effectiveness on engagement and achievement for high school seniors in AP© Literature and Composition.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Introduction.

The workshop model has been around for forty years and is now a popular way for elementary and intermediate teachers to integrate inquiry and differentiation into their classroom. *Does the use of the workshop model in high school improve student engagement and achievement?* Which workshop model provides the most improvement? How will we know that this model is superior in producing results? My research showed me that there are several ways to conduct a workshop. This led me to wonder which one is best. What happens when you change the whole instructional framework? This chapter will outline the setting, participants, procedure, changes to be made, quantitative measures, qualitative measures, and how data will be analyzed.

Any choice teachers make in the classroom must be in the best interest of the students to raise their achievement level. Switching to a workshop model interested me in the sense that it could increase my students' interactions with literature and make sense of it in a more meaningful way. Kids love stories when they are young and somewhere this love gets lost. If I am to rekindle this love of a good story through some of the greatest stories ever written, the workshop model may be the correct instructional path to lead them back.

Setting.

The study will take place in my AP© Literature and Composition course. I teach three sections of this course per school day, each with 24-33 17- or 18-year-old senior students at large suburban high school in the south metro area of Minneapolis/St. Paul.

The school's enrollment for the 2016-2017 school year was 2,061 in grades 9-12 with the senior class comprising 530 of those students. 73% percent of the whole-school student population are white (non-Hispanic), 10% Asian, 7% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 3% multi-racial per the Minnesota Department of Education website. The senior class has 288 male students and 243 female students. AP© Literature classes tend to be slightly more female with a ratio generally staying around 60%-40% females to males, though our total school population is 54% male. 16% of our students qualify for free or reduced lunch programs.

Participants.

Students choose to enroll in the AP© Literature course, part of the honors track of English courses. There are no barriers such as performance in previous English courses, GPA level, or class rank. Students are aware that this is a college preparatory course and may replace college credit if a score of 3 or higher is achieved on the AP© Literature test in May.

Eighty-eight students participated in this study. Assignment of students to the three sections is not random insofar as the researcher cannot randomize participants. To the best of my knowledge, students' placement in the various sections was random however (see Table 3.1, p. 29 for more specific details on the groups under study). Each student or student's guardian also completed the participant letter, giving permission to gather data (Appendix F, p. 96).

Table 3.1. Group composition data

Descriptor	Control	Literature Workshop	Reading Workshop
Total number of students	29	25	33
Male	10	13	14
Female	19	12	19

White	24	23	29
Asian	4	1	2
Black	0	1	1
Hispanic	0	0	0
Two or more races	1	0	1
Average overall GPA	3.77	3.29	3.88
Average senior honors GPA	3.65	3.01	3.91

Procedure.

Three measures of data were taken in this study. A pre- and post-unit student self perception survey monitored movement in attitude about engagement and motivation in the class for each student. A focus group of nine students met three times to discuss engagement and achievement in real time as the unit was happening to give insight into student experience. Finally, a common unit assessment administered among the three sections offered solid comparative data about which methodology was more successful for that unit.

Changes to be Made.

The control group was taught using my lesson plans from last year. Each one included two to three writing workshop days but not workshop structure in the literature phase of the unit. The second section followed the structure proposed by Sheridan Blau, who frames everything as an experiment. Each class period began with choices of pieces of literature, then moved into group work or individual writing, discussion, application to the essential question, and testing of validity of interpretations. The third section's lessons were structured into the reading workshop

as described by Cris Tovani which simply begins with a start-together, followed by a mini-lesson, then a managed independent learning time, and ended with an "end together," usually a discussion that asks all students to participate.

The essential questions and learnings did not change among the three sections, nor did the texts used. I did my best to make sure the only change is structural, so the data was reflective of the power of workshop only.

Tools.

Data was collected in three different forms. The student perception survey is a closed-response form - student must rate their perceptions on a scale (Appendix A, p. 68). Average scores were computed, saved to a secure computer, and the hard copies were stored in a locked cabinet until further data analysis. The same form was used at the end of the study to compare data (Appendix B, p. 72). Focus group meetings were recorded and transcribed in order to remain true to the discussion (Appendix C, p. 78). The unit exam was comprised of closed response and open response questions, moving from literal recall to literary evaluation (Appendix E, p. 95). The exam moves up through Bloom's taxonomy of questions, so the teacher can clearly see the depth to which the student has learned the material.

Achievement test.

The unit test from last year was used so that a comparison between this year and last year could be made. All sections of last years' class were taught with the control lesson plans. It was a fifty item test consisting of mainly recall items, requiring students to identify characters, events, and quotations.

Five short answer questions were added this year and aligned with Bloom's taxonomy of leveled questioning. Two short answer questions align with Level 1, two short answer questions align with Level 2, and one short answer question aligned with Level 3 (see Appendix E, p. 95 for questions). Those items were graded on a three point scale and averaged by section.

Engagement survey.

The study began with a modified version of Wang and Bergen's Classroom Engagement Survey (2014) and the Tripod Student Perception Survey for Secondary Students (Tripod Education Group, 2011). I compared the attitudes of students in March 2017 when they took the survey before the first workshop unit began and after they took the survey again in April 2017 after the workshop unit ended. The survey asked students to rate themselves as students, their attitudes in the class, their attitudes about school in general, and, most importantly for this study, how students perceived their achievement in the course.

After the initial survey, each section of AP© Literature experienced different instructional models. I taught one unit in three different ways: with last years' lesson plans, in Blau's literature workshop model, and in Tovani's reading workshop model. Once the unit was over, each section completed the same unit assessment in order to measure achievement.

The responses of the initial survey were averaged by group then subtracted from the average of the responses from the post-unit survey. Negative numbers show a reduction in the engagement dimension; positive numbers show an increase. Negative statements that refer to a positive engagement dimension were reverse coded as were positive statements that refer to a negative dimension. Items that were reverse coded are noted next to the item in Appendix B (p. 72).

Focus groups.

During the unit, I asked three randomly chosen students from each section to meet once a week to discuss their thoughts about the unit they are currently studying. This group remained static, with the same members, throughout the study. One benefit of studying this change with honors seniors is that I believe they conducted these meetings with meaningful discussion and thoughts about pedagogy. Of the nine students chosen by random selection, five were female and four were male. The participants were reflective of the gender makeup of the course for validity. The meetings were based on three questions, asked by the researcher:

1) To what extent do you feel engaged with the literature we are studying this week?
2) To what extent do you feel like you are learning and internalizing new information this week?
3) In what ways does the instruction this week feel different than a normal literature based class?

I kept notes during these meetings and used them to help create the "rich, thick description" (Creswell, 2004) of the students' experiences with the workshop model. My intent was also to use this data to look for the rationale behind the results from the student perception survey data. Meeting notes were examined to look for patterns that align with the outcomes of the data. Commentary from students that spoke to a facet of Skinner's engagement dimensions was recorded and coded by category.

Coding.

The engagement dimension categories I used to code the survey and focus group data came directly from Skinner et al. because their engagement measures aligned with what I wanted

to know about how my students were experiencing the workshop model. I added a ninth dimension to measure and compare student perception of the availability of choice. None of the measurement tools were organized by coding to make sure that the categories did not affect the outcome of the data. Each of the nine dimension used to code the data are described here.

Behavioral engagement.

There are student engagement practices that we can see as teachers. Is the student working through the struggle? Is the student making eye contact and paying attention? Teachers depend on these cues to monitor and adapt instruction. These are part of behavioral engagement. According to Skinner et al. (2008), behavior engagement is marked by "action initiation, effort, exertion, attempts, persistence, intensity, attention, concentration, absorption, and involvement" (p. 766). In my research, this is touched on in 21 survey items, such as "our class stays busy and doesn't waste time" and "I engage in class discussion to help make meaning of our classwork" (Appendix A, p. 68). The behavioral engagement category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "A" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.1 in Appendix D, p. 87).

Behavioral disengagement.

Outward signs of disengagement are also outwardly observable though the student's perception of what causes it may be different than the teacher's perception. Skinner et al. define characteristics of behavioral disaffection as "passivity, giving up, withdrawal, inattention, distracted, mentally disengaged, and unprepared" (p. 766). These issues were addressed in nine survey questions, including items such as "in this class, I stop trying when the work gets hard" and "I don't really care if I arrive on time for this class" (Appendix A, p. 70). The behavioral

disengagement category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "B" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.2 in Appendix D, p. 89).

Emotional engagement.

The emotional side of the engagement coin is much harder for educators to see. Behavioral engagement is about what they do. Emotional engagement is about what they feel intrinsically. This category encompasses "enthusiasm, interest, enjoyment, satisfaction, pride, vitality, and zest" (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 766). This part of the research was of particular interest to me because of its reflective nature and difficulty to monitor from outside the student. The survey asked seven questions to measure this dimension, including "I feel happy when I'm in this class" and "I like the ways we learn in this class" (Appendix A, p. 68). The emotional engagement category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "C" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.3 in Appendix D, p. 90).

Emotional disengagement.

It may be impossible to completely eradicate student feelings of disengagement though teachers certainly do not want to encourage them. Skinner lists these as "boredom, disinterest, frustration/anger, sadness, worry/anxiety, shame, and self-blame" (p. 766). Emotional disengagement was also measured in the survey in eleven items, such as "I feel out of place in this class, like I really don't fit it" and "I feel stressed out in this class" (Appendix A, p. 68). The emotional disengagement category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "D" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.4 in Appendix D, p. 91).

Perceived competency.

DeStigter (2003) praised Blau, the creator of *The Literature Workshop*, for focusing on making students the agents of their own study. Perceived competency aims to describe "students' generalized expectancies about the extent to which they can achieve success and avoid failure in school" (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 769). Six items on the pre- and post-unit survey measured this dimension, using items such as "even if the work in this class is hard, I can learn it" and "I have done my best quality work in this class all year long" (Appendix A, p. 68). The perceived competency category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "E" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.5 in Appendix D, p. 92).

Autonomy orientation.

Autonomy orientation measures whether students "engage in activities because they feel pressured or because they desire understanding and enjoy the task" (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 769). Using survey questions like "I have pushed myself to completely understand the lessons in this class" and "one of my goals in this class is to learn as much as I can," students responded to four items on the survey about this dimension (Appendix A, p. 68). The autonomy orientation category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "F" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.6 in Appendix D, p. 93).

Sense of relatedness.

Students answered seven survey items related to sense of relatedness or whether they felt they "belonged" to their teacher (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 770). This sense of belonging is measured by the survey based on the teacher's response to the student. Survey items for this category included "my teacher makes me believe that she cares about me" and "I care about

pleasing my teacher in this class" (Appendix A, p. 68). The sense of relatedness category was coded in the survey data as the letter "G" (Appendix B, p. 72). No focus group data is coded to this dimension because there were no responses that matched.

Teacher support.

Teacher support, according to Skinner et al., is the "involvement, structure, and autonomy support [students] experienced from their teacher" (p. 770). The survey asked nineteen questions about teacher support, including "my teacher wants us to use our thinking skills, not just memorize facts" and "my teacher makes lessons interesting" (Appendix A, p. 68). The teacher support category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "H" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.7 in Appendix D, p. 93).

Class agency.

