

What Middle Schoolers Want: An Analysis of the Most Circulated Texts in a Public School District

A Dissertation Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kimberly Flanders McCuiston

May 2015

Dedication

Sir Isaac Newton once said, “If I have seen further than others, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants.” I would like to dedicate this dissertation to those whose support have allowed me to see a little further. To my friend Janelle Bouknight, thank you for your mentoring, your support, and your friendship. I never would have considered a doctorate degree without you. To my literacy friends, I started the program not expecting to meet such interesting, entertaining, and intelligent women. You have made this journey a richer experience. Sarah Swauger, I have always been able to count on you for a kind word or a kick in the pants. Thank you, my person.

I am beyond blessed with the most supportive family a girl can have. My mother, Elizabeth Flanders, you have instilled in me a fervent love for learning that will never be extinguished. You will always be my first teacher. To my father, Ralph Flanders, and my stepmother Karen, you two have listened for hours on end to talk about school and classes. You both have the patience of Job. To my sister Amy, you are the most generous soul on this planet. I have leaned on you more times than I care to admit, and you have always supported me cheerfully. I am eternally grateful to God for giving me you as a sister and friend. To my Renaissance man Jason, I only wish I had your gift for words to express my gratitude to you for your support and love. For any dream or goal I had, you were there, urging me to achieve what I wanted. Your support for me gave me the courage to pursue this dream of a doctorate degree. Your love gave me a reason to continue building a better me. Thank you for being the Sherlock to my Holmes, the Doctor to my companion, and the Shawn to my Gus (or vice versa!).

Finally, to my Lord Jesus Christ, thank You for Your eternal love. This journey has shown me how true the verse is: “I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.”

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the mentors who have guided me in this endeavor. To Dr. Richard Allington, thank you for serving as my advisor, supervisor, dissertation chair, and professor. You struck a constructive balance between leading me through the twists and turns on the dissertation road and allowing me to challenge myself in the navigation of it as well. I am so fortunate to have learned from you.

To Dr. Anne McGill-Franzen, thank you for introducing a “middle school” teacher to the joys of kindergarten literacy and for challenging your students to pursue publication. Your challenge scared me, but it has made me a better student, researcher, and future professor. To Dr. Dennis Ciancio, thank you for guiding me through the dense forest that is statistical analysis. Under your guidance for this dissertation and in the classroom, I have realized how enjoyable and intriguing numbers can be. To Dr. Stergios Botzakis, thank you for your constant understanding, your willingness to listen and commiserate, and your introduction of the world of the graphic novel. You have provided me a rich understanding of adolescent literacy, which has and will continue to influence me as an educator.

And to Dr. Deborah Wooten, thank you for introducing me to the joys of sharing children’s books in the classroom. You have opened my eyes to the expanse of stories waiting to be shared with children. Thank you for allowing me to teach with you, to learn from you, and to share in the joys of finding new books. Thank you again, my doctoral committee, for your mentoring, sharing of knowledge, and generosity of time and attention. Without you, this dissertation would not be possible.

Abstract

In today's climate of education reform and the classroom concentration on texts that are academically rigorous, it is easy to forget the importance of encouraging voluntary reading for adolescents. Understanding students' interests in texts can provide teachers with the knowledge to promote voluntary reading within the classroom. This embedded case study examined the popularity of texts in a public school district's middle school libraries through quantitative data drawn from library circulation records. The records from 12 public middle school libraries from a school district in the southeastern United States were used to determine the 10 most frequently checked out books per school during the 2013-2014 school year. The books were read and analyzed to address the following research questions:

1. Of books checked out from middle school libraries, which genres, subgenres, or formats are most prevalent?
2. Which common composition and physical characteristics, as well as external influences, do these texts share?
3. Is there a relationship among these factors and school demographics (i.e.—school size, minority status, poverty level)?

After distinguishing among the various categories of features for the texts, statistical analyses were conducted using several tests, such as the independent samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance, and chi-square test for association. The study found that the middle school students had definitive preferences for the texts they checked out from school libraries. Fiction was significantly preferred over nonfiction with graphic novels and those in the science fiction/fantasy subgenre chosen more often than other subgenres. Protagonists in the popular texts were significantly more often white, middle-school age or older, and from one- or two-parent homes. The authors of the text were significantly more likely to be white and male.

Finally, when schools were grouped by similar demographics and texts were compared, genre and subgenre preferences were significantly different among the groups of varying demographics. Other significant findings are also discussed. The findings from this study indicate that adolescents were interested in texts that were relatively new and with relatable protagonists and story lines.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Overview	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Rationale for the Study	3
Theoretical Framework	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Overview of the Study	8
Significance of the Study	9
Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations	9
Organization of the Upcoming Chapters	11
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	12
Adolescent Reading Achievement and Voluntary Reading	13
Self-Determination Theory	28
Environmental Factors that Support Voluntary Reading	34
Influences on Student Interest	46
Chapter Summary	66
Chapter 3: Methods and Procedures	68
Study Design	68
Participants	70
Instrumentation	73
Procedures	78
Treatment of the Data	83
Chapter 4: Findings	87
Research Question One Findings	88
Research Question Two Findings	92
Research Question Three Findings	116
Chapter Summary	174
Chapter 5: Analysis and Synthesis	177
Summary of Key Findings and Connections to the Literature	180
Limitations of the Study	197
Recommendations	198
Conclusions and Implications	198
References	206
Appendices	219
Appendix A: Library Circulation Data Form	220
Appendix B: Book Characteristics Data Collection	221
Appendix C: Fictional Text Analysis	223

Appendix D: Book Characteristics Data Collection Sheet Instructions	227
Appendix E: Annotated List of Top 10 Books.....	230
Appendix F: Table of Original Top 10 Lists without Removal of Duplicate Texts or Series....	275
Vita	279

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Amount of Time Spent Reading for Fun by Age and NAEP Average Score, 2012	20
Table 3.1 Text Characteristics, Categories, and Statistical Tests	84
Table 4.1 Subgenres Represented	89
Table 4.2 Protagonist Age and Popularity with Welch's ANOVA Test.....	96
Table 4.3 Protagonist Age and Popularity Differences.....	97
Table 4.4 Protagonist Family Structure and Popularity of Texts.....	99
Table 4.5 Protagonist Family Structure Compared by Average Number on Top 10 Lists.....	100
Table 4.6 Protagonist SES and Popularity of Texts.....	103
Table 4.7 Protagonist SES and Popularity of Each Class in the Top 10 Lists.....	104
Table 4.8 Five Major Themes and Popularity.....	105
Table 4.9 Five Themes and the Prevalence of Each in the Top 10 Lists.....	106
Table 4.10 Schools Categorized by Size, Minority Percent Level, and SES Level.....	117
Table 4.11 School Size and Text Subgenre.....	119
Table 4.12 School Size and the Number of Series Books in Top 10 Lists.....	120
Table 4.13 School Size and Personality Traits of the Protagonist.....	125
Table 4.14 School Size and Publication Year Expected and Observed Counts.....	129
Table 4.15 Number of Texts for Subgenre by Minority Level Group.....	137
Table 4.16 Minority Level and Author Race Expected and Observed Counts.....	140
Table 4.17 Minority Level and Protagonist Race Expected and Observed Counts.....	142
Table 4.18 Minority Level and Protagonist Personality Traits.....	145
Table 4.19 Texts' Years of Publication in Four-Year Sections and Minority Level.....	149
Table 4.20 Minority Level and Accelerated Reader Expected and Observed Counts.....	153

Table 4.21 Number of Texts per Subgenre and School SES Level.....	157
Table 4.22 Protagonist Personality Traits and School SES Level Groups.....	162
Table 4.23 SES Level and Year of Publication Expected and Observed Counts.....	167
Table A.1 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Checkouts, Genres, Subgenres.....	230
Table A.2 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Series, Author Gender and Race, Protagonist Gender.....	236
Table A.3 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Protagonist Race, Age, Family Structure, Extroversion, Agreeableness.....	242
Table A.4 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Protagonist Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience, Emotional Stability, SES.....	248
Table A.5 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Theme, Lexile Level, Cover Art, and Back-of- Book Information.....	255
Table A.6 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Publication Year, Award-Winning, Awards Earned, Teens Top 10, District Novels List.....	262
Table A.7 Annotated List of Top 10 Books—On AR, AR Points, Made into Movies/TV, from Movies/TV, Social Media Page.....	260
Table A.8 List of Top 10 Books by School without Removal of Duplicate Books or Books from Same Series.....	275

Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

The focus for this study is the preferences of texts for voluntary reading of middle school students, specifically identified by library circulation records. The primary interest for these preferences is for texts that demonstrate to be of high interest to the students. This chapter provides a statement of the problem; the rationale for the study; the theoretical framework within which this study is housed; the purpose of the study; the research questions addressed; the significance of the study; assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study; and the organization of the upcoming chapters.

Statement of the Problem

Adolescent reading achievement over time has not shown the same levels of improvement as it has for students in lower grades (National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), 2013). In fact, scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) paint an unfortunate picture of educational progress over time. Over the past 40 years, the gains made by 13- and 17-year-old students on the NAEP test pale in comparison to those made by 9-year-olds on the same assessment. The trajectory of educational progress, then, has been much slower for adolescents.

The NAEP test results also allow analysis of the reading achievement for specific groups of students. Students receiving free or reduced-price lunch have scored significantly lower than other students not receiving this service (NCES, 2013). Unfortunately, the gap between students in poverty and those in the middle or upper class has not shown much improvement, specifically for 13-year-old students. Likewise, although students who struggle in reading have made reading achievement gains on the NAEP assessment, NAEP reading gains have also been dismal for 17-year-old students demonstrating average or high ability in reading. Finally, the NAEP assessment

provides disaggregated results based upon the educational level of students' parents. Students whose parents did not graduate high school have a positive trajectory in reading achievement gains, fortunately. Yet, the 13- and 17-year-old students whose parents graduated high school, had some college education, or graduated from college have shown no real gains on the NAEP reading assessment in the past 40 years. From these results, it is evident that reading achievement specifically among adolescents should be addressed, and ways to support greater reading development should be determined.

