

READER'S WORKSHOP

The Effectiveness of Reader's Workshop

By

Darlene Lasch

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Master in Education (M. Ed.)

Carthage College

Kenosha, Wisconsin

Summer 2018

Abstract

This study examined whether or not Reader's Workshop was effective in improving student achievement scores, based on the scores in Reading and Language Arts found on the schools' publicly available statewide report card results. This study compared schools that have implemented Reader's Workshop schoolwide to those schools who have not implemented Reader's Workshop schoolwide. A one-tailed t-test at a .05 level of significance was used to analyze the data and found that schools using Reader's Workshop performed significantly better than those schools not using it. This study also investigated whether or not schools using Reader's Workshop are showing a greater level of improvement since they began using it, or within the six years between 2011-2012 and 2016-2017 school years than those schools not using it. A one-tailed t-test at a .05 significance level found that the level of improvement was significantly higher for those schools using Reader's Workshop when compared to those schools not using it. The final portion of this study involved interviewing two educators who had used the Reader's Workshop model. Both educators indicated that they experienced positive results when using Reader's Workshop in their schools.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I must thank my family. Without the support of my husband, Robert Lasch, and my children, Ben and Grace, I would have been unable to complete this program. From flowers and cookies on my “first day of school” to encouraging me to keep going when things got rough to making their own dinners, their support has been invaluable.

I also must thank my family and friends who took the kids to the zoo, the park, movies, shopping and on playdates while I was studying or writing papers. Allowing my children to make memories while I have been concentrating on school work is something I am forever grateful for.

I am blessed to be surrounded by countless supportive and encouraging people who made this journey possible for me and I thank God for them and for the support He gave me as I prayed for strength and patience to complete this process.

Finally, thank you to the Carthage College professors who encouraged and challenged me through the years, particularly my thesis committee, Patricia Rieman, Lara Christoun and Allen Klingenberg.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....ii

Acknowledgments.....iii

Table of Contents.....iv

List of Tables.....v

Introduction.....1

Statement of Problem.....3

Purpose Statement.....3

Research Questions.....3

Hypotheses.....4

Definition of Terms.....4

Review of Literature.....7

Methodology.....22

Results.....26

Discussion.....35

Conclusion.....37

Recommendations.....37

Limitations.....38

Implications.....38

References.....41

Appendices.....46

List of Tables

Table One – Test Score Differences.....29

Table Two – Data Analysis Results for Hypotheses.....31

Chapter One

Introduction

Overview

Addressing the most effective way to teach reading can be a daunting task. Many teachers strive to make their students become confident and proficient readers, but as students progress through school, they sometimes begin to view reading in a negative light. Because of this, teachers are challenged to motivate their students and meet their diverse needs with new and innovative approaches (Mounla, 2011). There are many different methods and strategies which teachers can use along with many different reading curriculums and programs available for schools to use. While not a new concept, a current trend in reading instruction is the use of Reader's Workshop. It is important to know whether this strategy for teaching reading is likely to increase the reading achievement of students and result in a positive response from students in regards to their reading instruction.

Reader's Workshop involves a mini lesson where a teacher first teaches a particular skill or strategy, and then provides work time, where the students engage in independent reading and applying the lesson concepts just learned. During this time, a teacher conducts small groups or independent conferencing with students. "Share time" is also included in Reader's Workshop, where students are able to share with the rest of their class how they used a skill or strategy learned in the mini lesson (Reading & Writing Workshop, n.d).

As previously stated, the Workshop model is not entirely new. Donald Graves wrote *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work* (1983), which is often considered the

beginning of the Workshop method (Lain, 2017). Graves approach to writing instruction was to make students more aware of the adult writing process: drafting ideas, revising, editing, and publishing. Graves felt that by involving students in the writing process, they would become more active in the writing process and become more self-aware (Feinberg 2007). Graves was mentor to Lucy Calkins, who is considered to be the earliest architect of the Workshop model. Calkins wrote her book *The Art of Teaching Writing* in 1986 which echoed Graves philosophies that children should be taught using a Workshop model. Calkins transferred these concepts to reading in 2001 in her book *The Art of Teaching Reading*. Calkins believes in helping students live a “rich literary life” (Feinberg, 2007). Nancie Atwell first introduced the Reader's Workshop in 1987, using the collaborative efforts of many theorists and practitioners, who built upon the use of the Writer's Workshop systematic and easily implemented active approach and expanded these concepts to include reading (Literacy Workshop, n.d.). Atwell believed the success of the Workshop model came from students choosing what they read and what they write. She believed that because they choose what they read and write, students in Reader’s Workshop are more engaged. Because they are engaged, the experience and the amount of practice leads to growth, stamina, and excellence (Atwell, 2015).

Statement of Problem

When addressing the best means for delivering instruction to meet the needs of all students in the classroom, Reader's Workshop has been brought to the table as a viable solution to traditional reading instruction, which only meets the needs of a portion of the students in a classroom. In order to promote Reader's Workshop as the solution the school should adopt, the effectiveness of the Reader's Workshop program must be determined. However, there are few current quantitative studies showing the effectiveness of Reader's Workshop.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the implementation of Reader's Workshop has increased the Reading/Language Arts achievement scores at elementary and middle schools using the Reader's Workshop model in two midwestern counties. Beyond student achievement scores, student response to and teacher satisfaction with Reader's Workshop will also be investigated as measures of the effectiveness of this teaching strategy.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study included:

1. Are schools that have implemented Reader's Workshop scoring higher on achievement tests than those schools who are not using this method?
2. Are schools that have implemented Reader's Workshop showing greater improvements in achievement in Reading/Language Arts?
3. Are students showing a positive response to Reader's Workshop and are teachers satisfied with the learning results in their classrooms?

Hypotheses

In this study two sets of hypotheses were analyzed using two data sets.

Data set one:

H₀1: Schools using Reader's Workshop have the same or lower achievement scores in Reading/Language Arts as those schools not using Reader's Workshop.

H₁1: Schools using Reader's Workshop have higher scores in Reading/Language Arts than those schools who do not use Reader's Workshop.

Data set two:

H₀2: Schools using Reader's Workshop are showing the same or smaller improvements in Reading/Language Arts achievement scores since implementing Reader's Workshop or over a six year period than those schools not using the Workshop model.

H₁2: Schools using Reader's Workshop are showing greater improvement in achievement scores since implementing Reader's Workshop or over a six year period in Reading/Language Arts than those schools not using the Workshop model.

Definition of Terms:

Basal Reading Approach: "The Basal Reading Approach is a technique used to teach children reading skills. Basal stems from the word "base" or "basic". Commonly called "reading books" or "readers," basal readers are short stories, including individual books for learners, a teacher's edition, workbooks, assessments and activities for a specific reading level" (Braunshausen, 2017).

Guided Reading: Guided Reading is an instructional approach that involves a teacher working with a small group of students, who demonstrate similar reading behaviors and can all read similar levels of texts ("What Is Guided Reading?" n.d.).

IEP: IEP is the abbreviation for Individualized Education Plan. An Individualized Education Plan (IEP) is “a map that lays out the program of special education instruction, supports and services children need to make progress and succeed in school. Each program is designed to meet a child’s exact needs. The term *IEP* is also used to refer to the written plan that spells out the specific types of help the child will get” (Team n.d.).

Inclusion: “Inclusion is a term which expresses commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent appropriate, in the school and classroom he or she would otherwise attend. It involves bringing the support services to the child (rather than moving the child to the services) and requires only that the child will benefit from being in the class (rather than having to keep up with the other students).” (Special Education Inclusion, 2014)

Instruction: Instruction is the act of teaching and is designed to bridge the gap between what students already know and what they need to know (Frey & Fisher, 2006).