The main factors of the workshop model are choice and voice - having options, making that learning into something new, and sharing it out for others. Skinner did not include a category specifically for student choice, so I created this category to reflect the amount of perceived choice each group felt. The survey gave four items regarding student choice, especially whether students made enough of them (Appendix A, p. 68). Items included statements such as "students get to decide how activities are done in this class" and "my teacher gives us enough freedom." The class agency category was coded in the survey and focus group data as the letter "I" (Appendix B, p. 72 and Figure 4.8 in Appendix D, p. 94).

Data Collection and Analysis.

I chose a mix of data points to ensure objectivity in my analysis. I analyzed the observational data and focus group discussions looking for patterns first so that the surveys did

not cloud my judgment in the patterns. Identifying information was removed. I then analyzed the results of the unit exam and the surveys. Closed response questions were analyzed using standard statistical methods. Open response questions on the exam were graded on a three point scale - zero points for exhibiting no knowledge or not attempting the question to three points for understanding and analysis with textual references in the answer.

Chapter Three described the methodology for my action research project focused on the question of *does the use of the workshop model improve student engagement and achievement?* This study focused on my 12th grade AP© Literature classroom and the three sections of students I teach in that curriculum. They were 17- and 18-years-old in the honors track of the suburban high school in Minnesota. The study started in March 2017 and ended in April 2017. After changing the structure of my lessons to the workshop model, I observed changes in students, recorded discussions, measured achievement by exam, and measured engagement through a survey. Chapter Four will detail the results of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Experimenting with engagement and achievement in workshop models was driven not only by my district's desire to move ELA classes to the reading workshop model, but by my curiosity of whether we could find data to prove that the workshop model would outperform current teaching methods. I believed that the workshop model had not been widely practiced in the high school environment because we lacked local data and because the structure of high school differs distinctly from the elementary and middle level schools where the workshop model has been widely adopted. I looked forward to finding an answer to the question: *Does the use of the workshop model improve engagement and achievement in an honors senior-level literature classroom?*

Achievement test.

The data was analyzed using the average score out of fifty on the literal recall and the average score of students in each section on a three point scale on the open responses questions that address Levels 1, 2, and 3 of Bloom's questioning taxonomy. In the table below, I have broken out the objective averages from the average score on the leveled questions by section.

Table 4.1. Results of objective test and short answer questions by Bloom's levels

Section Name	*Objective*	*Level 1*	*Level 2*	*Level 3*
2016 Data	42.68			
Control	39.14	2.10	1.97	2.59
Reading Workshop	39.72	2.13	2.33	2.26
Literature Workshop	37.32	1.64	1.94	2.22

The workshop model that created the highest returns in the survey and focus groups returned the lowest level of achievement. The reading workshop model posted the highest achievement levels until the synthesis level of knowledge. It should be noted here that the reading workshop group also self-reported the highest percentage of the book read and had the highest GPA overall and in ELA classes. This does not discredit the fact that the reading workshop model produced positive returns in both achievement and engagement. However, a paired sample t-test was conducted to compare the objective test scores of the control group and to those of the the reading workshop group. With a p score of .60, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the .58 difference in test score data is not statistically significant.

Engagement survey.

The pre- and post-unit survey covered nine dimensions of engagement. Dimensions A through H come from Skinner et al.'s work (2008). The nine dimensions of engagement are (A) behavioral engagement, looking at involvement and concentration; (B) behavioral disengagement, looking at passivity, distraction, and inattention; (C) emotional engagement, primarily focused on enthusiasm and enjoyment; (D) emotional disaffection, focused on frustration, boredom, and anxiety; (E) perceived competence control, based on students' perception of achieving success ; (F) autonomy orientation, looking for student desire to learn the material at hand; (G) sense of relatedness or the sense of belonging in the classroom; and (H) teacher support, looking at the warmth or hostility of the teacher and feelings of help (Skinner et al., p. 767). I also added a ninth dimension, (I), class agency, to the survey to isolate student choice.

Survey information was compiled by taking the survey scale of Not Applicable, Totally Untrue, Mostly Untrue, Mostly True and Totally True and making it a 0-4 scale where zero was Not Applicable up to four for Totally True. Responses for pre-unit and post-unit were compiled and averaged separately by section using this scale. Survey items that were negatively coded are noted in Appendix B (p. 72). The two sets of data were then compared and the pre-unit average subtracted from the post-unit to reveal what movement had occurred. Items were then coded into the nine dimensions of engagement and the scores were averaged together to make the table below.

Table 4.2. Average Survey Responses by Engagement Dimension

Engagement Dimension	*Control*	*Reading Workshop*	*Literature Workshop*
A. Behavioral Engagement	-0.167	0.040	0.007
B. Behavioral Disengagement	0.155	0.076	-0.070
C. Emotional Engagement	-0.153	-0.024	0.006
D. Emotional Disengagement	0.172	0.113	-0.117
E. Perceived competency	0.034	-0.044	-0.031
F. Autonomy orientation	-0.086	-0.053	0.039
G. Sense of relatedness	0.269	0.306	0.199
H. Teacher support	0.283	0.252	0.365
I. Class agency	-0.109	0.056	0.080

The highest rate of increase across all dimensions was in teacher support, with the literature workshop group reporting the largest boost. The literature workshop class did receive the most feedback per day but it was mostly through group discussion. Behavioral engagement

increased in both workshop model groups though emotional engagement increased only in the literature workshop model group. Behavioral and emotional disengagement saw increases in the control and reading workshop groups. The literature workshop group was the only one to show a decrease in disengagement. Perceived competency rose in the control group, possibly because the other two groups were learning in an environment they had not experienced in AP© Literature before. Autonomy orientation increased only in the literature workshop group. Sense of relatedness went up in all groups, though highest in the reading workshop group. Both workshop model groups perceived the increase in choice, returning gains in the class agency category. The workshop model groups together returned the highest increase in all but one of the positive engagement dimensions. The control group returned the most dramatic increases in both disengagement dimensions as well as perceived competency.

Focus group.

The figures in Appendix D (p. 87) show transcribed responses of the focus groups broken out by the categories Skinner et al. (2008) used to study perceived engagement. General questions were asked for discussion rather than asking students about the particular dimensions of engagement in order to not skew the data. For a full transcript of the focus group responses, see Appendix C (p. 78). For a full list of the responses coded to each engagement dimension, see Appendix D (p. 87). All identifying pronouns have been removed from the responses to protect privacy.

Focus group responses coded to behavioral engagement tended to focus on the usefulness of group work and the benefit of diving back into the text. Students in the literature workshop group said, “It’s good because my partner and I will talk about what we need to talk about, but

we usually have time left over, so we get to go back and bring up the things you thought were important" and "The first time I read it, I don't get the deeper stuff because I'm trying to figure out what's going on. Having to go back into the text helps because I never would have gotten to that on my own." A student in the reading workshop group responded, "It brings your understanding more in depth to reread it from the book then process with a partner than discuss in a small group for whatever we're looking for that day. Maybe the other group chose a different one of the three so you kind of like swap. More parts you get to go in depth on." A student in the control group said, "I like that we go over it in class so that if you miss a part you can put those things together." All of these responses dealt with the idea of returning to confusion, a sure sign of involvement and concentration. The different groups handled this confusion in their different structures, though reported back positively that the structure was helpful in clarifying literary elements and meaning. In looking for the benefits of one model over another, this data does not show a lack of support in any of the models, though the literature workshop model had more incidents of positive behavioral engagement.

Behavioral disengagement in the focus group responses also tended to center around group work as well as completing the assigned reading. A student in the control group said, "Other people in my group haven't read, so if we just talk in small groups, I just sit there and I don't know what to do and then I don't understand it." Another student in the control group responded, "It's hard when other people around me don't read, so I can't really talk to them about it." A reading workshop group student commented on not completing the reading and said, "I watched the BBC miniseries, and it's exactly to the book. The test was easy." None of these responses denote the inattention of the disengagement group. They do however hint at passivity

in not finding other people who have read to discuss with or not delving into the text itself. Teachers tend to believe that group work is a positive engagement strategy but it may also lead to disengagement because of a lack of independent determination.

Emotional engagement focus group responses centered around positive feelings from class structure, availability of time to process, and the combination of rereading and group work. A student in the control group said, "I feel like when we have to do all this literacy stuff where we think through 'why did she write it like this?' and 'why is it done like this?' I actually got more into the book than the normal." In the midst of a commentary on asking questions, a reading workshop group students reported, "I like the way we are doing it now. We're still going over the same stuff as the study guides in the other class, but it's more stuff that we find and our own questions. I actually get to ask questions in here instead of it just being pointed out for us." A literature workshop group student said, "I like that we're not doing over-analysis, like, let's pick apart every single word." These statements are exciting because they denote an attention to the craft of the author and the work under study, showing growth toward Blau's performative literacy. Moreover, students showed an enthusiasm for taking personal ownership over the analysis, showing promise for carrying the skills learned into future study.

Focus group responses coded to emotional disaffection centered around boredom and anxiety about discussion performance or reading comprehension. A student in the reading workshop group reported, "I'm always worried that I won't have anything to say when we go around at the end because I don't know that I will have anything original to say." A reading workshop group student said, "I don't like quizzes, but I know what to do on those. The green sheet - I didn't know what to write on it." A student in the control group posited, "Yeah, like, it

was helpful because I got to analyze a little part for the theme of the book more, but then I, like, just felt really rushed." The reading workshop group responses confirmed the responses I had heard from teachers about being apprehensive to implement the workshop model. The control group student's comment is interesting in the context of the positive emotional engagement responses given by the workshop model groups participants. Making time in class for reflection and discussion tends to creates momentum for comprehension.

Students felt the ability to achieve success through productive struggle. One student in the reading workshop group responded, "That's why I like being graded on our notes and whether or not you're doing them because you're writing down what you want rather than having to remember little details." Another student from the same group said, "Last tri[mester] was ten or fifteen minutes of questions then you would teach for most of the hour after that. Then this tri it's more people working it out on their own." In both of these responses, students felt an increased sense of control over whether or not they were successful in the class. Autonomy is an important factor, especially for students nearing the end of their high school experience.

Autonomy orientation is an important factor in whether or not students read the parallel texts available to them or the original text assigned. How can we increase students' desire to learn the material? The focus group responses coded to this category provide some insight. Some of the responses were, "I feel like there's less 'find the hidden meaning.' We're working through as we go" from a student in the literature workshop group, and "With study guides, I'm reading to answer the questions. With this, I'm reading to understand it, so I look at it differently" from a student in the reading workshop group. Strikingly, the responses acknowledge that the conditions of the reading have changed. Teacher-set conditions can lead to feelings of autonomy.

Focus group responses coded to the teacher support dimension of engagement tended toward feedback and class structure. As one student in the reading workshop group stated, "There's a pattern now. English is not my class, I'm more of a math person. Sometimes when I come to English I'm afraid because I don't know what is going to happen, but I like now that I know what's going to happen when I come in." A student in the literature workshop group said, "It helps when you show us multiple parts where something like irony happens, and I missed it the first time through, but then I'm like 'oh yeah, I see that now. That totally makes sense.'" Both examples here center on structure set by the teacher leading to feelings of involvement and success in the task. This kind of help or gentle nudging in the right direction showed students how to direct their efforts. While these conditions did not guarantee useful text interpretation, clearly structure plays a part in feeling like students have been set up for success.