The NAEP reading assessments also provide survey data on the reading habits of 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old students (NCES, 2013). For years, students have answered questions about the amount of time they spend in reading, both in their academic and leisure time. Almost half of the nine-year-old students taking the NAEP assessment reported spending time almost daily in pleasure reading. Because the question asked students how much time they spent "reading for fun," the definition for what constitutes pleasure reading was left up to each student answering the question. Thus, pleasure reading might include reading on the internet, video games, and other activities. Only 27% of 13 year olds and 19% of 17 year olds reported daily pleasure reading in 2012. Consequently, the percentage of 13-year-old students reporting that they never or hardly ever read for pleasure was double that of 9 year olds, with 22% of 13 year olds and 11% of 9 year olds reporting the rare occurrence of reading for pleasure. The percentage of 17-year-olds who rarely read for pleasure was even higher at 27%. As students get older, reading for pleasure becomes much less of a priority.

As unfortunate as the results about pleasure reading are, the real issue is the effect this lack of pleasure reading has on reading achievement scores. Nine-year-old students who reported daily pleasure reading scored 19 points higher on the NAEP reading assessment than those who

reported rarely engaging in pleasure reading (NCES, 2013). The effect seems to be even greater for adolescents. There was a 27-point gap between 13 year olds who read daily for pleasure and those who rarely did and a 30-point gap between the 17-year-old counterparts. As these scores demonstrate, engaging in pleasure reading seems to have a significant effect on reading achievement.

Rationale for the Study

The effect reading has on reading achievement has been a substantial focus for reading researchers. For instance, exposure to print has shown to correlate positively with oral language ability, reading comprehension, and, to a smaller extent, word recognition and spelling ability among children from preschool-age through high school (Mol & Bus, 2011). Voluntary reading also has shown to improve students' vocabulary (Swanborn & de Glopper, 1999; Nagy, Anderson, & Herman, 1987). Students who read for pleasure encounter new words and, with frequent encounters and the use of context, gain understanding of the words' meanings, which may enhance the size of their vocabularies. Experiencing a wide variety of texts through voluntary reading is also important. Students who practice wide reading have broader background knowledge (Fisher, Grant, & Ross, 2010), better listening comprehension skills (Hedrick & Cunningham, 2002), and better oral text reading fluency skills than those who do not read broadly (Kuhn et al., 2006). Along with vocabulary, reading for pleasure, or voluntary reading, can build a student's self-confidence in his or her own ability to read. By reading texts with which the student has high success, the student builds self-efficacy (DeNaeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, & Rosseel, 2012; Baker & Wigfield, 1999). Voluntary reading, then, can provide students with the self-confidence to continue to engage in the reading task, which develops their word knowledge.

Several factors have been found to promote voluntary reading. First, students who have access to interesting texts have been found to engage more often in voluntary reading (McQuillan & Au, 2001; Ivey & Broadus, 2001; Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1999). In turn, a lack of access to a variety of interesting texts can deter students from engaging in voluntary reading. The responsibility of access to books has fallen on the school library, one of the most-cited places for accessing texts according to students (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Some have stated that the school library can be the “great equalizer” for students, providing the much-needed access to books that poverty tends to limit (Krashen, Lee, & McQuillan, 2012). Unfortunately, students who may rely most on the school library for texts may find their choices limited, as schools in poverty-stricken areas have been found to have fewer books than their counterparts in more wealthy districts (Pribesh, Gavigan, & Dickinson, 2011). The size of the library has been a consistent predictor of reading achievement, sometimes even more so than one’s socio-economic status (Krashen et al., 2012; Lance, 1994). Obviously, the school library and its offerings are of great importance to reading achievement.

Second, providing students with time to read interesting texts can promote voluntary reading (Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Worthy, 1996). By allowing students time to read what they choose to read, students are more likely to engage in voluntary reading during their leisure time. Providing choice in texts when reading in class can also promote voluntary reading (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Worthy & McKool, 1996). This allowance for choice in school reading can lay the groundwork for continuing the activity during their leisure time. Finally, certain teacher behaviors can encourage voluntary reading. In the classroom, teachers who model their thinking while reading have supported students’ voluntary reading (Fisher & Frey, 2012). When teachers model how readers think when reading, it makes the invisible act of reading visible to the

student. This allows the student to see that reading is something that takes practice for all, not just him or her. By demonstrating to students the mental actions one must make to read, the teacher offers to students the road map one takes in reading comprehension. Providing this support gives students the tools needed to read voluntarily.

Demonstrating the identity of teacher as reader has also shown to affect students' engagement in voluntary reading (Ivey & Johnston, 2013). Reading texts aloud to students during class time can entice students to read texts on their own (Cho & Choi, 2008; Ivey & Broadus, 2001). Teachers who provide texts to students based on their knowledge of the students' interests have also promoted voluntary reading from within their classrooms (Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1999). Acknowledgement of a student's interests validates the student and his or her interests and can bolster the teacher-student relationship. Knowing a student's interests also provides the teacher with the information needed to ensure access to a variety of texts of interest to that student. By providing these factors, voluntary reading can be supported and promoted.

In addition to supporting voluntary reading, certain instructional practices may also help in engaging readers with texts in the classroom. Guthrie, Wigfield, and You (2012) found that several teacher practices encourage students to engage in textual reading both in and out of the classroom. These practices echo the factors that support voluntary reading, such as providing access to interesting texts, allowing student choice in reading materials, and having knowledge of the individual student as a reader. Providing these instructional practices can encourage reading engagement and elevate reading achievement, as well as encourage voluntary reading.

Because of voluntary reading's potential effect on reading achievement, it is vital to support this activity. As has been shown, there are several factors that promote voluntary

reading—access to interesting texts, opportunity to read, choice in reading materials, and teacher behaviors such as modeling reading and thinking, reading aloud, and having knowledge of student interests. At the forefront of these factors is understanding student interests and providing access to interesting texts. It is important to know students' interests in order to provide them access to a variety of texts that may engage them in reading. The current study's goal is to provide this information.

Theoretical Framework

The importance of understanding student interests to support voluntary reading is housed in self-determination theory (SDT). SDT is a macro theory associated with human motivation and personality (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). SDT posits that humans have three basic needs that must be met in order to be intrinsically motivated: autonomy, relatedness, and competence (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Autonomy refers to the need to make one's own decisions over his or her actions. Relatedness requires one to feel connected to others; it requires the relationship one is in to consist of mutual respect and caring. The third basic need is competence, which requires the individual to feel capable of engaging in the activity.

Overall, identifying the reading interests of students to support voluntary reading fits well within the framework of SDT. First, providing access to interesting texts allows the student to feel autonomous in his or her selections for voluntary reading. Choice plays a large part in both factors that support voluntary reading and SDT's basic need of autonomy. By providing students with access to texts of interest to them, educators support the students' need for autonomy and voluntary reading. Second, by providing access to the texts students find interesting, the educator addresses the students' need for relatedness, as acknowledging students' interests show respect and care for the student. Finally, understanding student interest can encourage feelings of

competence. By examining the reading interests of students in depth—looking at multiple factors that may have affected student choice, such as physical characteristics of the text, protagonist characteristics, and readability level of the text—educators can provide access to texts that students are confident in reading. Acknowledging these interests to provide access to texts that students want to read can promote voluntary reading by meeting the needs of students that SDT states are required for intrinsic motivation.

Within SDT are two other theories that specifically house the current study. Cognitive evaluation theory (CET) addresses the relationship between one's environment and his or her interest in an activity (Vansteenkiste, Niemiec, & Soenens, 2010). CET postulates that there are certain environmental factors that support or undermine intrinsic motivation. Providing access to interesting texts, since it obliges the three basic needs of autonomy, relatedness, and competence, provides an environment that supports intrinsic motivation. Basic Needs Theory (BNT) states that the three needs of autonomy, relatedness, and competence must be met in order for one to be psychologically, physically, and socially healthy. As BNT relates specifically to the three needs for motivation, this theory provides the support for understanding the reading interests of students.

Purpose of the Study

As research has shown, understanding the reading preferences of adolescents can provide support for voluntary reading, as well as reading engagement in and out of the classroom. SDT provides reasons for examining students' interests in particular texts as they are conducive to students' feelings of autonomy, relatedness, and competence. As the school library has been one of the most-cited sources for books (e.g.--Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006) and of great importance in closing the rich-poor reading gap (e.g.--Krashen, et al., 2012), learning about adolescents'

reading preferences in this setting is necessary and appropriate. For these reasons, the purpose of this study was to examine the most frequently circulated texts by students in a district's middle school libraries and the relationships among the demographics of the schools and the students' preferences for certain text characteristics.

Research Questions

To study the reading interests of adolescents through the texts most frequently circulated in middle school libraries, it was necessary to examine each possible factor that influenced that interest. The research questions that were addressed in this study are as follows:

1. Of books checked out from middle school libraries, which genres, subgenres, or formats are most prevalent?
2. Which common composition and physical characteristics, as well as external influences, do these texts share?
3. Is there a relationship among these factors and school demographics (i.e.—school size, minority status, poverty level)?