Reader’s Workshop: Reader’s Workshop is a method of reading instruction in which the goal is to teach students how to read and comprehend text. Reader’s Workshop allows teachers to differentiate and meet the needs of all their students. During Reader’s Workshop, students each read books at their own level. Workshops are structured with a mini lesson, a read-aloud, independent reading and guided reading time, response and reflection and sharing at the end (“Reading Workshop”, n.d.).

Specific Learning Disability: The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction defines a Specific Learning Disability as: “Specific Learning Disability means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations, including conditions

such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia” (“Federal Definition”, 2018).

Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a way of thinking about teaching and learning that helps give all students an equal opportunity to succeed (Morin, (n.d.)). This includes stimulating interest and motivation for learning, presenting information and content in different ways and differentiating the ways that students can express what they know (“About Universal Design for Learning”, 2018).

Writer's Workshop: Writer's Workshop is an interactive approach to teaching writing in which students learn and practice the importance of rehearsal, drafting/revising, and editing their own work (Jasmine & Weiner, 2007).

Chapter Summary

Effective reading instruction is essential because children who struggle with reading in early elementary grades are more likely to struggle throughout school (“On Reading”, 2017). In order to determine if Reader's Workshop is an effective strategy for raising Reading and Language Arts achievement of students, schools' statewide report card achievement scores must be evaluated to determine whether or not schools using Reader's Workshop are: (a) earning higher achievement scores than schools not using the Workshop model, and (b) whether or not student achievement has improved more in schools using the Workshop model than in schools that have not implemented the Workshop model. Another effective means of gaining information on students' progress is to interview school staff who are using the Reader's Workshop to gather information on student response and classroom achievement, as well as teacher satisfaction when using this method. Chapter two will examine quantitative research found on other

reading instruction methods, on Reader's Workshop and on Writer's Workshop. Chapter two will also discuss qualitative research found regarding Reader's Workshop.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

Background

Donalyn Miller asks in the introduction of her popular book, *The Book Whisperer*, (2014) why the need to motivate and inspire young readers is such a hot-button issue. Miller pointed out that the topic is in the limelight because so many children do not read. Children are not seeing reading as meaningful in their lives (Miller, 2014). Miller's concern is not new, in fact, over 30 years ago, Paris and Jacobs (1984) described learning to read as a "gateway to education" and pointed out that it requires mastery of a variety of skills, and is not accomplished quickly or easily. Because of this, reading instruction is a large part of the education curriculum and a significant concern for teachers, parents, and researchers (Paris & Jacobs, 1984).

Reading can be difficult for children with unique learning needs. English Language Learners and students with disabilities are a significant part of the classroom population. One in ten public school students in the United States are English Language Learners (Sanchez, 2017). In the 2015-2016 school year, the percentage of students in the United States ages 3-21 receiving special education services was 13 percent of all public school students, with 34 percent of those students having specific learning disabilities ("The Condition of Education", 2018). Reading instruction must be able to reach a wide variety of learners, especially as schools are moving more and more towards inclusion in the regular education classroom for all learners. As classrooms become more diverse, teachers are implementing Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) focuses educators on developing flexible curricula that

provides students with multiple ways of accessing content, of expressing what they learn and for engaging their interest and motivation (Howard, 2004). Reader's Workshop goes hand-in-hand with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) as it allows students to work at their own level, to express their knowledge in different ways, and to be assessed in a variety of ways. As Cathy Roller stated in her book *Variability Not Disability: Struggling Readers in a Workshop Classroom* (1996):

“Rather than view children as capable or disabled, Workshop classrooms assume that children are different, that each child is unique and has special interests and abilities, and that differences are normal” (Roller, 1996, p. 7).

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments for implementing the Reader's Workshop program is how easily teachers can accommodate the needs of all their students. Research shows that effective reading instruction must encourage reading as a primary activity. In Reader's Workshop, students spend their time reading and writing to construct meaning. By conferring regularly with their teacher, the teacher is able to confer with students and can create opportunities to share the reading process and demonstrate strategies while individually assessing student progress (Towle, 2000). Part of the student's time spent reading in Reader's Workshop includes students reading books that they choose themselves, rather than all students reading the same books.

Nancie Atwell, a pioneer in Reader's Workshop stated in her book:

“My students taught me that they loved to read. They showed me that in-school reading, like in-school writing, could actually do something for them; that the ability to read for pleasure and personal meaning, like writing ability, is not a gift or a talent. It comes with the ability to choose, books to choose among, time to read, and a teacher who is a reader. Finally, I learned that selecting one's own books and reading them in school is not a luxury. It is the wellspring of student literacy and literacy appreciation.” (Atwell, 2015, p. 34)

Atwell found by simply allowing her students to choose what they read and to be able to read for pleasure in school that her students developed a love of reading.

Popular Alternative

A popular means of delivering reading instruction in the past has been through the use of the basal reading approach. In this approach, students are all using one “reading textbook”. These books consist of a collection of stories and teachers teaching skills using these stories as anchors. Since these books are written at or above grade-level, those students who struggle, including, but not limited to English Language Learner (ELL) students and those with learning disabilities, may find it difficult to keep up with the class and may be forced to move on to higher levels before they are ready. Since the text is focused on specific skills, it may sound stilted and may not appeal to many of the children. Advanced students are unable to move on to new levels and must wait until the majority of the class is ready to progress to the next level. “Typically, basal readers reward the average student, while penalizing both the struggling and the advanced student” (Richford, 2017). These disadvantages are not present in Reader’s Workshop because each student is reading at his or her own level. Quite often students are allowed to choose their own “good fit” books--books that they are able to read and comprehend independently, for independent reading time. Small group reading is done using books at or near the students’ reading level, again, so they are able to read, comprehend and participate in discussions of the books. Struggling readers are not pushed ahead before they are ready, and advanced readers are not held back when they are ready to move on.

Quantitative Research Findings

Research studies reviewed showed that there is little current statistical data supporting whether or not Reader's Workshop is effective. One quantitative study was identified describing a study one teacher conducted in her classroom in 1989-1990. Other results that were found gave examples of testing that could be used and data that was located for a related program, Writer's Workshop.

A quantitative study found investigating Reader's Workshop was conducted by a sixth grade teacher as she compared her students' achievement using Reader's Workshop versus those in a basal reading program. In this study, Smith divided her students into two groups: Group 1 and Group 2. During the first half of the school year, Group 1 did Reader's Workshop in the fall and then followed a basal program in the spring. Alternatively, Group 2 did a basal program in the fall and then Reader's Workshop in the spring. The researcher assessed comprehension by giving the *Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test* in September of 1989, before the study started, in January of 1990 when she reversed teaching methods and in May 1990 when the study ended. She compared the effects of the basal program and Reader's Workshop using a multivariate analysis of variance. The results indicated that Group 1 improved more than Group 2 during the first half of the school year (while they were using Reader's Workshop). When the teaching methods were switched during the second half of the year, Group 1 regressed, while Group 2 showed improvement. The researcher put the change scores for Reader's Workshop together for Group 1 and Group 2. She was directly comparing performance on Reader's Workshop versus the basal method regardless of when students had each type of instruction. Mean improvement using Reader's Workshop was 5.27 Normal Curve

Equivalents (NCEs), while mean improvement using the basal method was -1.18 Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs). That difference was highly significant in favor of the Reader's Workshop instruction (Swift, 1993). While this study's results support using the Reader's Workshop, it is limited by the small number of participants (83 students) and data that is more than 20 years old.