Oddly, the topic of choice only came up once in the focus group meetings, providing one data point for the class agency dimension. A literature workshop group student said, "She gives us a choice of sections" as the students were trying to figure out how their sections were different. The statement the student gave does not seem relevant, but the lack of discussion of choice in the reading workshop group was noticeable. The group with the most choice did not mention how they were given choice every day of the unit. It is possible that the availability of choice, without it being touted as choice, made it seem routine rather than a focal point of the unit.

After I transcribed and coded the focus group responses by the nine dimensions of engagement as discussed above and in Appendix D (p. 87) after prompting discussion with questions about how engaged students felt in the week's activities, the extent to which they felt

like they were learning, and whether the class felt different from other literature classes they had taken. Focus group responses by question prompt is recorded in Appendix C (p. 78). I then totaled the incidents of engagement discussion by section. Each section had three representatives who agreed to meet for the three meetings, making for a total of nine possible responders in each category per section for the focus group data. The literature workshop section had nine of nine possible responders because all three students attended each of the three meetings. The reading workshop section had seven of nine possible responders (two students each missed one meeting). The control group had six of nine possible responders (three students each missed one meeting). Therefore, I divided the raw number of incidents to be sure the numbers fairly represented the responders available - by six for the control group, seven for the reading workshop group, and nine for the literature workshop group.

Table 4.3 represents the summary of the focus group engagement data, analyzed as outlined above. The literature workshop group brought in the highest returns for behavioral and emotional engagement, with the control group coming in section. This outcome is surprising considering the reading workshop is designed to increase those measures of engagement. Both negative engagement dimensions were reported more often in the control group, mirroring the results of the engagement survey. Perceptions of teacher support were reported more often in the literature workshop group. The other dimensions were reported very little by any group.

Table 4.3. Focus Group Data by Engagement Dimension

Raw number divided by the number of respondents. Raw number is in parenthesis.

Engagement Dimension	*Control*	*Reading Workshop*	*Literature Workshop*
A. Behavioral Engagement	1.33 (8)	0.42 (3)	1.56 (14)
B. Behavioral Disengagement	1.00 (6)	0.28 (2)	0.33 (3)
C. Emotional Engagement	0.67 (4)	0.14 (1)	0.78 (7)
D. Emotional Disengagement	0.83 (5)	0.43 (3)	0.67 (6)
E. Perceived competency	0.17 (1)	0.00 (2)	0.00 (0)
F. Autonomy orientation	0.00 (0)	0.43 (3)	0.33 (3)
G. Sense of relatedness	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)
H. Teacher support	0.50 (3)	0.14 (1)	0.67 (6)
I. Class agency	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	0.22 (1)

I had hypothesized that the workshop model groups would score higher in engagement, and this was confirmed in both the survey and focus group data. What I had not expected was how strongly the control group would report disengagement. The positive feelings of choice and connection in the workshops were easy to predict given the research I had done and my experience in the classroom, but I was surprised at the disengagement factors. In fact, in the survey, the only group to report a reduction in disengagement was the literature workshop group. Ironically, this group also performed the lowest on the objective and leveled achievement data.

Analysis by Dimension

I will examine each dimension of engagement, as described by Skinner (2008), and synthesize the data collected on that dimension to explain the trends that lead to the indication that engagement in the workshop model does, indeed, lead to increased achievement.

It is important to remember that these models were introduced at the beginning of a new trimester, meaning that students may or may not have been together in English class before, thus affecting their comfortability with classmate perception and may or may not have had experience with me as a teacher. Some returns on the survey may be artificially high because the student did not have a prior opinion of me or my class and, therefore, marked NA on the survey. Also, in the focus group data, there was no way for the result to go negative, i.e. the student could not retract a statement.

Behavioral engagement.

According to Skinner et al. (2008), behavior engagement is marked by "action initiation, effort, exertion, attempts, persistence, intensity, attention, concentration, absorption, and involvement" (p. 766). In my research, 21 survey items, such as "our class stays busy and doesn't waste time" and "I engage in class discussion to help make meaning of our classwork" addressed this dimension (Appendix B, p. 72). Focus groups also discussed this in Figure 4.1 in Appendix D (p. 87).

On the survey, reports of behavioral engagement went up in the workshop classes and down in the control group, with the reading workshop group returning the highest positive change. I believe this is because the reading workshop model required all students to participate

every day. However, the focus group reported increased behavioral engagement in the control group, but not as much as in the literature workshop.

The focus group participants were motivated by the emphasis of focused rereading. I would expect adolescents are reticent to reread something they have already done, viewing it as a waste of time and leading to decreased behavioral engagement. However, the students described how being able to go back made them think about new information and connections they did not make the first time around. The expectation of those around them to have something to contribute to the group was also a motivator in reading the novel under discussion and focusing on the readings given as choices for discussion.

Workshop expectations of small group work seem to also have boosted concentration, with students in the workshop models responding more positively to survey items about keeping the brain busy than their control counterparts. Active small group discussion and conferences with the teacher on a regular basis helped to maintain involvement.

Behavioral disengagement.

Behavioral disaffection presents as "passivity, giving up, withdrawal, inattention, distracted, mentally disengaged, and unprepared" in the classroom (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 769). These issues were addressed in nine survey questions, including items such as "in this class, I stop trying when the work gets hard" and "I don't really care if I arrive on time for this class" (Appendix B, p. 72). Focus group responses are listed in Figure 4.2 in Appendix D (p. 89). In both the survey and the focus group, the control group scored highest in this category meaning they had the highest increase of disengagement behaviors. Survey data in this category increased significantly for the control group. It is possible that the focus group data was influenced by what

they were hearing about the structure of other classes, but this does not account for the survey returns.

Most disengagement comments either centered around using worksheets and knowing what to do with discussion. The only worksheet in this unit was a character map given to all classes, so I believe the negative comments may be reflective of about previous literature classes. The focus groups generally found the character map helpful, but students indicated that they had received study guides in other classes that had not been helpful. The other disengagement frustration in the focus group occurred when other group members had nothing to say. Discussions stalling out is not uncommon, but the reported frustration with it is a sign that a collaborative discussion culture must be grown. The ebb and flow of discussion, particularly about confusing or complex texts or topics, is something that has to be experienced regularly or it would logically frustrate some students.

Emotional engagement.

Emotional engagement encompasses "enthusiasm, interest, enjoyment, satisfaction, pride, vitality, and zest" (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 766). Focus group results for emotional engagement are in Figure 4.3 in Appendix D (p. 90). The survey asked seven questions to measure this dimension, including "I feel happy when I'm in this class" and "I like the ways we learn in this class" (Appendix A, p. 68 and Appendix B, p. 72). In both the survey data and the focus group, the literature workshop scored highest and is the only group to post a positive return on the survey.

Positive feelings and independent work time seemed to go hand in hand. Students reported that they could process the material more thoroughly because they had time and they

"got more out of this book" than normal. Those positive feelings seemed to be reinforced when the students could, in a small group without fear of large group ridicule, test out interpretations, discard, and revise.

Emotional disengagement.

During the focus groups, all sections reported some feelings of disengagement. Skinner lists these as "boredom, disinterest, frustration/anger, sadness, worry/anxiety, shame, and self-blame" (p. 766). See Figure 4.4 in Appendix D for all of their commentary (p. 91). Emotional disengagement was also measured in the survey in eleven items, such as "I feel out of place in this class, like I really don't fit in" and "I feel stressed out in this class" (Appendix A, p. 68 and Appendix B, p. 72). The control group had the highest increase in emotional disengagement by both measures. Just like behavioral disengagement, the literature workshop section was the only one to have a reverse trend.

Focus group conversation tended to center around frustration with the density of Austen's writing and subsequent amount of time it took to read as well as boredom listening to everyone else in the class talk. This last comment confirms one of the reasons the reading workshop model has not been widely adopted. Having every student respond to the whole class every day is time consuming and not always the most productive use of time as eventually comments become repetitive. If a teacher can create the parameters that whatever a person shares must build upon someone else's commentary, it becomes more interesting, though it takes up no less time.

Perceived competency.

Perceived competency aims to describe "students' generalized expectancies about the extent to which they can achieve success and avoid failure in school" (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 769). Six items on the pre- and post-unit survey measured this dimension, using items such as "even if the work in this class is hard, I can learn it" and "I have done my best quality work in this class all year long" (Appendix, p. 68 and Appendix B, p. 72). The reading workshop in the focus group data looks inconclusive (see Table 4.3, p. 48) because one comment was positive and one was negatively coded because the student was unsure they would say anything that was useful in the large group discussion at the end of the hour. Oddly, the literature workshop group did not score highest in either measure on this metric.

The control group scored highest in both the focus group and the survey, and this dimension was the only positive change in the survey for the control group. My hypothesis is anchored the structure of the class was more of the structure they are accustomed to, so they felt more positive about being able to complete the unit with the grade they expected.

Autonomy orientation.

Autonomy orientation measures the students' "engage in activities because they feel pressured or because they desire understanding and enjoy the task" (Skinner et al., 2008, p. 769). Using survey questions like "I have pushed myself to completely understand the lessons in this class" and "one of my goals in this class is to learn as much as I can," students responded to four items on the survey about this dimension (Appendix A, p. 68 and Appendix B, p. 72). Focus group responses are in Figure 4.6 in Appendix D (p. 93).

The workshop models split the highest returns in this category; the literature workshop had the only positive change on the survey while the reading workshop had the highest positive return on the focus group data. In the focus group discussion, the reading workshop students brought up how they were asked to complete annotations in the text per Tovani's (2011) suggestion. After checking notes for a grade twice, I told the students that I would not look again. Two students from the reading workshop section discussed in the third focus group meeting that they were still completing or thinking in terms of notes even though they did not need to because they found it helped. That desire to understand pushed them to complete the notes without having a grade attached as motivation.

Sense of relatedness.

Part of engagement is whether a student feels like they belong in the classroom. Students answered seven survey items to this category. Survey items included "my teacher makes me believe that she cares about me" and "I care about pleasing my teacher in this class" (Appendix A, p. 68 and Appendix B, p. 72). The focus groups did not mention anything about this, possibly because I was in the room when they discussed. On the survey, the reading workshop students responded the highest. This is also not surprising because I met with all of those students one-on-one at least twice over the course of the three-week unit. Their sense of connection should be higher because they had the highest amount of individual attention from the teacher.

Teacher support.

The findings in the self-relatedness dimension seem odd in the face of this category's summation. The teacher support category looked for the level of support and involvement each group felt came directly from the teacher. The survey included nineteen questions about teacher

support, including “my teacher wants us to use our thinking skills, not just memorize facts” and “my teacher makes lessons interesting” (Appendix A, p. 68 and Appendix B, p. 72). In both the survey and focus group data, the literature workshop group scored highest.

In theory, the reading workshop should claim this category as students received individual attention and a wider amount of choice. It seems here that the limited choice given to the literature workshop students, three options every day, was directed enough to see value but open enough to create a sense of self-direction. According to one student in the focus group, “Now, there’s questions, read a targeted something in the book, then discuss and go around. Before it could have been anything.” Teacher support is generally discussed as feedback, but even a slight change in how choice was presented showed that teacher support in lesson design can have a significant impact as well.