Overview of the Study

The current study was an embedded case study that utilizes middle school library records in one county-wide district to determine the most frequently circulated texts. Non-proportional quota sampling was used to determine the sample school district. The school district had 14 middle schools, of which 12 participated in the study. Of the 55,000 students in the district, the school district served approximately 13,000 students in grades 6 through 8. Overall, 74% of students in the district were white, 16% were African American, and 6% were Hispanic. The remaining 4% were Asian or Native American. Only 3.7% of the student population were English Language Learners. There were 49.5% of the district's students who were designated as

“economically disadvantaged.” The middle schools for the district ranged in size from approximately 340 students to almost 1400 students, serving grades 6 through 8. The middle schools provided relatively diverse demographics. One school had more than 93% of its population as white. Two schools had significantly larger minority populations with 48. The district’s library circulation records were examined for the 10 most popular texts in each middle school, based on circulation, during the period of August 2013 through May 2014. A content analysis of the texts was conducted. Statistical analyses conducted on the data included such techniques as independent samples t-tests, one-way analysis of variance tests, and chi-square tests for association.

Significance of the Study

As research literature has shown (e.g.—Ivey & Johnston, 2013; Mol & Bus, 2011), voluntary reading is related to a student’s reading achievement, and several factors, including access to interesting texts, encourage students to read for pleasure. There is, however, little recent research on the similarities of texts found to be of interest to students based on library circulation data. Furthermore, few studies have looked so specifically at the factors, such as protagonist personality, prevalence of social media pages, and author characteristics, to identify the commonalities and differences in texts among schools of various demographics. By examining the various factors that may affect student interest in texts and their relationships to school demographics, a broader understanding of student text selection can be garnered.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

The current study was influenced by certain assumptions, limitations, and delimitations. It was assumed that students who check out texts from the library do so because they are interested in reading the text. This can be a considerable assumption that could have had an

effect on the results of the study. However, as the study examined the most popular texts chosen for checkout, the assumption that the reason for checking out these texts was from student interest in reading them is reasonable.

One limitation of this study was that the sample procured from the middle school library population was not a random sample. This could limit the generalizability of the findings to the population as each member of the population did not have an equal chance of being selected for the sample. The use of non-proportional quota sampling rather than random sampling was chosen to ensure that minority populations are equally addressed within the sample. Participants were selected based upon the variations among the schools within the district, specifically schools of varying sizes, socio-economic status makeup, and variations of the size of minority populations within the school. As book selections by minorities have shown to differ from those of white students (e.g.--Williams, 2008), intentional inclusion of a variety of schools with differing racial makeup is necessary. Finally, the study was delimited to examine the circulation data for certain middle school libraries. It does not address the texts checked out by students from the public library, purchased from bookstores or online, or procured through receiving of gifts. Furthermore, the study was delimited to a sampling of middle schools in the southeastern United States. The study was further delimited by the inclusion of only districts where middle schools were defined as grades 6, 7, and 8, that had at least 10 middle schools within the district, and that was not going through school rezoning. This was done to provide a district large enough to reflect a variety of school demographics, have a definition of middle schools conducive to the growing actualizing of a middle school (NCES, 1996), and have library records that would not be affected by school rezoning.

Organization of the Upcoming Chapters

This chapter has provided a statement of the problem; the rationale for the study; the theoretical framework within which this study is housed; the purpose of the study; the research questions addressed; the significance of the study; and assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature associated with this study. Chapter 3 determines the methodological framework for the current study. In Chapter 4, the results of the study are given with an explanation of each analytical technique used. Finally, Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results from Chapter 4 and implications for future research.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to examine the most frequently circulated texts by students in a district's middle school libraries, the relationships among the demographics of the schools, and the students' preference for certain text characteristics. To provide evidence of the need for this study, as well as to demonstrate the theoretical framework within which this study is set, a review of the literature is necessary. This review of the literature, along with the justification for this study, also demonstrates questions in the research of adolescent reading motivation that have remained partially unanswered. This study's goal, then, was to provide some answers to those questions.

To determine the necessity of this study, the researcher first utilized three databases—ProQuest, ERIC, and Google Scholar—to procure research on adolescent motivation for reading and voluntary reading. Using keyword phrases, such as “adolescent reading motivation,” “voluntary reading,” and “self-selected texts,” the researcher was able to examine research on the importance of voluntary reading and choice for adolescents. Other keywords, such as “self-determination,” provided research on self-determination theory (SDT), the macro-theory in which this study is situated. Finally, a search of “access to texts” provided research that demonstrated adolescents' need for interesting, accessible texts. After this initial search, the researcher was able to cross-reference studies that provided a richer landscape to support the study.

This chapter begins with a discussion of adolescent reading achievement and voluntary reading and the relationship of the two. This discussion provides the justification for promoting voluntary reading. Next, the researcher will discuss SDT, two of its theories—cognitive evaluation theory and basic needs theory—and three elements that SDT states contribute to

intrinsic motivation—autonomy, relatedness, and competence. SDT provides for the need to understand adolescents’ reading preferences in order to support voluntary reading. Following, environmental factors that facilitate the choice for voluntary reading—access to interesting texts, opportunity to read, choice, high-success reading, and certain teacher behaviors—are revealed. Finally, the researcher emphasizes the factors of book composition, physical characteristics of books, and outside influences that affect text selection. The chapter ends with a discussion of the placement of this study within the current literature.

Adolescent Reading Achievement and Voluntary Reading

NAEP Assessment

To understand fully the impact voluntary reading may have on adolescent reading achievement, one might first look at the achievement scores found on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), since it provides a view of how students nationwide are performing in academic areas such as reading. The NAEP is the largest nationally and continuously used assessment to provide a view of what students at age 9, 13, and 17 years of age, or grades 4, 8, and 12, know in areas such as reading and mathematics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Two assessments, the main NAEP assessment and the long-term trend assessment, provide different views of the progress in reading and mathematics. The main NAEP assessment for reading began in 1992. The assessment is given every two years, with changes made to the assessment itself to reflect current instructional practices and curriculum. Students selected for the main assessment are chosen from those in 4th, 8th, and 12th grades. The long-term trend assessment series occurs typically every four years, beginning in 1971. Students selected for the long-term trend assessment are from the population of 9, 13, and 17 year olds. The content assessed by the long-term trend assessment has remained unchanged since 1990.

Because of this, the long-term trend assessment is seen as the most reliable for determining students' progress in reading and mathematics for the long term. Student scale scores on the long-term trend assessment range from 1 to 500 across all three age levels. Comparing the long-term changes in student reading achievement by comparing students' scale scores from 1971 to 2012 provides a view of the effectiveness of U.S. education institutions. Comparing these results across all three assessed ages also allows one to speculate on the areas where educational changes may need to occur.

The National Center of Education Statistics (NCES,2013) reported on the overall scores of students taking the NAEP long-term trend reading assessment, as well as the averages of student scores based on student demographics and characteristics. Overall, participants in the 9-year-old age group made a statistically significant, 13-point gain from 1971 to 2012 in reading achievement. Thirteen-year-old participants averaged an 8-point gain, still statistically significant, in the same timeframe. Seventeen year olds, however, only made a two-point gain, not statistically significant. As stated, the gains made over time in reading achievement became smaller as the age of the group increased. When looking at the differences between male and female participants in 1971 in each age group, females outperformed males in reading achievement with statistically significant gaps of 13 points between 9-year-old females and males, 11 points between 13 year olds, and 12 points between 17 year olds. In 2012, the gaps reduced to 5 points for 9 year olds, 8 points for 13 year olds, and 8 points for 17 year olds. Although there was a reduction in the gaps between female and male reading achievement at each age level, the gaps in 2012 were still statistically significant. Further analysis indicates that females' reading achievement gains were not as large as their male counterparts, especially for 17-year-old females, whose average score of 291 in 1971 remained constant in 2012. This lack

of growth in reading achievement provides a less-than-celebratory look at the reduction of the achievement gap between males and females at age 17. Although the 4-point gain made by males in the 17-year-old group have reduced the achievement gap to 8 points, the stagnation of the achievement level made by females in the group paints a negative view of reading achievement growth at this age. These scores demonstrate that, although most groups have made significant gains, the gains decrease as age increases. The analyses of these data demonstrate the need to address further the relative lack of reading achievement gains made by adolescents.

From the year 1975, data are available to analyze the growth in reading achievement of students disaggregated by race/ethnicity as well as by age. Beginning in 1975, statistically significant gaps have been found between white students and black or Hispanic students at each age group level. Although the differences in achievement scores were still statistically significant in 2012, the gaps between white students and black or Hispanic students have reduced. In the 9-year-old group, the difference between white and black students' achievement scores have reduced from a 36-point gap in 1975 to a 23-point gap in 2012 and the difference between white and Hispanic scores from 34 points to 21 points. For 13 year olds, the difference between white and black students' scores went from 31 points to 23 points in 2012, along with a gap reduction between white and Hispanic students from 27 points to 21 points. The difference between white students' average score in the 17-year-old group and black students' score went from 52 points to 26 points and from 41 points to 21 points between white and Hispanic students. The reduction in the gaps among these groups can be attributed to the statistically significant increase in average scores over time by black and Hispanic students across all age groups. White students in the 9-year-old and 13-year-old age groups also made statistically significant gains, although at a more modest trajectory. White students showed a 12-point growth in reading achievement in the

9-year-old group from 1975 to 2012, and a 6-point growth in the 13-year old age group. White students in the 17-year-old group, however, only made a 2-point gain since 1975, not statistically significant, which also affected the dramatic reduction of the achievement gap found with this age group. Although the reduction of achievement gaps among the groups is commendable, some concerns may also be found. First, the gap reduction between white and black or Hispanic students in the 13-year-old group is smaller than the reduction at age 9 or 17. Furthermore, white students in the 17-year-old group did not make a significant gain since 1975. These two findings support the need to investigate further the achievement needs of adolescents.