A study comparing the reading achievement levels of 323 third grade students, who were identified as at risk, from a Caribbean Title 1 school district, compared the students' performance as they used three different reading programs. The three different reading programs looked at were *Success for All*, Direct Instruction and Basal Reader. Descriptive data was calculated and analyzed. This data centered on the mean test scores for each program. Standard deviation was calculated and maximum and minimum test scores were noted. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the differences among students from the three reading programs on the total *WRAT-Expanded Reading Test* standardized scores. The independent variable, the reading program factor, included the three programs. The dependent variable was the total *WRAT-Expanded* reading test standardized achievement scores. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was significant, $F(2, 320) = 3.85, p=.02$. The strength of the relationship between the reading program factor and the total *WRAT-Expanded* reading test standardized scores as assessed by η^2 was small, with the reading factor accounting for 2% of the variance of the dependent variable. The data suggests there was statistically significant difference in standardized reading achievement scores between the three groups. The *Success for All* group had the highest standardized reading scores and the students who had four years instruction using the Success for All program

received significantly higher mean test scores than those instructed using Direct Instruction or Basal Reader (McCollum, McNeese, Styron & Lee, 2007).

The results of this study showed that the performance of the students can be affected by the instructional reading programs. This would align with the hypothesis that schools using Reader's Workshop will show higher test scores than those students not using Reader's Workshop.

Research on Writer's Workshop

Another study by Clippard (1998) examined the efficacy of Writer's Workshop at promoting writing skills and writing self-efficacy in a small group of students with learning disabilities who had significant writing deficits. Various outcomes from seventeen students involved in Writer's Workshop were compared and contrasted with identical outcomes of ten students with significant writing deficits who were exposed to the "writing across the curriculum approach". The results of this study showed that students who were instructed using the Writer's Workshop model did not score significantly higher on standardized writing tests. They did, however, score significantly higher on direct writing samples. Also, although the Writer's Workshop students did not score significantly higher on a standardized academic self-esteem test, an instrument created to measure self-esteem with respect to writing indicated that students enjoy writing more and saw themselves as stronger writers when compared to non-Writer's Workshop students (Clippard, 1998).

In 2001, Pollington, Wilcox and Morrizon compared the Self-Perception Scale, specifically in terms of writing, of fourth and fifth grade students who were instructed by a teacher using a Writer's Workshop approach and with those whose teachers used a

traditional approach to writing instruction. Results were measured using the Writer's Self-Perception Scale (Pollington, Wilcox & Morrison, 2001). No significant differences were found between the scores of students who had been taught by the two teaching approaches. Instead, the findings of this study suggests that individual teachers are more important than strategies or approaches in affecting the writer Self-Perception Scale of intermediate-grade students (Pollington, Wilcox & Morrison, 2001).

The findings of these two studies of Writer's Workshop--which used a similar model to Reader's Workshop--would suggest that the use of Reader's Workshop in schools may not increase standardized testing scores, thus rejecting the null hypotheses of both data sets.

The purpose of the study in Jasmine and Weiner's 2007 investigation of the effects of Writing Workshop on the abilities of first grade students was to explore the writing processes of drafting/revising and editing to support first grade students to become independent writers. The study incorporated qualitative and quantitative analysis. A pre-survey was administered to each child before he/she began the Writer's Workshop and a post survey after intervention. A checklist was used as a systematic observational research was used to record observed practices of students during the peer revising conferences. Portfolios were used to assess students' writing and were graded via a rubric. Lastly, students were interviewed regarding confidence and their ability in writing (Jasmine & Weiner, 2007). The results of this analysis of writing samples and student interviews resulted in the teacher continuing to use the Writer's Workshop. This program has helped students increase their independence and enjoyment of writing. The Writer's Workshop approach contributed many factors to creating a positive writing

atmosphere. Through the process of Writer's Workshop, students began to gain an understanding of purposes of writing and became more comfortable with the process. By the end of the process, these first grade students were able to work independently and helped each other add detail and edit their writing (Jasmine & Warner, 2007).

While this study did not include standardized testing, one could surmise that with the ability to work independently and with an increased understanding of their writing, students might score higher on standardized tests. If so, the effectiveness of Writer's Workshop would be shown in their scores, supporting the null hypotheses of both data sets in the current study.

Qualitative Research on Reader's Workshop

Qualitative research findings have been easier to locate while researching the effectiveness of Reader's Workshop. The following studies detail the researcher's findings on Reader's Workshop in various environments.

Mary R. Coakley-Fields (2018) looked at an inclusive reading classroom and acknowledged that many schools in the United States include children of varied reading abilities grouped into the same classrooms, but that it is not always defined what effectively including students should look like. For her study, Coakley-Fields reported on how two fourth-grade students engaged with each other during independent reading time during Reader's Workshop. One student was a "struggling reader," while the other was an "average reader". Through observations and interviews with the students and teacher, Mary found that the teacher utilized how she saw students including their peers in their engagement of texts and effectively, used student partnerships to promote learning. Because of this, she saw that marginalized readers can effectively, be

successfully included in Reader's Workshop when they are able to engage in the text with their classmates and when the teacher notices and flexibly supports this engagement (Coakley-Fields, 2018).

Two language arts teachers in a small, rural middle school set a goal of improving their reading instruction and ultimately their students' learning. The teachers implemented Reader's Workshop as their new methodology for teaching reading to all of their seventh and eighth grade classes. Over the course of eight months, the researchers did a total of 48 classroom observation in the seventh and eighth grade language arts classrooms, each lasting 80 minutes. There were twelve observations of each teacher's classroom in the spring of one school year and twelve observations of each teacher's classroom in the fall of the following school year. The researcher observed the classroom for evidence of conferencing instruction and student engagement in the course of the Reader's Workshop. Additionally, twenty-four, semi-structured interviews were conducted with each teacher over the course of the eight months. The interviews were each 10-30 minutes long and were held privately.

To study the data, the researcher used an inductive coding process. The observations and interviews showed that implementing Reader's Workshop in a small, rural Midwestern middle school language arts classrooms had some positive effects. The positive effects, according to the participating teachers, included increased: motivation, comprehension and opportunities for authentic learning experiences. Classroom observations confirmed motivation, comprehension and authentic experiences occurring within the classroom (Thomas, 2012).

A Manhattan Montessori school adopted a Reader's Workshop approach during the 2013-2014 school year. This school chose the Reader's Workshop to address several needs they had. The first need was to provide teachers with a strong, clear framework for literacy instruction. The school needed a framework that would provide teachers with a shared language to discuss student growth. Another need was to address comprehension, not just decoding and phonics. The school considered which program would provide a strong instructional framework that would meet the needs of the students and encourage greater consistency throughout the school building. After many years of conversation and thoughtful consideration, the school chose Reader's Workshop. This approach is in line with Montessori beliefs that would not stifle teachers' creativity and passion and would allow students to make choices about their work, to build independence, and to monitor their own progress (Cockerille, 2014).

As the school embarked on this change, they came to several realizations about Reader's Workshop. They realized that the Reader's Workshop fits with the Montessori values. It encourages students to work through difficulties with independence, to make choices about their own learning, and to evaluate their progress towards their goals. The school found that the Reader's Workshop has leverage across all areas of the curriculum and also leads to greater facility in writing. The teachers noted that they saw the importance of the reading/writing connection daily in their classrooms. Finally, the school learned that the Reader's Workshop helps to prepare students for future classroom experiences. The Reader's Workshop helped students to be flexible readers, to pay careful attention to what is really important and to build the stamina needed to read for long stretches of time (Cockerille, 2014).

It was noted that the successful implementation of the Reader's Workshop program does not happen overnight and it is crucial to build teachers' knowledge base, implement new teaching methods, and reflect on student growth (Cockerille, 2014). This school, too, recognized the numerous benefits of using Reader's Workshop with its students.

A middle school took a collaborative Reader's Workshop approach and found positive results as well. The teachers chose short, high interest texts for students to use. While they are reading, teachers think aloud, modeling for their students making predictions, asking questions, making connections and commenting on the text. They also demonstrate marking the text, while making comments about the reading strategies good teachers use. Students mark their own text on their own copies. After students have read a text and marked it. They then select "burning questions" and write these on sticky notes and place them on the Burning Questions chart. The students then reflect on things they wonder about in the text and these are written on a sticky note and shared on the Wondering Wall. Finally, they choose their favorite connection in the text and something they have read, viewed, heard or experienced. These get added to the Clever Connections chart. Students then work independently or in teams to find answers to each other's questions (Meyer, 2010).