Class agency.

In order to isolate the factor of choice in each group, the class agency dimension was coded separately. The survey included four items regarding student choice, especially whether students made enough of them (Appendix B, p. 72). Not surprisingly, the control section with no extra choice went negative on that category. There was one focus group comment about choice as seen in Figure 4.8 in Appendix D (p. 94).

Once again, the literature workshop section scored higher in this category even though they had less choice. Thinking back, the reason for the higher score may be because I offered the rereadings as choices, even though students were meant to have read that section the night before. When presenting reading choice to the reading workshop students, the choices of what to read were often going back over what they had read the night before and picking out one section

to bring to their group for discussion. Perhaps that was not perceived as agency because it was restricted to the reading they had done. Students may have felt the activity was more like a scavenger hunt than a choice.

Achievement.

All three sections underperformed compared to the students from last year; the average from last year was of 42.68 out of 50 multiple choice questions. The reading workshop model had the highest achievement as noted in Table 4.1 (p. 39) with an objective item total of 39.72. The difference showed to be statistically insignificant in a two-tailed t-test comparison of the control group and reading workshop group.

Interestingly, the level 3 questions had the highest return in the control group. The reading workshop group spent quite a lot of time on characterization and plot. We did not seem to have the time to move into the upper level analysis of the novel because small group discussions were spending more time in the lower levels of comprehension. Time did end up being an issue as far as deepening discussion is concerned because I had to keep time open for every student's voice to share with to the large group. This result may be caused by that use of time. The control group asked me the questions about basic plot points and characterization, which I answered for them. Rather than sending students into groups to discuss basic comprehension, students spent what group time they had discussing higher level questions.

Curriculum Evaluation

Because I needed to keep the content and readings similar for control purposes, I felt constricted in the choices I could offer for the workshop model groups. However, the workshop model classes had more questions at the beginning of class and had more to say about the book

itself after their independent work time or group examination time. The discussions we had in the control group were more productive than in the workshop groups: there was less student talk, but the student talk got further.

In the focus group, two students said they really liked the structure of the workshop group, that it "takes the mystery out of what we are doing in English." I found this to be an illuminating comment since students tend to say they like STEM or humanities but not both. Math classes tend to be more predictably structured as are science classes. Science classes do as well. How does routine play into the workshop model's success? In addition to a set routine, several factors of the workshop models used in this study had beneficial outcomes. Limited choice, teacher feedback, and time increased engagement, though not achievement. I will address this and other implications of my research in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

> "The battle here, or what feels like a battle, perhaps especially with high-achieving students -- high school seniors preparing for Advanced Placement tests for example, or college students worried about grades and eventual graduate school applications -- is to push students to enter for themselves into the hermeneutic arena and engage in acts of interpretation that will produce meanings that they themselves can trace back to the evidentiary reasons, textual facts, and ideological engagement that plausible meanings are built on."
>
> - Sheridan Blau, 2003, p. 187

This project began out of frustration with my students' reliance on parallel text, e.g. *Sparknotes* and *Shmoop,* as a replacement of reading the actual books assigned to them. I believed that using the workshop model as encouraged by my district might increase my students' reading of the original text. On that metric alone, this study has been successful. As I thought about the workshop model before this study, concerns about time, number of students, getting to every voice each day, providing enough choice, and the honors curriculum to be followed all reminded me why the reading workshop model has not caught on in high school classrooms beyond intervention in my school. I wanted to design a study that would isolate the benefits and drawbacks of making the jump to the workshop model and explore the logistics of doing so in an honors program with seniors.

Beginning this study, I expected that my control group would compare to last year's students on achievement, the reading workshop students would have high engagement and

possibly outperform the control group, and the literature workshop group would fall somewhere in the middle on engagement and outperform the reading workshop group on achievement. The literature workshop does not offer as much choice, does not allow for every voice to be heard by everyone else every day but involves certainly more participation than the control, and generally seems to be a hybrid of "traditional" instruction and workshop models.

There was no statistically significant change in the achievement data between the control group and the reading workshop model group. The literature workshop came in last, with an average significantly behind those of the control and reading workshop models. The control group outperformed the workshop model groups in higher level thinking, however. Students in the control group not only were able to synthesize information to discuss Austen's satire in characterization and plot, but they were better able to recall specific instances in the work itself. From the data, the workshop models in this study had no effect on achievement.

The engagement data was more clear. As I had expected, the control section increased its response on the disengagement measures. I had not expected how disengaged the control group became over the course of the unit. The workshop models collectively claimed all but one of the positive engagement traits. However, instead of the literature workshop landing in the middle most of the time, the reading workshop claimed the fewest positive dimensions and often fell between the control group and the literature workshop on most dimensions of engagement. My prediction of the middle performing model having the highest achievement was accurate; but I predicted the literature workshop would be the middle model. The reading workshop model instead showed some increase in engagement but a negligible increase in achievement. The

answer to the research question is that the workshop model increased engagement but had little or no effect on achievement.

Key Findings

Absence of choice and small group processing increases disengagement. The research clearly shows an increase in engagement when choice and voice are involved (Parsons et al., 2015; Flowerday, Schraw, & Stevens, 2007). Not allowing for choice and doing very little small group discussion had a far larger impact than I had hypothesized. When doing my initial research, I was looking for the positive and negative effects of workshop rather than the positive or negative effects of not offering choice and voice. The control group showed increased behavioral and emotional disengagement. According to Fredericks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004), disengagement can lead to a variety of negative effects from apprehension in making mistakes to dropping out of school. Though this seems extreme, it may have a bearing on whether or not a student decides to attempt higher level coursework and remain motivated to carry it through.

Voice, choice, and experimentation lead to engagement. Perhaps Tovani (2011) described the connection between emotional and cognitive engagement best in her rationale for the reading workshop model: "Through talk and text, I build their trust and create a connection that allows me to move them toward deeper cognitive engagement" (p. 32). All positive engagement measures to some degree increased with the two workshop models in this study. The factors that were not present in the control but were present in the workshop models were voice, choice, and experimentation with interpretations. The work of Blau, Tovani, Atwell, and Kletzien & Hushion all predicted this result.

Value of controlled choice. During a focus group meeting, one of my students from the literature workshop class said, "Class feels more structured… there's (sic) questions, read a targeted something in the book, then discuss and go around." Pondering her response afterward, I remembered that Nancie Atwell had identified this as controlled choice. She wrote, "Freedom of choice does not undercut structure" (1989, p. 15). Free choice can feel too boundless and wide to speak to the standards we must teach. Students feel this way as well. This speaks again to the idea of balance - there is a time for free choice (e.g. independent reading books) and a time for controlled choice (e.g. learning literary elements and how they work).

Collaborative discussion culture must be intentionally grown. If the role of public education is to grow productive citizens, perhaps we can do no higher service than to teach students how to discuss ideas respectfully. Hollander (2002) described direct instruction of discussion as "focus[ing] on discussion as a collective process seems to foster a greater sense of community, with more interaction and respect among students" (p. 325). Several students noted that while having an "every voice" share-out in the reading workshop model required them to crystallize something they had learned or worked on that day, it did not require them to listen, react, or build capacity in others. In the literature workshop, the groups went further to look at the "experiment" and the quality of what they had to say at the end of the hour was more dependent on productive group discussion. Feeling like what they had to add to discussion merited examination by fellow students, rather than simply stating it and having the class move on, helped the students feel more engaged in discussion.

Implications for Educators

Teacher support need not be in the form of individual feedback. The workshop models both built in time for the teacher to confer with students and check in on their development. In the literature workshop model, I mostly sat in with groups, retrieved information for questions they had about the text, encouraged students to stretch their thinking by taking interpretive risks, and clarified misunderstandings. In the reading workshop model, I circulated around the room and checked in with individual students, making sure to confer with each student at least once a week. Both groups reported increased teacher support, but the literature workshop group increased more. I believe this is because rather than checking in with them individually once to three times per week, I checked in with the experiment groups once or twice per day. Admittedly, the feedback I gave to individual students was more in-depth and targeted. However, it seems from the results of the study that frequent small group feedback is more helpful than less frequent individual feedback.

Create space for experimentation and failure. A student from the literature workshop group wrote on an exit card one day that she was way off in her interpretation of why a character was acting a certain way. She wrote, "I'm glad my group members didn't judge me. They're wrong sometimes, too." This student had only contributed to class discussion once this year. Her comment told me a couple of things - that she was participating in discussion and that enough space had been created for her to be wrong. It also reminded me of Salman Khan, the founder of Khan Academy, in a TED talk saying, "The traditional model - it penalizes you for experimentation and failure, but it does not expect mastery. We encourage you to experiment. We encourage you to [fail], but we do expect mastery" (2011). Giving time and conditions for

bouncing ideas off other students who had read the same literature created what Nancie Atwell (1998) cited as one of the values of the workshop model, "the predictable structure of a writing and reading workshop has given [teachers] a stable, authentic context in which to observe and theorize [about their students]" (p. 53). Creating this space for experimentation and failure is important for engagement, though this study does not support its translation to achievement.

Limitations

Eighty-eight honors-level seniors participated in this study. Because the study was held in the two weeks prior to and one week after Spring Break, students may have missed days for participating in any one of four different field trips or three different international school-sponsored trips, one of which kept four students out until the end of the study. Certainly, it is nearly impossible to have fully consistent participation with normal illness and other excused absences, but the timing of the study warrants consideration. Changing the study window to earlier in the year may have changed the results.

Related to timing, the study was completed over one month to monitor change in the course of one unit. Though there was movement in the data, one month is a short window of time to reassess how a student feels about their performance and the class as a whole. Stretching this timeframe out over more time while keeping the models in the same groups may have returned a different reflection of engagement.

The incoming achievement level of the groups also needs to be considered when interpreting the results as well. The reading workshop group - the group that returned the highest rate of reading, the relatively highest achievement result, and some of the highest engagement indicators - has the highest GPA overall and in senior honors literature classes. The class is

stacked with two of the five senior class valedictorians and four National Merit Scholars. Even though the models to be applied were chosen at random, it is possible that this group would have outscored the other two in percentage read and achievement despite the model used.

Finally, 88 students is a small sample size when studying achievement. Ideally, this study would have included more students and possibly taken another achievement measure such as the AP© Literature exam results to corroborate the findings of the unit test.

Recommendations for Future Research

Further research is needed to strengthen the link between the workshop model and achievement in the high school setting. The results of this study indicate that sharp rises in engagement do not necessarily lead to achievement. The literature workshop showed the highest increases in the positive engagement dimensions, but those increases did not translate proportionally to achievement on the literal or higher-level interpretive measures. The reading workshop model showed moderate increases in engagement and had the highest level of achievement, though not statistically significant. The achievement increase does not match the increases in engagement data. Either the link between engagement and achievement is not as strong as we believe or this is an anomaly for this group of students. Further study is needed, most likely experimenting with various workshop models on the same group of students, perhaps with junior students, to determine what engagement increases lead achievement.