One can also compare the differences in scores for students from low-income families via the NCES (2013) long-term trend data. The data for students who receive free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) have been disaggregated since 2004. Students at each age level receiving FRPL have made statistically significant gains from 2004 to 2012. The 9-year-old age group has increased their scale score average from 199 to 207 while the 13-year-old group has increased their scores from 241 in 2004 to 263 in 2012. Finally, the 17-year-old group increased from 262 in 2004 to 272 in 2012. Although these increases seem reassuring, the differences in the scores between poorer students and their wealthier peers continue to be significant. Nine-year-olds receiving FRPL averaged 28 points lower in 2004 than students not receiving FRPL. This gap remained at 28 points in 2012 as well. For 13-year-olds, those receiving FRPL scored 27 points lower than those not receiving FRPL in 2004. This remained the same for 2012 as well. The data showed a slight decrease in the gap between those receiving FRPL and those not with a gap of 23 points in 2012 from 26 points in 2004. Although the statistically significant increase in scores from 2004 to 2012 for all age groups receiving FRPL is comforting, the gap in reading achievement still remains between poorer children and their wealthier peers.

For students receiving special education services and students who are English Language Learners (ELL), the trajectory of scores over time do not show as promising a gain (NCES, 2013). Nine-year-old students receiving special education services have improved their scores only 5 points from 2004—when this delineation was first acknowledged with the NAEP test—with a score of 183 in 2012. Not only was this increase not statistically significant, the gap between students receiving special education services and those who were not has increased from a difference of 39 points in 2004 to a 42-point gap in 2012. Thirteen year olds receiving special education services have not fared much better, where the gap has gone from 44 points in 2004 to 43 points in 2012. The reduction of this considerable gap by only one point makes the statistically significant increase of 8 points made by students receiving special education services from 216 in 2004 to 224 in 2012 seem paltry in comparison. Greater gains, interestingly, for these students occurred with 17 year olds, gaining 12 points from 2004 to 2012 with a score of 248. The reading achievement gap between students with special education services and those without have reduced from 51 points in 2004 to 43 points in 2012. Although some gains are being made with students receiving special education services, the achievement gap between these students and those not receiving services is substantial, warranting an examination into how this can be remedied.

Unfortunately, ELLs have not had much success in improving their NAEP reading scores, either (NCES, 2013). For nine-year-old ELLS, a four-point gain is all that was made from 2004 to 2012 with a score of 191. Thirteen-year-old and 17-year-old ELLS either showed no improvement or lost ground, respectively. Thirteen-year-old ELLS remained at 217 points on average, while 17 year olds dropped from 242 points in 2004 to 235 points in 2012. None of the gains or losses made by ELLs were statistically significant. In comparing the scores for ELLs

and those made by non-ELL students, the gap between the two groups has expanded at each age level. The achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs in the 9-year-old age group has grown from 31 points in 2004 to 34 points in 2012. For 13 year olds, the gap has stretched from 41 points in 2004 to 48 points in 2012. The difference for 17-year-old ELLs and non-ELLs has expanded even more from 42 points in 2004 to 54 points in 2012. Obviously, there is a need to look further into what can be done to improve the scores for both students receiving special education services and those who are English Language Learners.

The NCES (2013) report also demarcated the scores of 13 and 17 year olds by parent educational attainment beginning in 1980. Distinctions were made among students whose parents did not finish high school, had earned a high school diploma, had received some education following high school, and had graduated from college. For 13 year olds, interestingly, students whose parents had not finished high school were the only ones to improve their scores significantly in 2012 in comparison to the 1980 scores. These students averaged a scale score of 239 in 1980 and 248 in 2012. Students, whose parents had earned a high school diploma, received some education after high school, or had graduated college, either lost ground or remained the same. In comparing the scores of each group to one another for 13 year olds, statistically significant differences were found between students whose parents graduated college and those whose parents did not finish high school, had a high school diploma, or had some college education. For 17 year olds, the same occurred. Students whose parents did not complete high school gained 4 points on average from 1980 to 2012. Students whose parents completed high school, received some education after high school, or earned a college degree all lost ground. Although students whose parents graduated college scored significantly better than those whose parents did not, these students' achievement scores have not significantly improved since

1980. It would seem that most 13 and 17 year olds, when grouped by parent education level, are not gaining ground when one looks at scores over the long term. Achievement gains over the long term seem to be made more with students whose parents are less academically educated than with those whose parents have been to college.

Finally, NAEP scores can be delineated by the amount of time the student spends reading for pleasure (NCES, 2013). In certain years, students taking the NAEP assessment answer questions that may provide insight into student achievement. One such question has the student determine how often they spend reading for pleasure with the following options: Almost Daily, 1-2 Times a Week, 1-2 Times a Month, 3-4 Times a Year, and Never/Hardly Ever. The NAEP survey does not define pleasure reading for the students, instead leaving the students to determine what is meant by pleasure reading. As Table 2.1 indicates, for all three age groups, students who stated that they read for pleasure Almost Daily had scores significantly higher than those who stated they read for pleasure 1-2 Times a Month, 3-4 Times a Year, and Never/Hardly Ever. For 13- and 17-year-old students, those who read daily for pleasure scored significantly better than those who read for pleasure only 1-2 times a week. The differences between students reading daily and those never or hardly ever reading for pleasure increased as the students' age increased. Nine year olds who read for pleasure scored 18 points higher on average than those who never or hardly ever pleasure read. For 13 year olds, the difference between the two increased to 27. The difference was even larger for 17 year olds at 30 points difference.

As Table 2.1 indicates, over half of the nine year olds surveyed spend time almost every day reading for fun. Yet, only 27% and 19% of 13 and 17 year olds do, respectively. A majority of 9 year olds—76%-- read at least one to two times a week, while only a little over half of the 13 year olds surveyed and 40% of 17 year olds engaged in the activity. One might question could

the frequency of time spent in voluntary reading be responsible for the robust gains made by 9 year olds and the feeble or lack of gains made by 13 and 17 year olds on the NAEP reading assessment. These findings indicate that the amount of pleasure reading may correlate positively with reading achievement scores.

Table 2.1

Time Spent Reading for Fun by Age and NAEP Reading Assessment Average, 2012

Amount of Time Reading for Fun	9 year olds Percentage	9 year olds Score	13 year olds Percentage	13 year olds Score	17 year olds Percentage	17 year olds Score
Almost Daily	53	226	27	276	19	302
1-2 Times a Week	23	226	26	267	21	294
1-2 Times a Month	7	219	14	264	16	288
3-4 Times a Year	7	211	11	258	18	288
Never/Hardly Ever	11	208	22	249	27	272

In summary, NAEP scores indicate that not all student subgroups are making achievement gains. Overall, 13- and 17-year-old students' gains are not as strong as those made by 9 year olds with 17-year-olds making no significant gains in reading achievement since 1971. Although male students taking the NAEP have reduced the achievement gap, they have not closed the gap completely, allowing a significant gap to remain between female and male scores at all age levels. Great gains have been made by black and Hispanic students at each age level, but gains are still needed to close the significant achievement gap still present between them and white students. White students have made smaller gains at the 13 and 17 age level than those at age 9. Black and Hispanic students have made comparatively smaller gains at age 13 than they did in 9 and 17 age levels. Students receiving FRPL have made significant gains since 2004 in

reading achievement, yet a significant gain remains between these students and those not receiving FRPL. Students receiving special education services have made some significant gains in achievement, yet the achievement gap between them and students not receiving these services remains significantly substantial with all age groups. ELLs have made no significant gains since 2004 in reading achievement, and the achievement gap between them and non-ELLs has continued to grow. These areas of concern require an examination of possibilities to remedy these issues. Data from the NAEP provide such a possibility in terms of pleasure reading. Students who stated they read for pleasure almost daily scored significantly better than those who read less than one to two times a week. This difference increases in adolescence. As adolescence has shown to be a time for less-than-ideal reading achievement gains, finding a possible means that could improve scores, such as promoting pleasure reading, should be further addressed.

Support for the NAEP Findings

Several studies provide support for the findings of the NCES (2013) data on voluntary reading frequency. McKenna, Conradi, Lawrence, Jang, and Meyer (2012) found in their study of approximately 4500 middle-school students that students' attitudes toward recreational reading were more negative than elementary students', although the attitudes did not change in a stepwise manner from grade level to grade level, offering instead a plateauing effect of reading interest. They also found that females' attitudes toward recreational reading were more positive than their male peers', except in the area of digital, recreational reading. These findings corroborate the findings of the NAEP survey as the percentage of 9 year olds reading almost daily were nearly double that of 13 year olds. Hopper (2005) found that almost twice the percentage of students in grades 7, 8, and 9 claimed to be reading a book at home than did the

percentage of students in grade 10. Similarly, McKenna, Kear, and Ellsworth (1995) found in their study of 18,185 U.S. students in grades 1-6 that student attitudes toward recreational and academic reading became more negative with age. Like the U.S., Greaney (1980) and Greaney and Hegarty (1987) also found that 5th graders in Ireland were reading more sporadically and spent less time reading books. Students' reading ability also seemed to affect the amount of enjoyment students have in reading for recreational or academic purposes (McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, 1995; Greaney & Hegarty, 1987; Greaney, 1980). It is not surprising that students who are more successful in reading would enjoy the activity more than those who are not as successful at the task. In examining the NCES (2013) data, students who read more frequently had higher scores on the NAEP reading assessment. It would seem, as Stanovich (1986) has stated, that the relationship between voluntary reading and reading achievement may, in fact, have a cyclical relationship, where reading more begets higher success in reading which allows the reader more enjoyment in the activity.

This relationship between voluntary reading and reading achievement has been the focus of much research. Over the past several decades, researchers have found that the development of orthographic processing skills have been linked to print exposure (Braten, Lie, Andreassen, & Olaussen, 1999; Cunningham & Stanovich, 1990). Orthographic processing skills refer to the use of graphic characteristics to distinguish words, whereas phonological processing uses sound characteristics (Braten et al., 1999). Both of these skills, along with a child's age, tend to affect how well a child can recognize words. A young child's exposure to print most likely will come from the home environment through the reading of bedtime stories, playing with magnetic letters, and the like. In essence, the term "exposure to print," when talking about younger

children, may be synonymous with voluntary reading of older children since both require an interest and desire to interact with text.