This collaborative Reader's Workshop process illustrates for teachers what resources students use for reading and critical competence. The student responses showed the depth of critical thinking generated in relation to the text. The teachers found that the student-generated questions and wonderings led to more relevant and intense investigations than if the teachers had generated comprehension questions themselves

prior to the lesson. The researcher found that the collaborative Reader's Workshop led to greater intellectual demand in the teaching of reading. This approach scaffolds students to higher-level thinking and engagement with texts and provides children with greater ownership of their own learning (Meyer, 2010).

This use of Reader's Workshop demonstrates how the Workshop framework can be manipulated to meet the needs of different students, to encourage higher-level thinking and to expand upon with new reading strategies.

Reader's Workshop was also studied in an alternative setting, a residential treatment center and school that serves adolescent male students who have been diagnosed with addictions and conduct disorders. Most of these students have been suspended or expelled from school or have felony charges. The school provides these students, who have difficulty making connections with people, with a treatment program as well as educational services (Taylor & Nesheim, 2000/2001).

Four goals were developed to direct the Workshop applications:

- “1. Provide motivation for reading children's literature and activating memories of early reading.
2. Model different techniques for sharing reading with the children in their lives.
3. Present children's literature as viable and enjoyable reading material for readers of all ages.
4. Create a model of reading as a valued activity that is entertaining and enjoyable” (Taylor, 2000).

The Reader's Workshop for this project included three parts: a mini lesson, reading and response time, and time to share. The Reader's Workshop provided structure and rationale for the students to be seen not only reading children's literature, but to be reading at all. Struggling readers, under different conditions, may have feared being mocked by their peers for reading books written for a younger audience. Because of this

structure, these students enjoyed the language and illustrations, revived childhood memories, modeled effective reading strategies and responded to the themes of the genre, whereas, they may have previously chosen not to read at all. Throughout this process, teachers modeled shared reading techniques and approaches that encouraged reader responses. Additionally, students learned multiple ways to gain meaning from text, support reading efforts and reinforce the sense of community among readers. With the focus being children's literature, the students were able to have fun and were able to enjoy manipulating the language and meaning in the literature (Taylor & Nesheim, 2000/2001).

This facility built on the belief that literacy is the willingness and ability to construct meaning from reading texts within a particular social context. Students were able to engage as readers and were able to take on new views as readers. The students' perceptions on reading were challenged. Students began to view reading as an enjoyable activity, as well as a valuable life activity. Students experimented with new reading behaviors and began to pay attention and respond positively to their peers. While many of these behaviors are not unusual in a classroom full of readers, these behaviors are surprising for "at-risk" teens who have had trouble making connections to learning and other people.

"Building on connections made between students' literacy experiences and their backgrounds, and connections shared among readers, this readers' Workshop fostered reading engagement and improved perceptions of reading for the students within this classroom community (Taylor & Nesheim, 2000/2001)."

This is another example of the success of Reader's Workshop, and shows how it can be used to reach not only "typical" students, but "at-risk" students as well.

An interesting perspective comes in the form of a parent's point of view as she spent a year as a volunteer in her son's first grade classroom, observing the use of Writer's Workshop for one hour each week. This parent was a college professor, who teaches business writing. As a parent volunteer, this mother was involved with conferencing with students--helping them to reflect upon their writing by answering questions that enable them to clarify their thinking. This mother stated that it did not take her long to realize the link between reading and writing. The experienced teacher in this classroom ran a strong language arts program. Included in her program were daily silent reading, daily teacher read alouds, writing in student response booklets and book displays based on the social studies and science topics being studied. The students took weekly trips to the library, where they selected books and the librarian read aloud to them. Parent and student reading aloud was encouraged. Because of these multiple exposures to reading, many children expanded beyond writing personal narratives and wrote stories that encompassed real-life experiences and fiction together. The parent noted that while these attempts were stilted at first, as the year went on, the attempts became more sophisticated. The parent reflected that while her observations were limited, it appeared that the more exposure to reading a child had, the more voice he or she found (Baker, 1994).

At the end of the year, this parent's conclusions were that while the Writer's Workshop approach does not turn all children into prolific writers, it did allow each child to write successfully, no matter what difficulties he or she encountered. She mentioned that her own child was both easily distracted and had trouble with fine motor skills, which made writing difficult for him. While he did not complete as many pieces of

writing as other students, he was pleased with what he wrote and is not intimidated by writing (Baker, 1994).

While this parent's observations are not scientific or formal research, they show some of the benefits of Writer's Workshop. Based on her descriptions of the literacy lessons taking place, it seems as though Reader's Workshops, or some elements of it, were being used in her son's classroom, creating a very Workshop based literacy block. Success can be gauged by test scores, but a student's personal response to a literacy skills can gauge success as well. Her comments about her son's response to writing based on his experience using Writer's Workshop show the success of this program.

Chapter Summary

While there is a great deal of qualitative data and studies examining Reader's Workshop, there have been no current quantitative studies found. There have been quantitative studies done on other reading programs and on Writer's Workshop, however, these studies have all looked at individual student success, as opposed to whole school success.

Qualitative studies have utilized both observations and interviews to determine success of these programs in different educational settings. Student engagement, student enjoyment and motivation to read are all included as success factors when looking qualitatively at the effectiveness of Reader's or Writer's Workshop.

Chapter Three will look at the methodology used in this study to determine if Reader's Workshop is an effective means of delivering reading instruction.

Chapter Three

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the implementation of Reader's Workshop has increased the Reading/Language Arts achievement scores at elementary and middle schools using the Reader's Workshop model in two midwestern counties. Beyond student achievement scores, student response to and teacher satisfaction with Reader's Workshop will also be investigated as measures of the effectiveness of this teaching strategy.

Data Collection Process

Data collection for this study was a two-part process. The first part consisted of electronic surveys which were sent to each public school district in two counties. Thirty surveys were sent out and thirteen responses were received, representing a total of 73 individual schools. (See Appendix A). Once the survey data was returned to the researcher, School Report Card data for English Language Arts was then obtained from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) website for each school represented in the survey data returned. This data resulted from standardized testing that every public school in the state of Wisconsin were required to complete.

The data collected from the interview respondents included responses to questions from the researcher. The questions asked pertained to the interviewees experience with Reader's Workshop, their feelings towards it and the student response they observed while using it. Additionally, the Special Education and Pupil Services Director was also asked about the achievement data she has analyzed regarding Reader's Workshop. See Appendix B for all interview questions. Interviews were conducted on site in a school in

one of these two counties with the interviewees. Interviewees agreed to participate in the study, knowing their identity would be kept confidential and with the knowledge that they could cease the interview at any point.

Participants

The survey participants in this study were two employees at school districts in two rural counties in Wisconsin. The interview participants were a teacher and the Director of Special Education and Pupil Services. Both the teacher and the director were at the same school. The participants were chosen using convenience sampling and were chosen because they fit the investigator's criteria relating to their knowledge of Reader's Workshop.

Data Analysis

The school report card data was divided first into two sets: schools which use Reader's Workshop and schools which did not use Reader's Workshop. (See Appendix C). The most recent scores for Reading/Language Arts from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) website were entered into an Excel spreadsheet and a one-tailed t-test was performed using a .05 level of significance to determine if schools that use the Reader's Workshop model performed better on standardized tests than those schools that do not use the Reader's Workshop model.