Also, I would like to pursue the idea of choice of text versus choice of interpretation in a common text. Can choice of interpretation have the same engagement effect as being able to choose the text? Neither workshop group had free choice of anchor text in this case. I noticed, however, in the focus groups and the survey data that class agency was highest when the teacher

offered three choices of text to revisit. The restricted choice of text seemed to increase the students' perception that they could find the element or skill under study, therefore bolstering student confidence in the veracity of their interpretation. Willingness to attempt an interpretation is, of course, the goal of high school literature classes, entering the hermeneutic arena as Blau puts it. If such a link between restricted choice and increased interpretative confidence can be proven, the increased sense of control may go further to encourage workshop use in the high school setting.

Development of the Author

Through this study, I have been reminded that the power of the workshop model lies in collaboration and connection. Students must be given the chance to experiment with their ideas, allow themselves to be wrong without necessarily doing it in front of the whole class, and get feedback from fellow students and the teacher. It was not as hard as I had anticipated to mold my classroom structure into the workshop models with a whole-class novel. Working around the choice requirement of the workshop philosophy with a central text was difficult at times but not impossible. Going forward, I want to experiment with offering more genuine choice, while still keeping to the required curriculum and maintaining the routine that several students found useful. Time for every voice is a legitimate concern with larger classes; it came up as a source of boredom for even a class of thirty-three or fewer. Classes at the high school often have 35 to 38 students in them. I found it helpful to frame literature as an experiment because the learning target becomes a sort of hypothesis, and they were more willing to take risks in that setting.

Plan for Communicating Results

I will share these results with administration and district leadership as well as other educators via the Hamline Digital Commons. My hope is that through committee work and collegial discussion, I will be able to demonstrate that the workshop model has feasibility and can have a positive impact in the high school setting. Also, I would like to start the conversation that there are many kinds of workshop models, some molded particularly to the high school ELA classroom.

Conclusion

Does the use of the workshop model improve engagement and achievement in an honors senior-level literature classroom? The workshop model has been used for decades in middle and elementary level classrooms but has struggled to become widely used in the high school setting. This study and recent research indicates that the use of the workshop structure, even independent of the free student choice often offered within the workshop model, encourages engagement in literature. There is compelling evidence here to suggest that the workshop structure widens student opportunities to engage in the struggle of meaning-making in literature and, thus, improves retention of what teachers aim to have students learn about the work of literature itself and about being a skilled reader. Therefore, educators must seek to give students space to test their interpretations and process their thinking and the text.

While evidence suggests that engagement is increased by the workshop values of voice, choice, and experimentation, achievement data suggests that there is also value in teacher-driven, direct instruction to move past the surface level understandings so that students can spend time experimenting and discussing higher levels of interpretation. There are myriad ways to structure

a workshop philosophy, each needing to be tailored to the students in the room, the work and skills, and the teaching style of the professional in the classroom. Balanced instruction remains the art of teaching.

Appendix A

Perceived Engagement Survey

Adapted from Tripod Student Perception Survey for Secondary Students V12 and Wang And Bergins' Classroom Engagement Survey

Instructions:

Thank you for participating in this survey. It is important that you think about your learning in AP© Literature & Composition only. The reason that some questions are very similar to others is to help make it really clear what you think. Marking "N/A" signifies that you have no basis for an opinion at this time.

Please check the box that best describes you:

- ▫ This is my first trimester in AP© Literature with this teacher.
- ▫ This is my second trimester in AP© Literature with this teacher; 1st trimester was the other.
- ▫ This is my second trimester in AP© Literature with this teacher; 2nd trimester was the other.
- ▫ This is my third trimester with this same teacher.

	Totally Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Mostly True	Totally True	N/A
1. In this class, it is important for me to thoroughly understand my class work.	○	○	○	○	○
2. I regularly participate in class discussion.	○	○	○	○	○
3. My teacher in this class makes me feel that she really cares about me.	○	○	○	○	○
4. I would ask the teacher for help, if I needed it.	○	○	○	○	○
5. One of my goals in this class has been to learn as much as I can.	○	○	○	○	○
6. This class keeps my brain really busy.	○	○	○	○	○
7. In this class, I take it easy and do not try very hard to do my best.	○	○	○	○	○
8. If I were confused in this class, I would handle it by myself, not ask for help.	○	○	○	○	○
9. I can do almost all the work in this class if I don't give up.	○	○	○	○	○
10. I feel out of place in this class, like I don't really fit in.	○	○	○	○	○
11. Sometimes I pretend to be working hard for this class, when I'm really not.	○	○	○	○	○
12. The material we are learning connects to my life outside of school.	○	○	○	○	○
13. Students get to make enough choices in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
14. I think a lot in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
15. I don't like asking the teacher in this class for help, even if I need it.	○	○	○	○	○
16. I don't really care whether I arrive on time to this class.	○	○	○	○	○
17. When doing schoolwork for this class, I try to learn as much as I can and I don't worry about how long it takes	○	○	○	○	○
18. When she is teaching us, my teacher thinks we understand even when we don't.	○	○	○	○	○

	Totally Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Mostly True	Totally True	N/A
19. Sometimes I question myself to make sure the content makes sense to me.	○	○	○	○	○
20. I engage in class discussion to help make meaning of our classwork.	○	○	○	○	○
21. Trying to be liked sometimes distracts me from my work in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
22. In this class, my teacher accepts nothing less than our full effort.	○	○	○	○	○
23. My teacher knows when the class understands, and when we do not.	○	○	○	○	○
24. This class is a happy place for me to be.	○	○	○	○	○
25. My teacher asks questions to be sure we are following along when she is teaching.	○	○	○	○	○
26. It's important to me that others do not think I'm dumb in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
27. Being in this class makes me feel angry.	○	○	○	○	○
28. My thinking in this class leads me to develop new questions.	○	○	○	○	○
29. My teacher wants me to explain my answers - why I think what I think.	○	○	○	○	○
30. My after-school activities don't leave enough time to finish my homework.	○	○	○	○	○
31. I feel respected in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
32. My classmates behave the way my teacher wants them to.	○	○	○	○	○
33. I have been able to figure out the most difficult work in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
34. My teacher really tries to understand how students feel about things.	○	○	○	○	○
35. Students get to decide how activities are done in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
36. I get nervous in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
37. My teacher wants us to share our thoughts.	○	○	○	○	○
38. One of my goals in this class has been to show others that I am good at class work.	○	○	○	○	○
39. In this class, we learn a lot almost every day.	○	○	○	○	○
40. I like the ways we learn in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
41. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day.	○	○	○	○	○
42. In this class, I stop trying when the work gets hard.	○	○	○	○	○
43. Our class stays busy and doesn't waste time.	○	○	○	○	○
44. We should be allowed to make more choices in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
45. I daydream in this class on a regular basis.	○	○	○	○	○

	Totally Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Mostly True	Totally True	N/A
46. My answers to this survey show what I really think.	○	○	○	○	○
47. My teacher doesn't let people give in when the work gets hard.	○	○	○	○	○
48. Even if the work in this class is hard, I can learn it.	○	○	○	○	○
49. This class does not keep my attention - I get bored.	○	○	○	○	○
50. I feel stressed out in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
51. While working on this class, I form new questions in my head.	○	○	○	○	○
52. I am constantly finding connections between the material in this class and my life outside of school.	○	○	○	○	○
53. My teacher wants us to use our thinking skills, not just memorize things.	○	○	○	○	○
54. I care about pleasing my teacher in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
55. I have done my best quality work in this class all year long.	○	○	○	○	○
56. Students speak up and share their ideas about class work.	○	○	○	○	○
57. My teacher makes lessons interesting.	○	○	○	○	○
58. One of my goals is to show others that class work is easy for me.	○	○	○	○	○
59. My teacher gives us time to explain our ideas.	○	○	○	○	○
60. In this class, we learn to correct our mistakes.	○	○	○	○	○
61. I combine information in this class to create new understandings.	○	○	○	○	○
62. I work well with my classmates and learn together with them.	○	○	○	○	○
63. My teacher explains difficult things clearly.	○	○	○	○	○
64. I am satisfied with what I have achieved in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
65. I am constantly keeping my mind from wandering.	○	○	○	○	○
66. My teacher makes learning enjoyable.	○	○	○	○	○
67. My teacher checks to make sure we understand what she is teaching us.	○	○	○	○	○
68. My teacher gives us enough freedom.	○	○	○	○	○
69. One of my goals in this class is to keep others from thinking I'm not smart.	○	○	○	○	○
70. I sometimes hold back from doing my best in this class, because of what others might say or think.	○	○	○	○	○
71. I ask questions in this class if I need to.	○	○	○	○	○

	Totally Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Mostly True	Totally True	N/A
72. In this class, it seems like my mind is always busy.	○	○	○	○	○
73. The comments that I get on my work in this class help me understand how to improve.	○	○	○	○	○
74. In this class, time seems to pass very quickly.	○	○	○	○	○
75. My behavior in this class sometimes annoys the teacher.	○	○	○	○	○
76. We get helpful comments to let us know what we did wrong on assignments.	○	○	○	○	○
77. My teacher asks students to explain more about answers they give.	○	○	○	○	○
78. My answers to this survey show my real opinions.	○	○	○	○	○
79. Sometimes I pretend I'm not trying hard in this class, when I really am.	○	○	○	○	○
80. My teacher respects my ideas and suggestions.	○	○	○	○	○
81. Putting together information from various sources in this class keeps it interesting.	○	○	○	○	○
82. Time seems to pass very quickly in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
83. In this class, I worry that I might not do as well as other students.	○	○	○	○	○
84. Sometimes in this class, I worry about not looking smart.	○	○	○	○	○
85. Putting together what we've learned before with the information we are learning is a key component in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
86. My teacher seems to know if something is bothering me.	○	○	○	○	○
87. For this class, I try hard to be on time and not be absent.	○	○	○	○	○
88. My classmates and I use our collective knowledge to learn together.	○	○	○	○	○
89. I'm certain I can master the skills taught in this class.	○	○	○	○	○
90. I have pushed myself hard to completely understand my lessons in this class.	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix B

Engagement perception average change by item and group

Survey Item	**Control**	**Reading Workshop**	**Literature Workshop**
Average % of book read	57.3	65.1	54.5
1. In this class, it is important for me to thoroughly understand my class work. (C)	-0.414	-0.139	-0.168
2. I regularly participate in class discussion. (A)	0.169	0.079	0.018
3. My teacher in this class makes me feel that she really cares about me. (G)	0.697	0.533	0.337
4. I would ask the teacher for help, if I needed it. (H)	-0.735	-0.463	-0.256
5. One of my goals in this class has been to learn as much as I can. (F)	-0.115	-0.220	0.015
6. This class keeps my brain really busy. (A)	-0.198	0.076	0.056
7. In this class, I take it easy and do not try very hard to do my best. (B)	0.326	0.220	-0.069
8. If I were confused in this class, I would handle it by myself, not ask for help. (B)	0.616	0.147	-0.019
9. I can do almost all the work in this class if I don't give up. (E)	0.052	0.118	-0.151
10. I feel out of place in this class, like I don't really fit in. (D)	0.345	0.175	0.024
11. Sometimes I pretend to be working hard for this class, when I'm really not. (B)	0.259	0.224	0.323
12. The material we are learning connects to my life outside of school. (C)	0.029	0	0.111
13. Students get to make enough choices in this class. (I)	-0.592	0.012	-0.052
14. I think a lot in this class. (A)	-0.367	0.110	-0.096