Voluntary reading has also been shown to enhance a student's vocabulary. Nagy, Anderson, and Herman (1987) found that their participants, who were in 3rd, 5th, and 7th grades, were able to recall word meanings a week after reading expository and narrative texts. They found that when conceptual difficulty was controlled, words from expository texts were learned incidentally when context provided support. This was true for proficient and struggling readers alike. Swanborn and de Glopper's (1999) meta-analysis of 15 experimental studies on incidental vocabulary learning determined that incidental word learning does take place during "natural" reading. Furthermore, they found that as students aged, their incidental word learning also improved. One stipulation for incidental word learning found by both Nagy et al. (1987) and Swanborn and de Glopper (1999) was the need for contextual support and a high ratio of vocabulary words to known words. By having a high ratio of vocabulary words to known words, students have more opportunity to utilize the context of known words to determine unknown words' meanings. Understandably, the more voluntary reading in which a student participates, the more words he or she will encounter, allowing for more chances for incidental word learning to take place (Nagy et al., 1987).

Questioning voluntary reading's benefits. Incidental word learning via voluntary reading has also been questioned by some researchers. Gardner (2004) found little commonality between words encountered in the reading of trade books and those encountered in academic reading. Because of this, Gardner stated that the acquisition of new words to one's vocabulary would likely not occur during voluntary reading. Carver (1994) came to similar conclusions of 219 participants in grades 3 through 6. For his study, Carver (1994) gave students two passages,

one an academic passage and one a passage sampled from a library book of varying difficulty. Students' reading levels were determined by the highest level of text they could read accurately with 75% comprehension. Students were told to underline any word they came across in the reading of the passage with which they were unfamiliar. Carver (1994) found that passages that were below the student's reading level had very few underlined words. Passages that were on the student's reading level had approximately 1 in every 100 words underlined, and passages that were above the student's reading level averaged 2% of words underlined. From these data, and the assumptions that students would choose books below their reading level when engaging in voluntary reading and that any time allotted to students to engage in reading of self-selected texts would result in students engaging in reading for only half that time, Carver (1994) concluded that little incidental vocabulary acquisition would occur in voluntary reading. Carver posited that providing time for self-selected reading in the classroom offered little educational value and academic reading of textbooks would be more beneficial to students.

Kamil (2008) also stated that recreational reading alone did not seem to improve reading ability. Classroom instruction was vital. Although Kamil did not find pleasure reading to be solely responsible for reading improvement, coupling explicit instruction in reading with the promotion of recreational reading improved comprehension and fluency.

Academic reading. Academic reading—reading done within the classroom setting through teacher assignment—may seem like it should be enough for students to become proficient readers. However, a look in the modern classroom often demonstrates the lack of reading practice actually occurring. Currently, core reading programs are being utilized in many classrooms. According to Brenner and Heibert's (2010) study, these core programs advocate for very little classroom time to be spent in actual reading. On average, the instructions in the

teacher's guide textbooks provided on average 14 to 18 minutes of reading per day. Because these reading programs were put in place especially to support struggling readers, who need even more practice in reading to become proficient, the amount of time spent in reading is not enough to affect positively struggling readers' reading achievement.

The problem with the amount of reading practice struggling readers receive in the classroom is compounded when one compares the number of words read to those read by proficient readers. Allington (1984) proposed that struggling readers actually read fewer words during silent reading than proficient readers. When students are assigned into reading groups based on reading ability, and those groups are assigned the same amount of time to spend in silent reading, proficient readers are likely to read more words in that timeframe than students who struggle with reading. That means struggling readers over time will have significantly less practice to become proficient. Stanovich's (1986) explanation of the "Matthew effect," named for the Gospel of Matthew, where those who read better continue to gain ground and those who struggle continue to lose ground, creating an ever-widening gap, addressed this same concern. For Stanovich (1986), students who struggle with reading have often had fewer experiences with texts and find them difficult to read. Because of this difficulty, struggling readers have a tough time comprehending the text, becoming frustrated with the task. Frustration with the task leads to less engagement in practice, which keeps the struggling reader from progressing in proficiency. Struggling readers are not only engaging in reading less often and reading fewer words in silent reading, they also are often given only portions of stories, rather than their entirety (Allington, 1984). Because these students are exposed to less complex storylines through snippets of texts, they continue to be offered less practice than are proficient readers. Obviously, some current classroom practices may not be supportive of reading achievement.

NRP. The National Research Panel's (NRP) (2000) report detailed important topics associated with reading and reading instruction—phonemic awareness, phonics instruction, fluency, comprehension, and the relationships of teacher education and computer technology to reading instruction. Unlike the NCES (2013) report, generally left out of the NRP (2000) report's conversation reflecting scientific research's stance on effective reading instruction was any influence voluntary reading has on reading achievement. The subsection on the importance of vocabulary instruction did discuss incidental word learning as a benefit of voluntary reading. However, in its section on reading fluency, the subcommittee for the NRP stated that the studies they analyzed regarding voluntary reading did not examine its effect on reading fluency. They determined that the only way to ensure voluntary reading's effectiveness in making students read more fluently was to compare the fluency of students who engaged in voluntary reading and those who were kept from reading. Of course, no study was found that offered such an experiment. Even more disturbing is the lack of any discussion on voluntary reading in the section on reading comprehension. The neglect for voluntary reading by the NRP may be due to the quick pace with which the NRP had to work to produce the report (NRP, 2000), instead of a reflection on its opinion of the benefits of voluntary reading. An additional reason for the exclusion of studies supporting voluntary reading from the NRP (2000) report may be the strict parameters set for studies allowed to be deemed as scientific (NRP, 2000).

Promoting voluntary reading. Although voluntary reading did not fit into the parameters set for the NRP's analysis, several studies support the benefits of voluntary reading (Braten et al., 1999; Swanborn & de Glopper, 1999; Cunningham & Stanovich, 1990; Nagy et al., 1987). With these studies and with the results of the NAEP (NCES, 2013), the intent of this study was to provide support for voluntary reading through an understanding of student reading

preferences. By knowing student preferences, teachers and schools can support students' voluntary reading within their own classrooms, as several research studies have found. Providing ample time for reading for pleasure, such as through Sustained Silent Reading (SSR), has been found not only to support voluntary reading but to correlate with superior reading achievement (Krashen, 2013; Dambar, Samuelsson, & Taube, 2011; Krashen 2002). Dambar et al. (2011) found in their study of overachieving and underachieving 3rd grade classes in Sweden that one aspect of the overachieving classes was extensive time given for voluntary reading and spent in voluntary reading activities. Teachers who provide the time and access for reading self-selected texts, model the enjoyment of reading, read aloud to promote student enjoyment, and take the time to know their students' reading preferences promote voluntary reading and reading engagement (Ivey & Johnston, 2013). Voluntary reading can be promoted through classroom practices, and knowing the reading preferences of one's students is essential.

Teachers and schools can also influence students' out-of-school voluntary reading through in-school practices. Providing access to high-interest, self-selected texts through field trips to the public library (Whitehead, 2004) and dispersal of books for summer reading (Allington et al., 2010) have been shown to engage students in reading when they are not in school. Reports of students requesting parents to take them to the library after in-school visits (Whitehead, 2004) as well as reports of students reading more during the summer months (Allington et al., 2010) demonstrate the effects these activities have on student voluntary reading. Not only have these activities supported an increase in voluntary reading, they have also contributed to improved student reading achievement, specifically in at-risk groups, such as ELLs (Whitehead, 2004) and minority students from homes of low socio-economic status (SES)

(Allington et al., 2010). These studies demonstrate that access alone to high-interest texts may lead to increased voluntary reading.

Self-Determination Theory

The importance of student reading preferences to reading achievement finds its roots in self-determination theory (SDT). SDT, a macro-theory of human motivation and personality, posits that there is an inherent curiosity one has for his or her environment, a desire to learn and cultivate one's knowledge (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). Humans have an instinctive need to expand their notions of themselves and their connections to others and move toward a progressively unified understanding of oneself (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this way, SDT asserts that humans desire both a relationship with certain others and an understanding of oneself (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Ryan and Deci (2002) point out that three basic psychological needs—autonomy, relatedness, and competence—are innate in humans. Autonomy refers to one feeling he or she is the origin for his or her own behavior. Relatedness signifies the connection one has to others, feeling that he or she is in a mutually caring relationship. Competence connotes the feeling that one is capable in his or her interactions. These needs are a part of the macro-theory of SDT but also constitute one of the five theories that SDT encompasses (Vansteenkiste, Niemic, & Soenens, 2010).

Theories of SDT

Vansteenkiste, Niemic, and Soenens (2010) addressed the five mini-theories of SDT, cognitive evaluation theory, organismic integration theory, causality orientations theory, basic needs theory, and goal content theory. Of these five mini-theories, two relate most closely with this study—cognitive evaluation theory (CET) and basic needs theory (BNT). First proposed to explain the effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation, cognitive evaluation theory analyzes the

relationship between one's environment and one's interest in the interaction (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Specifically it addresses the aspects of one's environment that either support or prevent intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation requires both a feeling of competence and autonomy. Although CET was established primarily in 1975 (Vansteenkiste et al. 2010), the theory became more elaborate in the 1980s when theorists posited that one's own regard for environmental factors as either controlling or non-controlling greatly affected one's intrinsic motivation for a task (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Because of this change, outside influences on one's behaviors were no longer seen as only capable of hindering intrinsic motivation. Instead, if one felt in tune with those influences and their demands, intrinsic motivation was still supported.