The second analysis looked at whether or not schools who use the Reader's Workshop model showed a greater increase in test scores than those schools who have not implemented the Workshop model. For the schools who have implemented Reader's Workshop, data was analyzed either beginning when they implemented the model, or in the last six years, if they implemented the model previous to this. This data set is

comprised first of schools using Reader's Workshop test scores from before they began using this model, or from 2011-2012, and then after they implemented the program. The difference in those scores was entered into an Excel spreadsheet. In a second column, the difference in test scores was listed for schools who have not used Reader's Workshop for the last six years. (See Table 1) A one-tailed t-test was conducted to determine if schools showed more improvement in scores when using Reader's Workshop as opposed to those schools not using that model.

Table 1

School Name	Yes/No	Test score - current	Test score before starting or oldest	Change	Score year used
A	No	33.2	28.6	4.6	2011-2012
B	No	21.6	15.5	6.1	2011-2012

For complete data set, see Appendix C

Data from the interviews was coded thematically. Themes were determined and coded as “positives for Reader’s Workshops” and “negatives for non-Reader’s Workshop methods”. Additional coding was done for “teacher response” and “student response”.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 focused on how data was gathered for this study and then how it was analyzed. The data was collected via survey, online data from the Wisconsin Department of Instruction, and interviews. The quantitative data was analyzed using a one-tailed t-test with a .05 significance level. The qualitative data was thematically coded, with the

focus on data being the benefits of Reader's Workshop and the negatives associated with non-Reader's Workshop frameworks.

In Chapter Four the researcher examined the results found in this study and determine if the null or research hypotheses would be accepted or rejected for each of the data sets. The researcher will determine if those schools using Reader's Workshop are performing better than those schools not using Reader's Workshop as well as if those school's using Reader's Workshop are showing a greater amount of growth in achievement scores than those schools not using Reader's Workshop. The interview results will be examined to determine teacher satisfaction and student response to the use of Reader's Workshop in their classrooms.

Chapter Four

Results

Hypothesis Set One

The data showing the current achievement levels for Reading and Language Arts for the two sets of schools, those using Reader’s Workshop and those not using this strategy were analyzed using an Excel t-test two sample assuming equal variance. The results for both hypothesis one and two are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Data Analysis Results for Hypotheses

Hypothesis	t critical	t value	p value	Decision
1	1.667	2.880	0.003	Reject the null, accept the research hypothesis
2	1.667	4.880	0.00003	Reject the null, accept the research hypothesis

See Appendix D for complete data analysis results

Data was compared from a total of 73 schools. Of these 73 schools, 35 used the Reader’s Workshop model and 38 did not use the Reader’s Workshop model. The data was analyzed at a 5% significance level and was tested using a one-tailed t-test because the null hypothesis was that the schools performed at the same or lower level when they had implemented Reader’s Workshop. The t critical for a one-tailed test was 1.667 and the t statistic found was 2.880 (see Appendix D for data analysis). With these results, the investigator could reject null hypothesis one and accept research hypothesis one. This meant that schools using Reader’s Workshop were performing significantly better than those schools not using the Reader’s Workshop model with a p-value of .003.

Hypothesis Set Two

The data showing the difference in achievement scores from either the six years previous, or before the Reader's Workshop model implemented were analyzed next for both sets of schools. The data was analyzed using an Excel t-test two sample assuming equal variances. The data was analyzed at the 5% significance level and was analyzed with a one-tailed test because the null hypothesis was that the schools using Reader's Workshop showed a higher rate of improvement when using Reader's Workshop than those schools not using the Reader's Workshop model (See Appendix D for data analysis). The t critical for a one-tailed test was 1.667 and the t statistic found was 4.880 with a p-value of 0.00003. Thus null hypothesis two was rejected and research hypothesis two was accepted, meaning that the improvement shown in schools using Reader's Workshop is significantly greater than the improvement shown in schools not using the Workshop model, since implementation or in in the six years between the 2011-2012 and 2016-2017 school years.

Interview results

The interview results netted positive responses in regards to Reader's Workshop. The teacher interviewed was teaching her class using a basal reader prior to switching to Reader's Workshop two years ago. The Director of Special Education and Pupil Services had been a special education teacher previous to her current position. As a teacher, she had been pulling students out of class for their specialized instruction in a separate environment. In the last school year, part of her day was spent co-teaching in a classroom where the special education students were not being pulled out for language arts instruction, but instead were participating in Reader's and Writer's Workshop within

the general education setting. Both of these educators were excited to discuss their experiences with Reader's Workshop.

The teacher was asked why she had switched from teaching using a basal approach to Reader's Workshop and her response was that it is the best approach for students. She felt that she could meet all the needs of all the children. She pointed out that when using Reader's Workshop, the special education students are able to stay in the classroom, therefore, everyone is included. When asked if she was happy that she made the switch, her response was, "Beyond happy." She pointed out that she felt the old curriculum was "boring," that she could only teach to the textbook, and that the textbook was too hard and did not meet the needs of the majority of the children in her classroom. With Reader's Workshop, she can work adjust her teaching to meet all of the children's needs.

When the Director of Special Education and Pupil Services was asked about her experience with Reader's Workshop, she made a point of saying that she really loved the way students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) (special education students) could be part of the whole classroom and get the instruction they need without being pulled out of the classroom. In the past, and in other classrooms, when teachers were using a basal program, what she referred to as a "boxed set," students were seen not to fit in, or to be able to do the work required, so they were sent out of the classroom to work separately with other special education students with a special education teacher, in a different classroom. This director believes that the children can get the specialized instruction promised in their IEP in the regular education classroom with their peers when the Reader's Workshop approach is used. She went on to say that she really likes that not

only are the children really where they need to be, but also that they do not always have to be grouped by ability. She pointed out that children have different skills and the Workshop model allows teachers to find out what those skills are, and group them differently sometimes. Her example was that children do not always need to be grouped by their reading level. If a child is at a reading level D, for instance, he may not always need to be with other level D readers. If the class is working on a unit about presidents and he has a lot of knowledge about presidents, he could be grouped to take advantage of that knowledge he has and able to express his knowledge and the information he knows. The Director mentioned that seeing this children get the instruction they need in the classroom has been so powerful and very motivating both for the students and for herself.

Both educators were asked what student response they had seen to Reader's Workshop. The teacher responded that they loved it. The students set their own goals, they are keeping track of their own growth and accomplishments and that this makes them own their learning and see their own growth. She said that she has seen very positive changes in her students using Reader's Workshop, that they like reading now. The teacher began the year by teaching routines and building the students' independent reading stamina, so now they are able to sit down and enjoy a book. She stated that reading time is no longer, "Here is your book, here is your workbook page, no love of reading," but instead Workshop gives them the love of reading. She said that when using the old curriculum she was unable to get to know her students as readers, there was no one-on-one conferences, it was never small groups and it was never skills based. She described it as "Here you go! I hope it works!" She felt that if it did not work, some children were following the curriculum and others were not and it made those children

who were not “feel like fools.” With Reader’s Workshop, she says everyone is doing what they need to do and it “does not matter.” When asked about having the special education students remain in the classroom and what her experience had been with that with the implementation of Workshop, she had all positive things to say. She expressed that she loves that the special education students feel like they are part of the classroom. They are no longer leaving for every subject, so it makes them feel included. She said it makes them feel smart and she has heard comments such as, “I am smart” and “I have got this!” She said they feel like they are reading just like the other students in the class are reading because they are able to read at their level, not at the too hard level of the basals. To sum up, she said, “It gives those kids a chance to learn to love school and to feel like they are part of their class, not just special ed.”

The Director of Special Education and Pupil services also discussed student response to Reader’s Workshop. She was best able to sum up what she saw by referring to first quarter parent/teacher conferences. She said that all the parents were saying how much their children loved to read, and that they have never liked reading before, but now they are loving reading. They said the students love the classroom and they loved the way it was set up. It was very positive feedback and very different conferences than she had experienced in the past.