15. I don't like asking the teacher in this class for help, even if I need it. (H) *reverse coded*	0.925	0.130	0.087
16. I don't really care whether I arrive on time to this class. (B)	0.017	0.010	-0.035
17. When doing schoolwork for this class, I try to learn as much as I can and I don't worry about how long it takes. (A)	-0.140	0.057	0.054
18. When she is teaching us, my teacher thinks we understand even when we don't. (H) *reverse coded*	1.122	0.494	0.079
19. Sometimes I question myself to make sure the content makes sense to me. (A)	-0.153	-0.152	0.052
20. I engage in class discussion to help make meaning of our classwork. (A)	-0.115	0.115	0.010
21. Trying to be liked sometimes distracts me from my work in this class. (B)	-0.042	-0.019	-0.367
22. In this class, my teacher accepts nothing less than our full effort. (H)	0.532	0.340	0.473
23. My teacher knows when the class understands, and when we do not. (H)	0.735	0.367	0.513
24. This class is a happy place for me to be. (C)	-0.175	0.245	-0.055
25. My teacher asks questions to be sure we are following along when she is teaching. (H)	0.818	0.524	0.626
26. It's important to me that others do not think I'm dumb in this class. (D)	-0.358	-0.213	-0.608
27. Being in this class makes me feel angry. (D)	0.770	0.240	-0.190
28. My thinking in this class leads me to develop new questions. (A)	-0.437	-0.018	-0.030
29. My teacher wants me to explain my answers - why I think what I think. (H)	1.071	0.357	0.449
30. My after-school activities don't leave enough time to	0.371	0.152	0.146

finish my homework. (B)			
31. I feel respected in this class. (C)	0.102	-0.105	0.079
32. My classmates behave the way my teacher wants them to. (G)	0.376	0.434	0.126
33. I have been able to figure out the most difficult work in this class. (E)	0.419	-0.297	0.086
34. My teacher really tries to understand how students feel about things. (G)	0.877	0.333	0.559
35. Students get to decide how activities are done in this class. (I)	0.160	-0.027	0.436
36. I get nervous in this class. (D)	0.314	0.357	0.005
37. My teacher wants us to share our thoughts. (H)	0.464	0.643	0.409
38. One of my goals in this class has been to show others that I am good at class work. (D) *reverse coded*	-0.128	-0.132	-0.598
39. In this class, we learn a lot almost every day. (F)	-0.065	-0.054	0.138
40. I like the ways we learn in this class. (C)	-0.070	-0.2	0.096
41. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day. (H)	0.728	0.253	0.425
42. In this class, I stop trying when the work gets hard. (B)	0.207	-0.032	0.099
43. Our class stays busy and doesn't waste time. (A)	0.289	0.309	0.039
44. We should be allowed to make more choices in this class. (I) *reverse coded*	0.422	-0.095	0.379
45. I daydream in this class on a regular basis. (D)	0.405	-0.054	-0.340
46. My answers to this survey show what I really think.	0.231	0.173	0.345
47. My teacher doesn't let people give in when the work gets hard. (H)	0.671	0.568	0.382
48. Even if the work in this class is hard, I can learn it. (E)	-0.096	-0.041	-0.197

49. This class does not keep my attention - I get bored. (D)	0.562	-0.185	-0.264
50. I feel stressed out in this class. (D)	-0.099	0.458	-0.003
51. While working on this class, I form new questions in my head. (A)	-0.193	0.044	0.184
52. I am constantly finding connections between the material in this class and my life outside of school. (A)	-0.316	0.123	-0.082
53. My teacher wants us to use our thinking skills, not just memorize things. (H)	0.197	0.558	0.108
54. I care about pleasing my teacher in this class. (G)	-0.433	0.040	0.020
55. I have done my best quality work in this class all year long. (E)	-0.222	0.013	-0.250
56. Students speak up and share their ideas about class work. (A)	-0.368	0.074	0.251
57. My teacher makes lessons interesting. (H)	0.452	0.307	0.608
58. One of my goals is to show others that class work is easy for me. (A)	-0.030	-0.059	-0.244
59. My teacher gives us time to explain our ideas. (H)	1.032	0.652	0.461
60. In this class, we learn to correct our mistakes. (E)	-0.020	0.011	0.237
61. I combine information in this class to create new understandings. (C)	-0.363	0.042	-0.258
62. I work well with my classmates and learn together with them. (A)	0.042	0.159	0.125
63. My teacher explains difficult things clearly. (H)	0.425	0.409	0.439
64. I am satisfied with what I have achieved in this class. (F)	-0.081	0.196	-0.096
65. I am constantly keeping my mind from wandering. (D)	0.092	0.165	0.076
66. My teacher makes learning enjoyable. (H)	0.419	0.372	0.434
67. My teacher checks to make sure we understand what she is teaching us. (H)	0.603	0.596	0.348

68. My teacher gives us enough freedom. (I)	0.417	0.144	0.314
69. One of my goals in this class is to keep others from thinking I'm not smart. (A)	0.314	-0.326	-0.335
70. I sometimes hold back from doing my best in this class, because of what others might say or think. (B)	-0.284	-0.029	-0.438
71. I ask questions in this class if I need to. (A)	-0.25	0.009	0.069
72. In this class, it seems like my mind is always busy. (A)	-0.579	-0.054	-0.010
73. The comments that I get on my work in this class help me understand how to improve. (H)	-0.485	-0.282	0.476
74. In this class, time seems to pass very quickly. (C)	-0.179	-0.011	0.236
75. My behavior in this class sometimes annoys the teacher. (G) *reverse coded*	0.714	-0.147	0.106
76. We get helpful comments to let us know what we did wrong on assignments. (H)	-0.359	-0.144	0.460
77. My teacher asks students to explain more about answers they give. (H)	0.858	0.361	0.754
78. My answers to this survey show my real opinions.	0.163	0.208	0.308
79. Sometimes I pretend I'm not trying hard in this class, when I really am. (B)	-0.076	0.009	-0.269
80. My teacher respects my ideas and suggestions. (G)	0.672	0.555	0.330
81. Putting together information from various sources in this class keeps it interesting. (A)	-0.543	0.070	-0.141
82. Time seems to pass very quickly in this class. (A)	-0.183	0.023	0.136
83. In this class, I worry that I might not do as well as other students. (D)	-0.196	0.230	-0.214
84. Sometimes in this class, I worry about not looking smart. (D)	-0.069	-0.061	-0.375
85. Putting together what we've learned before with the information we are learning is a key component in this class. (A)	-0.325	0.033	-0.215

86. My teacher seems to know if something is bothering me. (G)	0.405	0.100	0.128
87. For this class, I try hard to be on time and not be absent. (A)	-0.057	0.033	0.122
88. My classmates and I use our collective knowledge to learn together. (A)	-0.074	0.133	0.177
89. I'm certain I can master the skills taught in this class. (E)	0.068	-0.067	0.091
90. I have pushed myself hard to completely understand my lessons in this class. (F)	-0.081	-0.133	0.098

Appendix C

Focus group responses by prompt question.

To what extent do you feel engaged with the literature we are studying this week?

Focus group 1:

C "I like that we go over it in class so that if you miss a part you can put those things together."

LW "You get a better idea of what actually happened. I like it."

RW "It's a good book, it's just dense."

C "I like the variety of characters."

C "I tried talking with my group but then we finished early and just kinda sat there, waiting."

RW "I do like going around the room because it brings up things that you may not have noticed."

RW "I like going around but I think it's hard sometimes to find 34 or 35 things to talk about. So it gets a little redundant."

C "I think it's good to be able to turn and talk to the people around us about what is going on."

LW "I like the whole group discussion because you don't get to talk to people on the other side of the room so you get more responses and brings up more ideas."

LW "I like picking out the quotes and having to have something to say about that. There are certainly 35 quotes so there's no running out of things to say about that."

LW "She gives us a choice of sections."

Focus group 2:

LW "It brings your understanding more in depth to reread it from the book then process with a partner than discuss in a small group for whatever we're looking for that day. Maybe the other

group chose a different one of the three so you kind of like swap. More parts you get to go in depth on."

RW "The majority of class is the discussion part."

LW "It's nice when she gives us the parts because you know exactly what you are looking for."

C "It's hard when other people around me don't read so I can't really talk to them about it."

LW "If you have a really good partner, it's nice to have common discussion."

LW "If the partner chooses another part, then together you have more that you understand."

RW "That's why the notes we are doing are helpful because you remember the questions you had or the parts that were trouble. It made me pay attention."

RW "She said she's not going to check the notes again. But I still find myself thinking of them. I think doing them at first has helped me enough though I'm not doing it still"

RW "Notes help you remember what you were thinking last night when you try to discuss the next day."

C "If I don't remember, I just keep going."

LW "Being forced to reread it made me slow down and figure out who was talking"

LW "I like that we're not doing over analysis, like, let's pick apart every single word."

LW "It feels like an independent reading book."

C "There was one night that I was so tired that reading five pages, I reread it over and over. So I just gave up. I knew I could not comprehend it."

LW "It also depends on what other homework you have because you're like 'I'll read' then you get really tired and end up not remembering anything you read."

Focus group 3:

LW “I kind of like [our] hour. I like all the group work. It’s nice just to circle up with the same people; get to know what they are doing.”

C “I liked getting into groups, finding quotes, and drawing a picture. I think that really helped, but I felt really rushed.”

LW “Like when you were finding quotes or what?”

C “Yeah, like, it was helpful because I got to analyze a little part for the theme of the book more, but then I, like, just felt really rushed.”

LW “We talked in groups, kind of, about a part that we like, that we didn’t spend enough time of when we were reading the book. And, it’s always helpful to read, I guess, but I don’t know if you have enough time in class to reread an entire part.”

RW “I think the rereads are nice because you get to reread a page or two then it’ll explain so much more than that page.”

C “Wait, she reread to you guys?”

RW “No, we reread and looked for stuff like irony and whatnot. It just helped.”

C “We looked at satire which was really cool.”

RW “The activities in class were helpful because I didn’t do anything at home on my own so…”

LW “At least he’s honest”

RW “I watched the ThugNotes a few times.”

LW “So what we did in class was really helpful to get an idea of what was happening and be able to go in depth on something that you didn’t have any idea what it was going into it. But then

coming out of it, I had a pretty good idea of how it connected to everything that went on in that section."

LW "I think what we did in class didn't really help for the test though because we'd talk a lot about satire and, like, irony but we don't really test on that.The test questions were more like, 'who was Darcy's cousin?' or 'what was this estate?'

RW "It was more like what was the content of the book, not what it means"

LW "We talked about the literary devices but not so much the basics."

RW "I feel like talking about irony and stuff in class helped more with the free response. That was just like if you read it or not."

LW "I think what helped was outlining at the end of class yesterday what we needed to know. I don't remember if Ms. Stensaas said it or someone else, but someone said we needed to know the places and if no one told me that, I would have been sunk."