The second mini-theory of SDT that influences this study is BNT. This theory posits that there are basic psychological needs that must be satisfied for psychological, physical, and social health (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). These needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—undergird SDT as well. These three basic needs require certain social environments to be supportive in order for the needs to be satisfied. Autonomy needs a perceived non-controlling environment; competence needs a clearly defined environment rather than one that is confusing or belittling; and relatedness needs a welcoming environment rather than one that is impersonal. When these needs are met, human motivation thrives. When these needs are not met, people find other ways to replicate the satisfaction of these needs. BNT also posits that autonomy, relatedness, and competence reflect the needs of all humans, are critical to well-being, and reside at the subconscious level (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010).

Studies Using SDT

Ryan and Deci (2000) state that SDT is utilized in several realms of research: education, health care, psychotherapy, career choice, sports participation, and religious choice. Several studies in education have ground their research in SDT. Brooks and Young (2011) utilized SDT in their study that looked at the relationship between motivation and student empowerment. With 419 college students, the researchers gauged participants' intrinsic motivation, found through motivation questionnaires, in regards to varying levels of expectations for class attendance and choice in assignments. They found that students whose teacher had a mandatory attendance policy and offered no choice in class assignments reported higher levels of intrinsic motivation than students whose teacher had a mandatory attendance policy but offered some choice in class assignments. Those in the mandatory attendance/choice in assignments group had higher levels of amotivation and extrinsic motivation. Brooks and Young (2011) proposed that having both a mandatory attendance policy and no choice in assignments allowed for students to realize there was a particular environment set by the teacher, whereas having a mandatory attendance policy and some choice in assignments portrayed mixed messages about the environment. This supports the supposition of SDT that for an environment to support competence, it has to be clearly defined. Brooks and Young (2011) ultimately found that intrinsic motivation related positively with student empowerment.

DeNaeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, and Rosseel (2012) also utilized SDT to base their study. To determine the relationship among reader self-concept, reading motivation, reader behavior, and reading performance, DeNaeghel et al. (2012) had 1260 5th grade Flemish students complete both the Motivation for Reading Questionnaire (MRQ) and the Self-Regulation Questionnaire—Reading Motivation, a questionnaire designated specifically for

SDT. Reading achievement scores were taken from a Flemish reading comprehension assessment, and reading frequency and reader self-concept were taken from a questionnaire used with the Progress in International Reading Literacy (PIRLS) assessment. Teacher input was used to determine students' average reading engagement. DeNaeghel et al. (2012) found that recreational autonomous reading (voluntary reading) and controlled reading motivation, as well as reader self-concept each made its own contribution to reading behavior and performance. Reader self-concept was positively associated with leisure-time reading frequency, student reading engagement, and reading comprehension. Recreational controlled reading motivation had a negative relationship with reading comprehension, suggesting that a student's feelings of internal or external pressure to engage in voluntary reading relates negatively to reading comprehension. The only significant positive relationship among academic reading motivation, reading behaviors, and reading performance was between autonomous academic reading motivation and reading frequency. Both recreational and academic autonomous reading motivation related positively with voluntary reading frequency. This study portrays the tenets of BNT, where perceptions of control in the environment hinder intrinsic motivation.

Finally, Arnone, Reynolds, and Marshall (2009) looked specifically at competence and autonomy in their study on students' perceptions of librarian competence with technology and self-concept as researchers. Using a variety of questionnaires, such as the Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Learning Climate Questionnaire (Perceived Autonomy Support), the researchers gathered data on 1272 8th grade students and their perceptions of autonomy and competence regarding information skills. They found that the more autonomy a student felt in the school library, the more perceived competence the student felt in his or her own information skills. Generally, the more satisfaction the student felt in his or her basic needs

being met, the more perceived competence the student felt (Arnone et al., 2009). Interestingly, the perceived competence of the librarian's computer skills also related positively with the student's own perceived competence of his or her own information skills. Arnone et al. (2009) also found that students who used the library's resources for research more often also had higher perceived competence of their own information skills. Students who searched online to satisfy their own curiosity more often were more likely to feel intrinsically motivated to engage in research. The study provides support for the need for perceived competence and autonomy for one to be intrinsically motivated.

Influence of SDT on Current Study

The current study is heavily influenced by SDT, two of its mini-theories CET and BNT, and some of the educational research utilizing SDT. Intrinsic motivation is necessary for students to engage in an activity for long term. To support intrinsic motivation, it is necessary to acknowledge students' personal reading interests through stocking libraries with books they want to read. This requires gathering data on student reading interests. By stocking school libraries with books students want to read, educators provide them with an environment that supports students' need for relatedness. School libraries that consider student interests when purchasing books portray to students an environment that cares about them and their interests. Students also need to feel competent in their ability to read if they are to become lifelong readers. This is not often going to happen solely through the teacher-assigned texts. Instead, students need access to interesting books, books that are familiar to them either through prior knowledge of a series or characters or through connections to other media such as television or movies. The familiar provides a supportive setting for competence. As school libraries reflect the interests of their

students, autonomy is supported, as students are provided with interesting choices in books they want to read. In these regards, SDT, along with its theories CET and BNT, influences this study.

The current study is also influenced by some of the education studies also set in SDT. Brooks and Young (2011) found that competence can be supported in a seemingly controlling environment. Likewise, DeNaeghel et al. (2012) found that a student's perceptions of the controlling nature of outside influences can affect the intrinsic motivation a student has for reading, even voluntary reading. In response to the findings of these two studies, this study was not concerned with discovering the reason a student had for checking out a particular book. It may be that the student decided without influence of others that he or she wanted to read that particular book. It may be that a teacher influenced a student to check out a particular book by recommending it to him or her. In following the tenets of SDT, some outside influences, such as rewards earned, can affect the perceived locus of causality to become an external one, hindering the recipient's intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Other influences, such as teacher suggestion of books based upon his or her knowledge of the student's interests, can allow for a perceived internal locus of causality, although the influence is an external one. The recipient's perception of the influence as providing autonomy, no matter how illusionary, determines if the influence supports or hinders intrinsic motivation.

One of Arnone et al.'s (2009) findings guides the current study. Specifically, Arnone et al. (2009) found that the perceived competence of the librarian affected the perceived competence of the student. Providing data on middle school reading preferences helps, when used to make decisions of library purchases, the perceived competence of the librarian. Students who notice the plethora of interesting books making up their school libraries will often believe the librarian capable of picking out "good" books. This belief in the competence of the librarian

can not only make student perceptions of his or her recommendations acceptable, it also opens the entire library to the student as filled with “probably good” books.

Environmental Factors that Support Voluntary Reading

An environment that fosters voluntary reading also supports SDT’s proposed basic psychological needs of humans—autonomy, relatedness and competence. Access to interesting texts, opportunity to read, and choice in reading materials provide students with autonomy as well as support for voluntary reading. Relatedness is supported by certain teacher behaviors, such as knowing the interests of one’s students and providing a reading-friendly atmosphere, which, in turn, support voluntary reading. Continual encounters with high-success reading encourage voluntary reading and provide an environment conducive to feelings of competence. In all, by emphasizing environments conducive to voluntary reading—access to interesting texts, opportunities to read, choice, high-success reading, and teacher behaviors—students’ basic psychological needs of autonomy, relatedness, and competence are also met.

Access to Interesting Texts

In order to engage in voluntary reading, it seems obvious that the individual would need access to texts that he or she finds interesting. Unfortunately, not all students have access to texts that are of interest to them. McQuillan and Au (2001) found that students whose parents had a college education had more books in the home than those whose parents have only a high school diploma. Not surprisingly, having more books in the home allowed for more options for students to find books of interest to them. Yet, the number of books at home of interest to students did not correlate significantly with reading frequency. Instead, the number of books owned by the student and the number of trips made to the school library were both associated with reading

frequency. From this, it is evident that teachers and school libraries play an important role in engaging students in voluntary reading.

Although students may look to schools to provide them with interesting texts, books that are of interest to them may not be readily available at the schoolhouse either. In their study of the reading interests of 6th grade students and their teachers' awareness of these interests, Worthy, Moorman, and Turner (1999) found that the reading interests of students, specifically male students, who were low-achieving, poor, or reluctant readers, were of limited access within the school classrooms or libraries. Students who were high-achieving, middle class, or avid readers tended to find their reading interests mirrored in the offerings of the school. Interests, such as comics, popular magazines, drawing, and cars or trucks were of limited accessibility within the library. Librarians and teachers reflected on the reasons for the lack of access as believing the materials were often stolen or easily damaged. The lack of access of interesting texts was particularly problematic for low-income students, who utilized the library as their main source for reading materials. Ivey and Broaddus (2001) also found that, although many students in their study were motivated to read by finding interesting texts and having choice in the selections of those texts, few students mentioned enjoying the materials they found in their own classrooms. The contrast between what is available in school and what students actually like to read has been found to affect students' opinions of reading in general (Worthy, 1996). Students who rarely find books of interest in their school reading materials seem to associate the activity of reading as solely belonging to the type of reading they are exposed to at school. A negative view of reading, in general, may thus be cultivated by lack of access to interesting texts.

Providing access to interesting texts can occur in a variety of ways. Allington et al. (2010) provided 852 1st and 2nd grade students with self-selected texts over the course of 3

summers. With the provision of books as their only treatment, the participants reported reading more on average over the summers and, at the end of the third summer, scored higher than the control group on standardized tests. In this study, access to texts involved giving self-selected books to students rather than lending them. Unfortunately, not all studies' findings are so positive. Kim and Guryan (2010) studied the effects of giving self-selected texts to students and offering reading workshops to parents to demonstrate what they could do over the summer to help their 4th graders in reading. Although the treatment groups reported reading more over the summer than the control group, no significant reading achievement was documented. Kim and Guryan (2010) surmised the reason could have been the lack of decoding skills of the students as well as the possibility that texts chosen by the students were too challenging..