When asked what these educators would recommend to other teachers, they both had similar responses in regards to planning and taking the time to do it right. They both mentioned that the first 24-25 days are teaching what is expected during the Reader’s Workshop time and that that is crucial in a successful Workshop. The Director of Special Education and Pupil Services also expanded to say that teachers should consider using

Reader's Workshop because it helps all students work at their level; lower level children, higher level children, it provides flexibility and children who are able to be more independent can be more independent and children who need more structure can have that provided. While these are all good things, she mentioned that it is harder for some teachers to "wrap their brain around keeping it organized" and added that teachers have to have strong classroom management skills, be organized and be willing to accept that things do not always go the way they were planned and be willing to continue to take those risks, regardless.

The Director of Special Education and Pupil Services was asked what she has noticed when looking at the achievement data for students in classrooms that use Reader's Workshop versus those that did not. She responded that in a study she did a comparison of those two types of classrooms using student *Fountas and Pinnell* reading levels, she found that the classrooms using Reader's Workshop had a larger number of students who went up five or six reading levels between the fall and winter testing periods and very few students, who only went up zero or one, than the classrooms not using Reader's Workshop. The classrooms that did not use Reader's Workshop had students who mainly went up one reading level and none that went up more than five. So, all classrooms had student improvement, but the classrooms using Reader's Workshop had students making more improvement. She did state later that the same third graders did not do amazing overall on the *Wisconsin State Forward Exam*, but also pointed out that that could have been a result of it being their first time taking that exam and that it will be interesting to watch how they do next year and further into the future.

Both educators stated that they saw their students embrace the love of reading through their experience with Reader's Workshop. The teacher perhaps summed it up best when she said, "No matter who they are! No matter what level they were at, that did not matter! They can all read a book and love reading!".

Chapter Summary

The results of the quantitative data analysis demonstrated that both of the null hypotheses were rejected and the alternative hypotheses accepted at a very significant level. Statistically, this indicates that schools using Reader's Workshop are scoring higher on standardized achievement tests than those schools not using the Reader's Workshop model. Furthermore, those schools using Reader's Workshop are also showing a greater amount of improvement in reading scores since the implementation of Reader's Workshop, or within the six years between 2011-2012 school year and the 2016-2017 school year, versus those schools not using Reader's Workshop.

The qualitative research demonstrates that educators who have begun using Reader's Workshop after having used other means of delivering reading instruction are pleased with the outcomes. They are enjoying seeing their special education students remain in class and appreciate being able to meet the needs for all students--special education, lower readers, average readers, and advanced readers. They reported seeing positive responses from their students, feelings of pride and belonging in the classroom. Most importantly, students are expressing their love for reading and parents are reporting students are enjoying reading and enjoying school. The Director of Special Education reported that she found higher individual student growth, based on reading levels, in classrooms that use Reader's Workshop versus those that do not use Reader's Workshop.

While both educators pointed out while there is significant planning, organization, student management skills and patience required for effective Reader's Workshop implementation, they both recommend it to other teachers based on their own classroom experiences.

In Chapter Five the researcher will look again at the purpose of this study and will draw conclusions, make recommendations and examine the limitations and implications of this study.

Chapter Five

Discussion, Implications, Recommendations

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the implementation of Reader's Workshop has increased the Reading/Language Arts achievement scores at elementary and middle schools using the Reader's Workshop model in two midwestern counties. Beyond student achievement scores, student response to and teacher satisfaction with Reader's Workshop were also investigated as measures of the effectiveness of this teaching strategy.

Choosing the most effective way to teach reading can be a daunting task and holds a great deal of importance for educators. There are many different strategies which can be used along with many different reading curriculums and programs. Many schools are choosing to follow the Reader's Workshop model for their reading instruction. One of the two large districts in this study has been using the Reader's Workshop model in their schools since 2004. Many of the smaller school districts in that county have begun to follow their lead and have been or are beginning to implement the Reader's Workshop model as well. The other large district had only one school using the Workshop model. While there has not been extensive quantitative data studies supporting the effectiveness of Reader's Workshop, school districts are observing the successes of it in other schools and many are implementing it in their schools.

In this study, the investigator divided the schools into those schools who have implemented the Reader's Workshop model and those who have not implemented the Reader's Workshop model. The first data set compared the overall Reading/Language

Arts test scores based on the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction report cards of those schools using the Reader's Workshop model, versus those schools not using the Reader's Workshop model using 2016-2017 data. Null hypothesis one was rejected, and research hypothesis one was accepted, meaning that those schools using Reader's Workshop are performing significantly better with a p-value of 0.003 than those schools not using Reader's Workshop.

The second data set analyzed the test scores from either six years previous, or since the Reader's Workshop model was implemented for both sets of schools (if less than six years ago), to determine if there was a greater amount of improvement in those schools using Reader's Workshop versus those schools not using Reader's Workshop. Null hypothesis two was rejected and research hypothesis two was accepted, meaning the improvement shown in schools using Reader's Workshop is greater than the improvement in schools not using the Workshop model with a p-value of 0.00003.

Qualitatively speaking, interviews were done with two educators holding different positions in a school district. These educators were asked a series of questions regarding their beliefs on the effectiveness of Reader's Workshops, the results they saw in classrooms, their students' responses to it and what they would recommend to other teachers. Both educators favor Reader's Workshop over other methods of delivering reading instruction, primarily the basal method. They like that it meets the needs of all students in their classrooms and that special education students are no longer being removed to receive their specialized instruction in reading and language arts in other classrooms away from their classroom peers. They both reported positive response from their students as well as from the students' parents, with the common theme being that

students now love to read. The Director of Special Education and Pupil services reported that in a study she did, students in grade three in classrooms using Reader's Workshop showed a greater amount of growth than third grade students in classrooms not using Reader's Workshop.

Conclusions

The research conducted in this study showed the success schools have shown using Reader's Workshop. The data analyzed in this study falls in line with the success schools have once they implemented the Writer's Workshop model for teaching Writing. Schools who use the Reader's Workshop model show higher test scores as well as greater levels of improvement from their students on standardized tests than those schools not using Reader's Workshop. It can be concluded that as other schools notice the success of this program, more and more schools will begin using it.

Beyond standardized testing, success was also shown by teacher's satisfaction with this program, as well as student's positive responses and a reported love for reading.

Recommendations

To conduct further research in this area, individual student's achievements should be monitored and charted to investigate how their performance is affected by this teaching strategy for reading. It would benefit future studies to compare classrooms using Reader's Workshop using their achievement data with classrooms not being taught using Reader's Workshop. Another suggestion would be to expand this survey to include additional districts in order to comprise a larger base of information from which to generalize the study's findings. Additional interviews should be done to interview

teachers from a variety of schools in a variety of grades to provide more substantiated qualitative data findings.

The researcher recommends further testing using a larger number of schools as well as testing of individual students and further interviews with more teachers in a variety of schools.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are the number of schools studied as well as the limited number of educators interviewed. Despite these limitations the researcher recommends to teachers who are responsible for reading instruction that they consider implementing Reader's Workshop in their classroom. After examining data collected in this study and speaking with educators, the researcher believes that the Reader's Workshop is an effective means of delivering reading instruction and enables more students to participate successfully in reading instruction within their own classroom and fosters a love of reading in students.

Implications

Teachers who wish to implement the Reader's Workshop in their classroom should spend at least several weeks teaching students the classroom processes associated with Reader's Workshop. It is recommended that students practice independent reading to build stamina, to practice moving about the room in ways that align with the teacher's workshop process, to practice meeting in small groups and in independent groups, and to practice voice levels associated with Reader's Workshop jobs. Once these routines are established, the class can be divided into groups based on students reading level or skill ability levels. The teacher can plan mini lessons and begin to deliver these to students as

well as begin to meet with small groups while the other groups are reading or practicing the skills associated with mini lessons. Because routines were taught and established first, this Reading Workshop time should be a rich learning time for all students. It is recommended that the teacher be willing to reteach routines following breaks from school or if students are straying from the expectations set. While the Reading Workshop may be a change that takes teacher's out of their comfort zone, the benefits to students makes it worthwhile for the teacher to stretch themselves to take the risk of trying something new.