C "I actually really enjoyed the big group discussion with our class. Like I think our class went really in depth and that really helped me a lot when taking the test. It was really interesting when we were doing quotes and stuff because people were thinking about whether Darcy was a feminist or not"

RW "I feel like ours was good too but it didn't really prepare us for the test because the questions that come up in big happy circle time aren't the same as the ones that come up on the test. The test is a lot of basic content where big happy circle time is 'oh let's analyze these characters and how they feel' because that's extra text stuff. So I think it was useful but not for the test."

LW " From class to class, the questions that come up in the big group are always going to be different so it's not like you can incorporate those into the test really."

RW "I'm always worried that I won't have anything to say when we go around at the end because I don't know that I will have anything original to say."

C "People got upset about the pop quizzes but it's literally on her calendar. If you read the calendar, it says when the quizzes are. I can't believe they were shocked. The quizzes weren't hard either. It was super surface level - really just whether you read or not"

C "I just read Sparknotes and I did really well on them so…"

LW "I feel like quizzes would have helped more cause then I would have actually had to prepare more for those. I didn't at all until PAWS today so…. I felt really lost during some of the discussions so I feel like with quizzes I would have at least had to read up to that section for that day."

LW "Were the quizzes like the test questions?"

C "We corrected them right away after the quiz too you got immediate feedback. It was nice"

LW "I'd rather do the quizzes than the green sheet (response journal)."

LW "Yes, and no."

LW "I don't like quizzes but I know what to do on those. The green sheet I didn't know what to write on it."

C "I'd rather take the quizzes too. I know I look smart but I don't test well."

RW "I watched the BBC miniseries and it's exactly to the book. The test was easy."

To what extent do you feel like you are learning and internalizing new information this week?

Focus group 1:

LW “In author style, I’m definitely diving into something different here because I, you really have to focus a lot.”

RW “Definitely different in style than all the other books we’ve read.”

C “I think we’re finally diving deeper into the book”

LW “The female characters have such strong personalities. It’s different.”

LW “I don’t know if I’ve pulled apart anything”

C “We started talking about possible themes.”

C “I think right now I’m just trying to figure out characters”

LW “It’s probably good that we haven’t gotten into that yet because it’s so early in the book.”

LW “So much is happening right now. They’ve been to six dinner parties so it’s good we’re not trying to do too much analysis right now.”

C “I don’t think I’d call it new but we’re going over what we know. Going in depth with that.”

Focus group 2:

LW “We worked on irony a lot this week. The rereads helped with that.”

LW “It helps when you show us multiple parts where something like irony happens and I missed it the first time through but then I’m like ‘oh yeah, I see that now. That totally makes sense.’”

C “Today it was so helpful that more people talked and asked questions because I got it more. Other people in my group haven’t read so if we just talk in small groups, I just sit there and I don’t know what to do and then I don’t understand it.”

RW “I’m learning about different ways to look at the book so moving forward I can think about those things too.”

LW “The first time I read it, I don’t get the deeper stuff because I’m trying to figure out what’s going on. Having to go back into the text helps because I never would have gotten to that on my own.”

Focus group 3:

C “There wasn’t that much new information. It was really just processing. I feel like we really just reviewed this week.”

C “I feel like we didn’t go as in depth as I would have hope because we got to the surface then a little deeper then it was just static. It’s like when someone uses really fancy words for something really simple”

In what ways does the instruction this week feel different than a normal literature based class?

Focus group 1:

RW “it feels like we just had more time to talk by ourselves.”

RW “last tri was 10 or 15 minutes of questions then you would teach for most of the hour after that. Then this tri it’s more people working it out on their own.”

LW “At some point the worksheet doesn’t get to good thinking, helping you figure it out more.”

C “I feel like there’s less ‘find the hidden meaning.’ We’re working through as we go.”

LW “I like that I can come here with my questions and trying to work it out.”

RW “Right now I don’t like it. It seems kind of boring to me - just the book. It’s a lot of the normal stuff, marriage and gossip.”

C “I feel like I can relax a little more and not focus on the grade.”

LW “It’s still structured but we have discussion, then some reading, then more discussion and questions and get to ask you more questions than before.”

Focus group 2:

C “My whole last trimester was just filling out study guides. That was good and bad.”

RW “I like the way we are doing it now. We’re still going over the same stuff as the study guides in the other class but it’s more stuff that we find and our own questions. I actually get to ask questions in here instead of it just being pointed out for us.”

LW “It’s good because my partner and I will talk about what we need to talk about but we usually have time left over so we get to go back and bring up the things you thought were important.”

RW “With study guides, I’m reading to answer the questions. With this, I’m reading to understand it so I look at it differently.”

RW “That’s why I like being graded on our notes and whether or not you’re doing them because you’re writing down what you want rather than having to remember little details.”

LW “Overall, this tri, class feels more structured. Last tri, we’d come in, ask questions, do an activity, and read more. But now, there’s questions, read a targeted something in the book, then discuss and go around. Before it could have been anything.”

RW “There’s a pattern now. English is not my class, I’m more of a math person. Sometimes when I come to English I’m afraid because I don’t know what is going to happen but I like now that I know what’s going to happen when I come in.”

LW “In English, it depends on whether you like the book. If you don’t, it’s harder to motivate yourself to push through and read and pay attention in discussion.”

Focus group 3:

C “I feel like it’s more chillaxed.”

LW “Yeah a lot more”

C “It was nice because then my brain could actually work in a sense. Like actually think.”

C “I feel like when we have to do all this literacy stuff where we think through why did she write it like this and why is it done like this. I actually got more into the book than the normal”

LW “ [Reading workshop] hour did you like it?”

RW “It was a lot of partner discussing.”

C “It’s like that thing in middle school.”

LW “I liked [literature workshop] hour.”

LW “ [The workshop] hours seem really similar. [The control] hour seems like it was way out in nowhere.”

RW “It sounds like the [control] hour was more individual. You prepared yourself for the quizzes rather than talking.”

C “I like the way [the control] did it but I didn’t experience the other ones so maybe it was better.”

Appendix D

Focus Group Responses by Engagement Dimension

The letters in front of responses represent the group to which the speaker belongs: C for control, RW for reading workshop, and LW for literature workshop. All identifying pronouns have been removed. Responses are organized chronologically rather than by respondent.

Figure 4.1. Behavioral engagement focus group responses.

C "I like that we go over it in class so that if you miss a part you can put those things together."

C "I think it's good to be able to turn and talk to the people around us about what is going on."

RW "It brings your understanding more in depth to reread it from the book then process with a partner than discuss in a small group for whatever we're looking for that day. Maybe the other group chose a different one of the three so you kind of like swap. More parts you get to go in depth on."

LW "If the partner chooses another part, then together you have more that you understand."

RW "That's why the notes we are doing are helpful because you remember the questions you had or the parts that were trouble. It made me pay attention."

RW "She said she's not going to check the notes again. But I still find myself thinking of them. I think doing them at first has helped me enough though I'm not doing it still"

RW "Notes help you remember what you were thinking last night when you try to discuss the next day."

LW “I kind of like [our] hour. I like all the group work. It’s nice just to circle up with the same people; get to know what they are doing.”

LW “I think the rereads are nice because you get to reread a page or two then it’ll explain so much more than that page.”

LW “No, we reread and looked for stuff like irony and whatnot. It just helped.”

C “We looked at satire which was really cool.”

LW “So what we did in class was really helpful to get an idea of what was happening and be able to go in depth on something that you didn’t have any idea what it was going into it. But then coming out of it, I had a pretty good idea of how it connected to everything that went on in that section.”

C “I actually really enjoyed the big group discussion with our class. Like I think our class went really in depth and that really helped me a lot when taking the test. It was really interesting when we were doing quotes and stuff because people were thinking about whether Darcy was a feminist or not”

LW “ From class to class, the questions that come up in the big group are always going to be different, so it’s not like you can incorporate those into the test really.”

C “People got upset about the pop quizzes, but it’s literally on her calendar. If you read the calendar, it says when the quizzes are. I can’t believe they were shocked. The quizzes weren’t hard either. It was super surface level - really just whether you read or not.”

LW “In author style, I’m definitely diving into something different here because you really have to focus a lot.”

RW “Definitely different in style than all the other books we’ve read.”

C “I think we’re finally diving deeper into the book.”

LW “I don’t know if I’ve pulled apart anything.”

C “We started talking about possible themes.”

C “I think right now I’m just trying to figure out characters.”

LW “It’s probably good that we haven’t gotten into that yet because it’s so early in the book.”

LW “So much is happening right now. They’ve been to six dinner parties, so it’s good we’re not trying to do too much analysis right now.”

LW “We worked on irony a lot this week. The rereads helped with that.”

LW “The first time I read it, I don’t get the deeper stuff because I’m trying to figure out what’s going on. Having to go back into the text helps because I never would have gotten to that on my own.”

LW “It’s good because my partner and I will talk about what we need to talk about, but we usually have time left over, so we get to go back and bring up the things you thought were important.”

Figure 4.2. Behavioral disengagement focus group responses.

C “I tried talking with my group, but then we finished early and just kinda sat there, waiting.”

C “It’s hard when other people around me don’t read, so I can’t really talk to them about it.”

C “If I don’t remember, I just keep going.”

LW “It also depends on what other homework you have because you’re like, ‘I’ll read,’ then you get really tired and end up not remembering anything you read.”

LW “The activities in class were helpful because I didn’t do anything at home on my own.”

RW “I watched the ThugNotes a few times.”

C “I just read Sparknotes and I did really well on them so…”

RW “I feel like quizzes would have helped more ‘cause then I would have actually had to prepare more for those. I didn’t at all until PAWS today, so…. I felt really lost during some of the discussions, so I feel like with quizzes I would have at least had to read up to that section for that day.”

RW “I watched the BBC miniseries and it’s exactly to the book. The test was easy.”

C “Today it was so helpful that more people talked and asked questions because I got it more. Other people in my group haven’t read, so if we just talk in small groups, I just sit there and I don’t know what to do and then I don’t understand it.”

C “I feel like we didn’t go as in depth as I would have hoped because we got to the surface then a little deeper then it was just static. It’s like when someone uses really fancy words for something really simple.”

Figure 4.3. Emotional engagement focus group responses.

LW “You get a better idea of what actually happened. I like it.”

C “I like the variety of characters.”

LW “I like the whole group discussion because you don’t get to talk to people on the other side of the room, so you get more responses and brings up more ideas.”

LW “I like picking out the quotes and having to have something to say about that. There are certainly 35 quotes, so there’s no running out of things to say about that.”

LW “If you have a really good partner, it’s nice to have common discussion.”

LW “I like that we’re not doing over-analysis, like, let’s pick apart every single word.”

LW “It feels like an independent reading book.”

LW “I like that I can come here with my questions and trying to work it out.”

C “I feel like I can relax a little more and not focus on the grade.”

LW “It’s still structured, but we have discussion, then some reading, then more discussion and questions and get to ask you more questions than before.”

RW “I like the way we are doing it now. We’re still going over the same stuff as the study guides in the other class, but it’s more stuff that we find and our own questions. I actually get to ask questions in here instead of it just being pointed out for us.”

C “It was nice because then my brain could actually work in a sense. Like actually think.”

C “I feel like when we have to do all this literacy stuff where we think through “why did she write it like this?” and “why is it done like this?”. I actually got more into the book than the normal.”