The giving of books can also affect how one views the activity of reading, as well as providing more access to interesting texts. Often, students who claim to be avid readers speak of receiving books as gifts throughout their childhood (Strommen & Mates, 2004; Shapiro & Whitney, 1997). For non-avid readers, receiving a book as a gift is usually a rare occurrence and is most likely confined to the students' pre-school years (Strommen & Mates, 2004). Giving books as gifts in a consistent manner, along with modeling the act of reading for pleasure, beyond the early school years may provide children with an image of reading as a pleasurable task. By providing greater access to interesting texts and portraying reading as a pleasurable activity, giving books as gifts can promote voluntary reading.

Although book ownership can lead to more instances of voluntary reading, access to interesting texts may also be provided through the lending of books. In a meta-analysis of research studies focused on the effects of giving or lending books to students, Lindsay (2013) found that both giving and lending books encourage voluntary reading. Students who are taken

to the library frequently report engaging more often in voluntary reading (McQuillan & Au, 2001; Ramos & Krashen, 1998). Even with relatively short lending periods, visiting the library may allow access to more texts than the number one could possibly afford to buy. Another location in schools that can support students need for access to interesting texts is the classroom library. Cho and Choi's (2008) study found that providing Korean students who were learning English with modeled reading, access to interesting texts via the classroom library, and opportunities to read those texts through Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) encouraged voluntary reading and reading achievement. With access to interesting texts from the classroom and school libraries, voluntary reading can be supported.

Having access to interesting texts provides an environment conducive to meeting a student's need for autonomy. Autonomy requires that the student feel that his or her behavior is determined from within himself or herself. With limited access to interesting texts, a student may not feel that the action of choosing a book is really coming from within him or her, especially when teachers urge students to "just choose a book" when it is time for self-selected reading. However, when a student has access to a wide variety of texts that are of interest to him or her, choosing a book to read during self-selected reading time may allow the student to feel ownership over the behavior of reading that text.

Opportunities to Read

As important as access to interesting texts is to promoting voluntary reading, so is having opportunity to read self-selected texts. Students who reported having little interest in reading also reported having infrequent opportunities in school to read what they want to read (Worthy, 1996). These same students could discuss several instances of and interests in reading enjoyment, yet they had come to associate reading in general with the school reading they

detested. Classrooms and schools that provided ample opportunities to read self-selected texts had students who were more likely to engage in voluntary reading (McKool, 2007). Students themselves have claimed their interest in opportunities to read self-selected texts. Ivey and Broaddus (2001) found over half of the seventh graders surveyed selected free reading as their favorite classroom activity. When asked for causal factors of engaged reading, the eighth graders in Ivey and Johnston's (2013) study identified opportunity to read self-selected texts as one factor contributing to engaged reading. This finding echoes that of Guthrie, Schafer, and Huang (2001) in their analyses of opportunity to read, balanced literacy, and the NAEP assessment with fourth graders. Opportunity to read does not just encourage avid readers. Both avid and reluctant readers, when asked what teachers could do to promote voluntary reading, suggested providing time in class to read interesting books (McKool, 2007). Providing time to read self-selected texts obviously promotes voluntary reading.

Teachers can provide time to read in class in a couple of ways. One way is through Sustained Silent Reading (SSR). SSR, where students read silently from self-selected texts usually for a pre-determined amount of time, has been utilized in elementary, middle and high schools (Cline & Kretke, 1980). Benefits to SSR have included positive feelings for visiting the school library as well as for reading books of their choice. Feelings of competence with school-assigned reading also occurred. SSR was also beneficial for Korean students learning English, where achievement gains and a heightened sense of competence were found (Cho & Choi, 2008). Although SSR has its benefits one problem with the concept of SSR is the lack of any social aspect for reading. For this reason, some studies have adjusted SSR to have some aspect of conversation involved (Reutzel, Fawson, & Smith, 2008; Parr & Maguiness, 2005) or have utilized another method entirely (Ivey & Johnston, 2013). For Ivey and Johnston (2013),

providing ample opportunity to read meant allowing students the time to read self-selected texts and to discuss them with others when the desire to do so arose naturally. For these students, the social aspect of the opportunity to read provided students with a factor that supported engaged reading. Whether silent or not, providing opportunity to read self-selected texts encourages engaged and voluntary reading.

Giving students an opportunity to read self-selected texts can promote autonomy. However, the time given for students to read self-selected texts cannot happen sporadically. To help students develop a love of reading, having an opportunity to read what they want to read must be given often. When students enjoy time spent reading books that they have chosen, giving students an opportunity to read allows them to take ownership of their reading behavior, as being given time to read complements their own desire to read the book they have self-selected. By providing both access to texts that students want to read and the time to read them, reading becomes an autonomous act.

Choice

Allowing choice in the reading of texts in school can encourage voluntary reading. The lack of choice, contradictorily, in school reading can diminish student interest in reading as an activity (Worthy & McKool, 1996). Providing choice in school reading may shed a positive light on the activity of reading, as students read on topics that interest them. Through interest and feelings of competence from self-selection of materials, students may find reading to be a pleasant activity. Both avid and reluctant readers recognize choice in school reading as a way for teachers to encourage voluntary reading outside of school (McKool, 2007). Not only does choice shed a positive light on reading for reluctant readers, it can support the enjoyment avid readers have for reading. Remarkably, offering choice in texts in school does not have to be

unbounded by limits. Rather, even when choice is somewhat limited by constraints such as genre or reading level, perceived choice can still encourage voluntary reading (Fisher & Frey, 2012). Heron (2003) found that although students preferred choice, teacher limits placed on choice in some instances were actually preferable to students. Allowing students to choose from a preconceived selection of texts may thus provide the feeling of choice while still exercising one's knowledge of the texts that are suitable for each student's needs.

Providing choice in texts gets to the heart of intrinsic motivation. When assessing the relationships among aspects of motivation and reading frequency, Baker and Wigfield (1999) found that self-efficacy, challenge, curiosity, and involvement correlated positively with reading activity. Students who felt capable, yet appropriately challenged, who were interested in the text and felt an involvement in the activity were more likely to engage in reading. All of these motivators associate directly with choice. Choice provides students the opportunity to read something of interest to them. It allows them to choose a text that is written at a level where they feel competent in their ability to read it and yet challenged enough to sustain their interest. It also allows the choice of topic that can engage them in discussions with other classmates. Often, students' choice in reading materials are not reflected in what they are assigned to read in schools (Smith & Wilhelm, 2002). Unlike assigned school reading, where students may feel a lack of interest, lament the loss of choice, and demonstrate a lack of value for reading (Lenters, 2006), reading a self-selected text can provide students with interest in and ownership of the reading activity.

Because choice provides for intrinsic motivation to occur, choice is also conducive to the basic psychological needs posited by SDT. Choice in reading provides students with an environment supportive of autonomy, where students are in control of their own learning and

activities. It also allows students to feel competent as they read a self-selected text matched to the ability and level of challenge they determine that they can handle, even when choice has been limited to a certain number of texts. Choice also provides the environment supportive of relatedness by allowing students to choose a topic that connects them with other select readers. DeNaeghel et al. (2012) found that recreational autonomous reading had a positive association with reading frequency, engagement, and comprehension. Establishing a classroom environment supportive of autonomy, competence, and relatedness by allowing choice in reading materials may provide a similar arrangement.

High-Success Reading

Engaging in voluntary reading can be promoted through numerous opportunities for high-success reading. Allington (2009) promoted practice in high-success reading when combined with access to interesting texts and opportunities to read to encourage voluntary reading. Gabriel, Allington, and Billen (2012) found that students who read subscription magazines could become more confident in their reading ability. Because subscription magazines generally focused on one broad topic, the vocabulary used among the articles offered a repetition supportive of vocabulary development. Furthermore, writing styles for each article were similar, allowing students to practice fluent reading without attending to too-difficult vocabulary or unfamiliar writing styles. Because students receiving these magazine subscriptions chose which magazine to receive, prior knowledge and interest in the topic were already established. Students were interested in the topic, had the access to built-in scaffolds of reading similarly styled articles with a repetitive vocabulary, allowing for the feeling of competence to emerge and enjoyment to ensue.

High-success reading attends to a reader's self-efficacy, or one's feeling of competence. Baker and Wigfield (1999) found a strong correlation between self-efficacy and reading activity.

Likewise, DeNaeghel et al. (2012) found that a student's perceived competence had a high association with autonomous reading motivation. Feelings of competence can affect how much a student is willing to read outside of school (McKool, 2007). Students who feel capable of reading will more likely engage in the activity than students who do not feel confident in their own abilities. High-success reading allows for this confidence in the reader.

Teacher Behaviors

Some teacher behaviors have been noted to promote voluntary reading for students. For instance, teachers who model for students the complex act of reading may encourage students to engage in voluntary reading. By seeing how one thinks, comprehends, and uses text structures and features to engage in reading, students are made aware of what needs to occur while reading (Fisher & Frey, 2012). Making the often-invisible aspects of engaged reading visible to students provides students with a set of instructions for the act of reading. With this knowledge, students may feel more competent in engaging in reading on their own, especially with texts they have chosen themselves. The behavior of modeling reading also gives readers a role model for reading (Ivey & Johnston, 2013). By portraying the teacher as reader, students are shown that reading is an act that others engage in for pleasure. Having adults as models of reading for pleasure has been beneficial in encouraging students to engage in voluntary reading (Neuman, 1986). Providing students with this role model can serve as both a positive influence for voluntary reading and, when demonstrating reading strategies, can provide students with the strategy instruction needed to become successful readers.