Schools who use the information in this study to make a decision to implement the Reader's Workshop schoolwide will be encouraging teachers who teach reading to be able to deliver reading instruction that meets the needs of all students. Those students who excel will be allowed to move forward and be challenged and those students who struggle will be able to fully participate with their classmates. Each student will be given the opportunity to read at his or her own level while remaining part of their classroom community and working with their own peers. Every student is being given what he or she needs to be successful.

Chapter Summary

The findings in this study found that Reader's Workshop is an effective means of delivering reading instruction in elementary and middle schools. Data analysis showed that schools using Reader's Workshop performed significantly better than those schools not using Reader's Workshop. Analysis also showed that the level of improvement was significantly higher for those schools using Reader's Workshop as opposed to those schools not using it. Interviews with two educators regarding their experience with

Reader's Workshop resulted in positive responses regarding their satisfaction with it and their students response to it.

This study provides quantitative data for a topic that has not been studied quantitatively in recent years. These data analysis results can give schools the confidence to implement this method of delivering instruction. The data shows that Reader's Workshop is an effective means of delivering reading instructions. It shows that schools that have already implemented it are demonstrating better standardized test scores than those schools who have not implemented it. The data analysis also found that schools have shown a greater rate of improvement on their standardized test scores than those schools who have not implemented the Reader's Workshop schoolwide. Additionally, the interviews conducted in this study showed that educators are satisfied with the results they have seen in their classrooms. The educators reported seeing increased reading ability as gauged by growth in reading level of students and that students are expressing a love of reading and are enjoying and able to participate fully in reading instruction in their own classrooms. Special education students who are instructed using Reader's Workshop are able to remain in their classrooms and not be pulled out of class for reading instruction. Because of this, all students feel they are a part of their classroom community and all students are being given what they need to be successful.

REFERENCES

- About Universal Design for Learning. (2018, January 25). Retrieved August 8, 2018, from <http://www.cast.org/our-work/about-udl.html#.W2r5-dhKiL8>
- Atwell, N. (2015). *In the middle: A lifetime of learning about writing, reading, and adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, p. 34.
- Baker, E. C. (1994). Writing and reading in a first-grade Writers' Workshop. *The Reading Teacher*, 47(5), 372-377. Retrieved July 9, 2018.
- Braunshausen, S. (2017, November 21). What is the basal reading approach? Retrieved July 5, 2018, from <http://education.seattlepi.com/basal-reading-approach-1838.html>
- Clippard, D. (1998). Efficacy of Writers' Workshop for Students With Significant Writing Deficits. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 13(1), 1998th ser., 7-26.
- Coakley-Fields, M. R. (2018). Markers of an "inclusive" reading classroom: Peers facilitating inclusion at the margins of a fourth grade Reading Workshop. *Reading Horizons*, 57(1), 3rd ser., 15-31. Retrieved July 5, 2018.
- Cockerille, A. G. (2014). Reading Workshop in the Montessori Classroom. *Montessori Life*, fall, 36-43.
- The condition of education - preprimary, elementary, and secondary Education - elementary and secondary enrollment - children and youth with disabilities - Indicator April (2018). (n.d.). Retrieved July 5, 2018, from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgg.asp

- Federal definition/criteria for specific learning disabilities. (2018, June 15). Retrieved July 5, 2018, from <https://dpi.wi.gov/sped/program/specific-learning-disabilities/criteria/federal-definition-criteria>
- Feinberg, B. (2007). The Lucy Calkins project. *Education Next*, 7(3). Retrieved June 14, 2018.
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2006). *Language Arts Workshop: Purposeful reading and writing instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Howard, K. L. (2004). Universal Design for Learning meeting the needs of all students. *International Society for Technology in Education*, 31(5), 26-29. Retrieved July 5, 2018.
- Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W. (2007). The effects of Writing Workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(2), 131-139. doi:10.1007/s10643-007-0186-3
- Lain, S. (2017). Show, don't tell: Reading Workshop fosters engagement and success. *Texas Journal of Literacy Education*, 5(2), winter 2017.
- Literacy Workshops. (n.d.). Retrieved July 5, 2018, from <https://www.theprojectschool.org/Page/48>
- McCollum, S., McNeese, M. N., Styron, R., & Lee, D. E. (2007). A School District Comparison of Reading Achievement Based on Three Reading Programs. *The Journal of At-Risk Issues*, 13(1), winter 2007, 1-6.
- Meyer, K. (2010). A collaborative approach to Reading Workshop in the middle years. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(6), 501-507. Retrieved July 9, 2018.
- Miller, D. (2014). *Book Whisperer, The: Awakening the Inner Reader in Every Child*.

Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Morin, A. (n.d.). Universal Design for Learning (UDL): What You Need to Know.

Retrieved July 5, 2018, from https://www.understood.org/en/learning-attention-issues/treatments-approaches/educational-strategies/universal-design-for-learning-what-it-is-and-how-it-works?gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4ZX0t4OI3AIViIF-Ch29ng2PEAAYASAAEgJTLvD_BwE

Mounla, G., Bahous, R., & N, M. (2011). "I Am in Grade One and I Can Read!" The Readers' Workshop. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 11(3), 279-291.

(n.d.). Retrieved June 22, 2017

On Reading, Learning to Read, and Effective Reading Instruction: An Overview of What

We Know and How We Know It. (2017, October 25). Retrieved June 14, 2018, from <http://www2.ncte.org/statement/onreading/>

Paris, S. G., & Jacobs, J. E. (1984). The benefits of informed instruction for children's reading awareness and comprehension skills. *Child Development*, 55(6), 2083-2093. Retrieved July 9, 2018.

Pollington, M. F., Wilcox, B., & Morrison, T. G. (2001). Self-Perception in Writing: The Effects of Writing Workshop and Traditional Instruction on Intermediate Grade Students. *Reading Psychology*, 249-265.

Reading Workshop - Information, ideas, and resources from Busy Teacher's Cafe. (n.d.).

Retrieved July 9, 2018, from

http://www.busyteacherscafe.com/literacy/reading_workshop.html

Richford, N. (2017, November 21). The Advantages & Disadvantages of a Basal/Anthology Approach. Retrieved July 5, 2018, from

<https://classroom.synonym.com/advantages-disadvantages-basal-anthology-approach-12205842.html>

Roller, C. M. (1996). *Variability, not disability: Struggling readers in a Workshop classroom*. International Literacy Association.

Sanchez, C. (2017, February 23). English Language Learners: How Your State Is Doing. Retrieved July 5, 2018, from

<https://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2017/02/23/512451228/5-million-english-language-learners-a-vast-pool-of-talent-at-risk>

Special Education Inclusion. (2014, September 15). Retrieved July 5, 2018, from <http://weac.org/articles/specialedinc/>

Swift, K. (1993). Try Reading Workshop in your classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 46(5), 366-371. Retrieved July 9, 2018.

Taylor, S. V., & Nesheim, D. W. (2000/2001). Making literacy real for "high-risk" adolescent emerging readers: An innovative application of Readers' Workshop. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(4), 308-318. Retrieved July 9, 2018.

Team, U. (n.d.). Learning About IEPs. Retrieved July 21, 2018, from <https://www.understood.org/en/school-learning/special-services/ieps/what-is-an-iep>

Thomas, A. F. (2012). The effects of implementing a Reading Workshop in middle school language arts classrooms. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 9. Retrieved July 9, 2018.

Towle, W. (2000). The art of the Reading Workshop. *Educational Leadership*, 38-41. Retrieved July 9, 2018.