Figure 4.4. Emotional disengagement focus group responses.

RW “I like going around, but I think it’s hard sometimes to find 34 or 35 things to talk about. So it gets a little redundant.”

C “There was one night that I was so tired that reading five pages - I reread it over and over. So I just gave up. I knew I could not comprehend it.”

C “I liked getting into groups, finding quotes, and drawing a picture. I think that really helped, but I felt really rushed.”

C “Yeah, like, it was helpful because I got to analyze a little part for the theme of the book more, but then I, like, just felt really rushed.”

RW “I’m always worried that I won’t have anything to say when we go around at the end because I don’t know that I will have anything original to say.”

RW “I feel like quizzes would have helped more ‘cause then I would have actually had to prepare more for those. I didn’t at all until PAWS today so, I felt really lost during some of the discussions, so I feel like with quizzes I would have at least had to read up to that section for that day.”

RW “I don’t like quizzes, but I know what to do on those. The green sheet I didn’t know what to write on it.”

LW “At some point the worksheet doesn’t get to good thinking, helping you figure it out more.”

RW “Right now I don’t like it. It seems kind of boring to me - just the book. It’s a lot of the normal stuff, marriage and gossip.”

LW “In English, it depends on whether you like the book. If you don’t, it’s harder to motivate yourself to push through and read and pay attention in discussion.”

LW “ [The workshop] hours seem really similar. [The control] hour seems like it was way out in nowhere.”

Figure 4.5. Perceived competency focus group responses.

C “I’d rather take the quizzes, too. I know I look smart, but I don’t test well.”

RW “Last tri was 10 or 15 minutes of questions then you would teach for most of the hour after that. Then this tri it’s more people working it out on their own.”

RW “That’s why I like being graded on our notes and whether or not you’re doing them because you’re writing down what you want rather than having to remember little details.”

Figure 4.6. Autonomy orientation focus group responses.

RW “I do like going around the room because it brings up things that you may not have noticed.”

RW “I’m learning about different ways to look at the book, so moving forward I can think about those things too.”

LW “I feel like there’s less ‘find the hidden meaning.’ We’re working through as we go.”

RW “With study guides, I’m reading to answer the questions. With this, I’m reading to understand it, so I look at it differently.”

LW “I liked [literature workshop] hour. I actually wanted to learn more about Austen.”

C “I like the way [the control] did it, but I didn’t experience the other ones so maybe it was better.”

Figure 4.7. Teacher support focus group responses.

LW “It’s nice when she gives us the parts because you know exactly what you are looking for.”

LW “Being forced to reread it made me slow down and figure out who was talking.”

LW “I think what helped was outlining at the end of class yesterday what we needed to know. I don’t remember if Ms. Stensaas said it or someone else, but someone said we needed to know the places, and if no one told me that, I would have been sunk.”

C “We corrected them right away after the quiz too. You got immediate feedback. It was nice.”

LW “It helps when you show us multiple parts where something like irony happens, and I missed it the first time through, but then I’m like ‘oh yeah, I see that now. That totally makes sense.’”

LW “Overall, this tri, class feels more structured. Last tri, we’d come in, ask questions, do an activity, and read more. But now, there’s questions, read a targeted something in the book, then discuss and go around. Before it could have been anything.”

RW “There’s a pattern now. English is not my class, I’m more of a math person. Sometimes when I come to English I’m afraid because I don’t know what is going to happen, but I like now that I know what’s going to happen when I come in.”

C “I feel like it’s more chillaxed.”

LW “Yeah, a lot more.”

Figure 4.8. Class agency focus group responses.

LW “She gives us a choice of sections.”

Appendix E

Leveled short answer questions given to measure achievement

Short Answer (2-3 sentences each)

51. Choose one of the quotes above on which to base your short answer on the back of your answer sheet. Summarize the situation in the book that surrounds that quote and how the quote you've chosen reflects Georgian presumptions of worth and propriety.

52. Choose two characters that act as foils in the novel. Determine the contrasts that make them foils and what qualities are highlighted as a result.

53. Predict Georgiana Darcy's reaction if she were in the same situation as Elizabeth is during the ball in which she first met Darcy. What do we know about her character that points toward the reaction you posit?

54. Critics of Elizabeth and Darcy's marriage will say that she wouldn't have loved him if he hadn't thrown influence and money into the situation with Bingley and Wickham respectively. According to this theory, true love can only exist regardless of money or power therefore her love is not real. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this evaluation? How would their relationship have changed if Darcy were poor?

55. Considering the satirical social commentary in the novel, what do you believe Jane Austen is trying to say about marriage and/or gender roles? Support your answer with two examples from the text.

Appendix F

Participant Letter

March 13, 2017

Dear parents/guardians,

For the first three weeks of this trimester, I will be collecting data for my master's capstone in my AP© Literature and Composition classes. The purpose of my research is to determine the effectiveness of different teaching methods.

I will be collecting information on student behavior in class and informal feedback, as well as performance on class assessments. Also, three students from each section will be chosen at random to be part of a focus group. The assignments will be similar and assessments will be the same across all classes. The risks are low considering the control group will be doing the lesson plans from last year. The possible benefits may be higher engagement with the texts under study, with classmates, and with the instructor.

For the majority of my students, their identities will not be used at all because class data will be averaged. If your student were to be used in the study as an example, s/he will be assigned a letter (e.g. Student A) to protect his or her identity. For the students who are randomly selected to be in the focus group, they will be assigned pseudonyms and identifying information protected. During the study, data will be kept either on a password-protected computer or in a locked file cabinet to protect participant information.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Refusal to participate or to discontinue ongoing participation will incur no penalty.

Thank you for considering helping me complete my master's program. I appreciate it greatly. As always, if you have questions or concerns, please contact me either by email or phone. If you would like to contact my conferring university, that information is also listed here.

Contact information:

Investigator – Sara M. Stensaas	sara.stensaas@district196.org	651-683-6900 ext. 96537
Hamline University IRB Board	Matthew Olson, IRB Chair	mholson@hamline.edu

Yours in the pursuit of excellence,

Sara Stensaas, English/Language Arts teacher

Please detach this section and return it to school by Monday, March 20

☐Yes, you have permission to use my student's data in your study given that identifying information will be protected.

☐No, you do not have permission to use my student's data in your study despite identifying information being protected.

Student's name: _____

Parent/guardian signature: _____

References

Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviours predicting students' engagement in schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *72,* 261-278. doi: 10.1348/000709902158883

Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Atwell, N. (2015). *In the middle: A lifetime of learning about writing, reading, and adolescents* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Blau, S.D. (2001). *The literature workshop: Teaching texts and their readers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Blau, S. D. (2003). Performative literacy: The habits of mind of highly literate readers. *Voices from the Middle, 10*(3), 18-22. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2780/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/VM/0103-march03/VM0103Performative.pdf

Blau, S. D. (2006). *The literature workshop: Teaching texts and their readers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bullock, R. (Ed.). (1998). *Why workshop? Changing course in 7-12 English*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

The College Board. (2014). *English literature and composition course description* [PDF file]. Retrieved from

https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/ap/ap-english-literature-and-composition-course-description.pdf

Covey, S. R. (1990). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Creswell, J. W. (2004). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 4th ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Cronjé, J. (2006). Paradigms regained: Toward integrating objectivism and constructivism in instructional design and the learning sciences. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, *54*(4), 387-416. doi: 10.1007/s11423-006-9605-1

DeStigter, T. (2003). Book talk: Toward changing the culture of literature classrooms. *English Education, 36*(1), 80-85. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2087/stable/40173154

Flowerday, T., Schraw, G., & Stevens, J. (2004). The role of choice and interest in reader engagement. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 72*(2), 93-114. doi: 10.3200/jexe.72.2.93-114

Fredericks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59-109. doi: 10.3102/00346543074001059

Gulla, A. (2012). Putting the "Shop" in reading workshop: Building reading stamina in a ninth-grade literacy class in a Bronx vocational high school. *The English Journal, 101*(5), 57-62. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2087/stable/23269530

Hollander, J. A. (2002). Learning to discuss: Strategies for improving the quality of class discussion. *Teaching Sociology, 30*(3), 317-327. doi: 10.2307/3211480

Kletzien, S. B., & Hushion, B. C. (1992). Reading workshop: Reading, writing, thinking. *Journal of Reading, 35*(6). Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40007556

Khan, Salman. (2011). Let's use video to reinvent education. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/salman_khan_let_s_use_video_to_reinvent_education

Metallidou, P., & Vlachou, A. (2007). Motivational beliefs, cognitive engagement, and achievement in language and mathematics in elementary school children. *International Journal of Psychology, 42*, 2-15. doi: 10.1080/00207590500411179

Minnesota Department of Education. (2017). Minnesota Report Card. Retrieved from http://rc.education.state.mn.us/#

Monahan, P. (2008). You want me to teach reading? Confessions of a secondary literature teacher. *The English Journal, 97*(6), 98-104. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2087/stable/40503420

Ozer, O. (2004). Constructivism in Piaget and Vygotsky. *The Fountain*, *48* (October).

Parsons, S. A., Malloy, J. A., Parsons, A. W., & Burrowbridge, S.C. (2015). Students' engagement in literacy tasks. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(2), 223-231. doi: 10.1002/trtr:1387

Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Wynn, S. R. (2010). The effectiveness of relative importance of choice in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*, 896-915. doi: 10.1037/a0019545

Reutzel, D., & Cooter, R. (1991). Organizing for effective instruction: The reading workshop. *The Reading Teacher, 44*(8), 548-554. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2087/stable/20200734

Rorabaugh, P. (1999). Review: Teaching in the middle. *The English Journal, 88*(5), 108-110. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/821796

Rush-Levine, C. L. (2011). Growing literate beings. *Voices from the Middle, 18*(3), 33-34. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2780/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/VM/0183-mar2011/VM0183Growing.pdf

Sipe, R.B. & Rosewarne, T. (2005). Learning to love the questions: Professional growth and perspective transformations. *The English Journal, 95*(2), 41-46. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30046543

Skinner, E., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*(4), 765-781. doi: 10.1037/a0012840

Sundararajan, B. (2010). Emergence of the most knowledgeable other (MKO): Social network analysis of chat and bulletin board conversations in a CSCL system. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 8*(2), 191-208. Retrieved from www.ejel.org

Swift, K. (1993). Try reading workshop in your classroom. *Reading Teacher*, (*46)*3, 66-371.

The Ohio State University. (2014). *Literacy Collaborative*® [PDF file]. Retrieved from http://www.lcosu.org/training/lcbrochure.pdf

Tovani, Cris. (2011). *So what do they really know?: Assessment that informs teaching and learning*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Tripod Education Group. (2011). Tripod student perception survey for secondary students V12. [PDF file]. Retrieved from

http://www.rochesterteachers.com/rochester_teachers_association/Local_files/TripodSurvey.pdf

Wang, Z., Bergin, C., & Bergin, D.A. (2014). Measuring engagement in fourth to twelfth grade classrooms: The classroom engagement inventory. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*(4), 517-535. doi: 10.1037/spq0000050

Wiggins, G., & Wilbur, D. (2015). How to make your questions essential. *Educational Leadership, 73*(1), 10-15.