Reading & Writing Workshop. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2017, from

<https://cli.org/resource/reading-writing-workshop/>

What Is Guided Reading? | Scholastic. (n.d.). Retrieved July 5, 2018, from

<https://www.scholastic.com/teachers/articles/17-18/what-is-guided-reading/>

Appendix A

Effectiveness of Reader's and Writer's Workshop
Consent Statement
<p>The purpose of this research project is to develop a better understanding of the effectiveness of Reader's Workshop. If you choose to participate you will be asked to answer 2 questions regarding your school's use of Reader's Workshop.</p> <p>Your participation in this project will not involve any personal risks to you or to others. Your participation will significantly contribute to the completion of the project and, to that extent, will further our understanding of the effectiveness of Reader's Workshop. If you choose to participate, no identifying information will be collected from you. Therefore, you will not be linked to the research project in any way. The results of the findings will be made available to the participants upon request. Please be aware that your participation in this project is strictly voluntary. You may decline to participate; you may with-draw or you may choose to stop the survey at any time without penalty. ELECTRONIC CONSENT: Please select your choice below. Clicking on the "Agree" button indicates that you have read the above information, you voluntarily agree to participate, and are 18 years of age or older.</p> <p>1. Does your school use the Reading Workshop model?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Some of our teachers use the Reading Workshop model. <input type="radio"/> Yes, the entire school follows the workshop model for reading. <p>2. If yes, when did your school implement the reading workshop model?</p> <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 40px; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>

Appendix B

Interview Questions - Director of Special Education and Pupil Services

What is your experience with and feelings towards Reader's Workshop?

What do you feel are the benefits or downfalls of Reader's Workshop?

Why do you feel a teacher should consider or should not consider using Reader's Workshop in their classroom?

What have you noticed looking at the achievement data for students in classrooms that use Reader's Workshop vs those who do not use the Workshop model?

How do special education students perform in a classroom that uses the Workshop model as opposed to a classroom that uses a different model?

How have you witnessed students responding to Reader's Workshop?

Is there anything else you would like to share regarding Reader's Workshop?

Interview Questions - Third Grade Teacher

How long have you been teaching using Reader's Workshop?

What made you decide to switch teaching methods in favor of the Workshop model?

Are you happy you made the switch?

How have your students responded to the Workshop model?

Have you seen positive or negative changes in your students since teaching this way?

Has your students attitude regarding reading differed from when you taught reading using a different method?

Is there anything else you would like to share regarding Reader's Workshop? What you would recommend to other teachers?

**Appendix C
Data Collected**

School Name	Yes/No	Test score - current	Test score before starting or oldest	Change	Score year used
A	No	33.2	28.6	4.6	2011-2012
B	No	21.6	15.5	6.1	2011-2012
C	No	18.3	17	1.3	2011-2012
D	No	33.3	30.7	2.6	2011-2012
E	No	13	18.9	-5.9	2011-2012
F	No	12.7	11	1.7	2011-2012
G	No	10.3	12.3	-2	2011-2012
H	No	45.3	39.8	5.5	2011-2012
I	No	19.7	23	-3.3	2011-2012
J	No	21.9	21.9	0	2011-2012
K	No	12.1	15.8	-3.7	2011-2012
L	No	17.6	20	-2.4	2011-2012
M	No	10.4	9.3	1.1	2011-2012
N	No	8.7	10.5	-1.8	2011-2012

School Name	Yes/No	Test score - current	Test score before starting or oldest	Change	Score year used
O	No	24.2	26.5	-2.3	2011-2012
P	No	14.5	12.2	2.3	2011-2012
Q	No	14.8	21	-6.2	2011-2012
R	No	20.4	22.4	-2	2011-2012
S	No	25.7	21.9	3.8	2011-2012
T	No	30.2	25.2	5	2011-2012
U	No	16.2	19.9	-3.7	2011-2012
V	No	25.1	25.9	-0.8	2011-2012
W	No	14.6	21.2	-6.6	2011-2012
X	No	34.1	31.4	2.7	2011-2012
Y	No	36.1	37.5	-1.4	2011-2012
Z	No	22.5	26.4	-3.9	2011-2012
A1	No	44	32.3	11.7	2011-2012
B1	No	39.9	34	5.9	2011-2012
C1	No	39.8	31.7	8.1	2011-2012
D1	No	43.1	35.1	8	2011-2012

School Name	Yes/No	Test score - current	Test score before starting or oldest	Change	Score year used
E1	No	41.4	36.1	5.3	2011-2012
F1	No	40.6	34.1	6.5	2011-2012
G1	No	43.8	38	5.8	2011-2012
H1	Yes	30	21.7	8.3	2011-2012
I1	Yes	19.9	14.2	5.7	2011-2012
J1	Yes	44.9	37.1	7.8	2011-2012
K1	Yes	24.4	26.2	-1.8	2011-2012
L1	Yes	45.9	38.7	7.2	2011-2012
M1	Yes	31.6	29	2.6	2011-2012
N1	Yes	18.1	11.3	6.8	2011-2012
O1	Yes	26	19.5	6.5	2011-2012
P1	Yes	31.1	26.6	4.5	2011-2012
Q1	Yes	29.1	29.3	-0.2	2011-2012
R1	Yes	19.2	17.3	1.9	2011-2012
S1	Yes	38.2	30.6	7.6	2011-2012
T1	Yes	45.4	34.3	11.1	2011-2012

School Name	Yes/No	Test score - current	Test score before starting or oldest	Change	Score year used
U1	Yes	33.9	31.6	2.3	2011-2012
V1	Yes	23.2	22.8	0.4	2011-2012
W1	Yes	34.6	30	4.6	2011-2012
X1	Yes	20.3	14.2	6.1	2011-2012
Y1	Yes	43.2	30.7	12.5	2011-2012
Z1	Yes	38	33.4	4.6	2011-2012
A2	Yes	42	34.5	7.5	2011-2012
B2	Yes	41.6	31.7	9.9	2011-2012
C2	Yes	42.4	34.4	8	2011-2012
D2	Yes	27.9	26.5	1.4	2011-2012
E2	Yes	32.4	29.4	3	2011-2012
F2	Yes	25	16.4	8.6	2011-2012
G2	Yes	25.3	23.5	1.8	2011-2012
H2	Yes	22.7	23.1	-0.4	2011-2012
I2	Yes	39.4	27.4	12	2011-2012
J2	Yes	16.8	10.4	6.4	2011-2012

School Name	Yes/No	Test score - current	Test score before starting or oldest	Change	Score year used
K2	Yes	14.9	14.8	0.1	2011-2012
L2	Yes	38.4	34.1	4.3	2013-2014
M2	Yes	38.5	29.1	9.4	2013-2014
N2	Yes	35.6	27.9	7.7	2015-2016
O2	Yes	43	28.2	14.8	2011-2012
P2	Yes	41.3	28.6	12.7	2011-2012
Q2	Yes	39.2	31.3	7.9	2011-2012
R2	Yes	43.9	30.5	13.4	2011-2012
S2	Yes	33.8	25.1	8.7	2011-2012
T2	Yes	40.2	31.1	9.1	2011-2012
U2	Yes	29.9	22.8	7.1	2011-2012

**Appendix D
Data Results**

Data Set 1 Testing Schools' Current Test Scores using Reader's Workshop vs Not

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	32.78	25.730303
Variance	81.99753846	140.409053
Observations	40	33
Pooled Variance	108.3238549	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	71	
t Stat	2.880274845	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.002624644	
t Critical one-tail	1.666599658	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.005249288	
t Critical two-tail	1.993943368	

Data Set 2 Testing Schools' Improvements Since Implementing RW vs Not

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances

	<i>Variable 1</i>	<i>Variable 2</i>
Mean	6.2975	1.27272727
Variance	16.95409615	21.8814205
Observations	40	33
Pooled Variance	19.17486204	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	71	
t Stat	4.879505758	
P(T<=t) one-tail	3.15477E-06	
t Critical one-tail	1.666599658	
P(T<=t) two-tail	6.30954E-06	
t Critical two-tail	1.993943368	