Read alouds have been particularly successful with engaging students in voluntary reading. Read alouds require the teacher to read portions of books aloud to students. Students tend to value the time in class where teachers read aloud to them and recognize this act as

influencing voluntary reading (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001). When combined with access to interesting texts and opportunities to read, read alouds can enhance student learning, promote student self-efficacy, and entice students to engage in voluntary reading (Cho & Choi, 2008), as well as promote engaged reading (Ivey & Johnston, 2013). Teacher read alouds provide a model for expressive reading, demonstrate to students engaged reading where comprehension occurs, and builds student vocabulary (Ivey & Broaddus, 2000). Read alouds have the capability to entice students to read certain books, as they provide to students a window into the language and story style of a chosen book. By reading aloud, teachers offer students insight into a book, as well as an example of fluent reading.

Teachers who possess knowledge of their students as readers can also promote voluntary reading. When teachers have little knowledge of student interests, their classroom libraries can reflect this (Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1996). However, when teachers take the time to understand each student's specific interests and gather a classroom library reflective of these, an environment that encourages voluntary reading is developed. Knowledge of student interests influences a teacher's selection for appropriate books for his or her class, which in turn promotes engaged, voluntary reading (Ivey & Johnston, 2013). As teachers realize student interests, connecting students with similar interests to promote discussions of choice books can also encourage engaged, voluntary reading. Teacher knowledge of students can be used to create an environment that supports student autonomy, competence, and relatedness. By selecting books for the classroom library based on student interests, the teacher provides an environment that supports student autonomy. Selecting a variety of books that allow for high-success reading for the teacher's particular students requires knowledge of each student's reading level. Providing books that allow each student to read with high success provides an environment that promotes

the feeling of competence when one reads. Finally, understanding the interests of each student and connecting students to one another through these interests, the teacher creates an environment that supports relatedness.

A teacher or librarian may be able to find out about student interests by checking the library records or using another computer database. Gordon and Lu (2008) used an online computer system to keep track of the number of students looking at certain subgenres of texts in a summer reading program for remedial high school students. They found through the number of “hits” each subgenre received that realistic fiction, science fiction and fantasy, and nonfiction subgenres such as biography were the most popular subgenres to these students. Pierce (2003) analyzed the number of checkouts of young adult texts from a public library. What she found was that texts that had been highly sought after were no longer being checked out. Informational texts about sports, rock stars, sexuality, illegal drug use, and cartoons were the most often non-circulated materials, due, at least in part, to the number of these texts found missing from the shelves. Pierce deduced that, in some cases, the lack of checkouts—particularly those for books that were missing or stolen--could portray the extreme popularity of those books. As shown, utilizing library circulation rates or other computer databases may provide teachers and librarians with the information needed to stock classroom and school libraries with the texts students want to read.

Teacher behaviors that support voluntary reading, such as reading aloud and understanding a student’s interests, provide an environment that supports intrinsic motivation. Introducing students to high-interest texts through read alouds provides students with the feeling of competence and promotes curiosity in the text. Understanding student interests and providing texts that reflect these interests as well as the time to read them gives students a feeling of

autonomy. These teacher behaviors may influence students to read voluntarily, yet allowing students to be intrinsically motivated to do so.

School influence on voluntary reading may also include programs that reward students for reading. Programs, such as *Accelerated Reader (AR)*, provide assessments students take for books read. A point system usually is kept, where students earn points for successfully completing tests on books they have read. Although these programs have shown an increase in voluntary reading (Huang, 2012), few studies of these programs demonstrate reading achievement growth or promotion of intrinsic reading motivation (e.g.—Huang, 2012; Mallette, Henk, & Melnick, 2004). Tangible rewards for reading, as utilized in *AR*, may, in fact, be unwarranted for students. Smith and Westberg (2011) found in their study of *AR* and middle grades students that students really did not like the extra components of *AR*—the assessments, points system, and prizes---and instead preferred reading as the sole activity. Some students stated that they did not oppose the rewards but were not enticed to read because of them. Other students claimed to read faster in order to “get through” more books to earn more points for prizes. Although *AR* has been utilized to promote reading especially to those who do not choose to read on their own or are lower-achieving reading students, Groce and Groce (2005) found that students who earned the most points in *AR* were already the higher-achieving students in school. The use of programs, such as *AR*, then, do not seem to provide an environment conducive to intrinsic motivation, nor promote the sense of autonomy within its students.

Providing access to texts that are interesting to students, opportunities to read self-selected, high-success texts, and an atmosphere that supports autonomy, competence, and relatedness through supportive teacher behaviors are influential in promoting voluntary reading. By providing all of these aspects within the classroom and school, voluntary reading often will

occur. Environments that include reward systems for reading may not be conducive to the promotion of intrinsic motivation for voluntary reading. It makes sense that in order to provide an atmosphere that supports voluntary reading, one must first look at the texts available to students within the school library. Without texts of interest to students, opportunities to read and teacher behaviors may not encourage voluntary reading at all. The texts students want to read must be available to students first before other aspects of the school environment can be effective in promoting voluntary reading. This study's goal is to provide that information.

Influences on Student Interest

In order to understand student interests, one must examine the methods and characteristics students use to determine if a book is interesting to them. Research has addressed different aspects of book selection, such as genre interests, gender of the protagonist, and movie and television influence, that impact student interest. Some aspects address the composition of the book. These characteristics include the genre, author, character traits of the protagonist, themes, and reading levels of the books. Other aspects address the physical characteristics of the books that appeal to students. These include the back-of-book summary or book jacket summary and the cover art. Finally, some influences on student interest occur outside of the book altogether. These include the influence of television shows and movies, awards given and placement on bestseller or approved-novel lists and within the Accelerated Reader database, the year the book was published and its availability, and the influence of social media. Obviously, there are numerous, possible influences on student selection of text.

Influences of the Book's Composition

Genre, subgenre, and format. The term genre may have an ambiguous meaning because it has been used to mean broad categories such as fiction and nonfiction or more narrow

ones such as adventure stories, mysteries, and science fiction. To simplify matters for this study, genre refers to two categories: fiction and nonfiction. Within those two genres are many subgenres, such as biography, autobiography, and how-to books for nonfiction, and mysteries, adventure, and science fiction for fiction. As many subgenres as can be found, student interests in a particular subgenre seem to be just as various. Even within one group of individuals, such as by gender or reading achievement status, student preferences may reflect a variety of interests. For instance, Harrison (2012) found that late-adolescent males had a variety of interests for reading, yet did not show a particular interest, overall, in the many subgenres of fiction. McKenna (1986) found that the adolescent remedial readers in his study had 12 subgenres of interest that were universal for the group, regardless of age or sex. These included, among others, comics, weird but true stories, books on rock stars, ghosts, and magic. When subdividing the participants into age groups or gender, even more diversity of interests emerged. Worthy et al. (1999) found that the sixth graders in their study had a variety of interests even when the groups were divided by achievement level, gender, and attitudes toward reading.

Subgenres, such as science fiction and fantasy, can also have specific sub-categories that are of interest. Serafini and Blasingame (2012) stated that one sub-category that has increased in popularity with adolescents is dystopian fiction. As dystopian fiction takes what is currently happening in the world, such as the popularity of reality television or the reliance on technology, it offers to teens a glimpse at what may happen if humans are not cognizant of the danger that could occur if they are not careful. Obviously, adolescents have varied and distinctive interests when it comes to selecting books by subgenre.

Although students have demonstrated having a variety of interests, it may be possible to find commonality among the genre interests they portray. As stated, some researchers have

examined the interests of certain groups of students to gauge their particular interests in genres. One simple way researchers have demarcated groups is by gender. Gender differences in the interests in broad categories of fiction and nonfiction have been found. Hartlage-Striby (2001) found with the study of students in elementary school that males were more likely to check out nonfiction books from the school library than female students were. However, with an increase in age, more nonfiction books were checked out by both sexes, though the percentile of males checking out nonfiction was still higher than that of females. Late-adolescent males also showed a proclivity for nonfiction (Harrison, 2012). McKenna (1986) found that adolescent males were more likely to be interested in action-oriented texts, while females were more interested in texts that involved emotions or relationships. One may reason that males' inclination toward nonfiction demonstrates an information-gathering purpose for reading, while the females' choice for fiction or affective literature demonstrates a purpose of entertainment.

Identifying the subgenre-based interests of students of a certain race or ethnicity has also been researched. The interests of African-American children in particular have been studied. Groenke, Bennett, and Hill (2012) found in their interviews with 6th grade, African-American females that the adolescents had a variety of subgenre interests, such as cookbooks, historical fiction, and romance. However, when one examines more closely the relation of these types of subgenres to one another, one might discover that the participants all preferred books that had a realistic quality to them. Williams (2008) found in her study of African-American children, aged 8 to 12 years, selecting books to read for the summer, that popular subgenres amongst her participants were biographies, series books, and books about superheroes. An examination of these choices allows for another supposition—having prior knowledge supports all three of these

subgenres. The purpose of choosing a biography, book in a series, or a book about a superhero may be because of experience or knowledge about the person or character presented in the story.

Books that are part of a series also offer readers the feeling of competence as they read. Young and Ward (2010) identified supports that series books offer to readers. As one reads books in a series, he or she finds familiarity in the format, settings, and situations of the story. The language and style of the writing displays some predictability. Characters are recurring. The repetitive quality of a series book is especially beneficial for struggling readers. The predictable nature of the story allows the reader to attend to specific reading skills while reading rather than having to become familiar with new characters, settings, language, and writing style.

Some studies have viewed the subgenre interests of students with different reading abilities. Worthy et al. (1999) found that, although high-achieving and low-achieving readers had some similar interests, there were some differences as well. Low-achieving readers preferred texts about drawing and cars and trucks. High-achieving students preferred books written for adults and books that were humorous. McKenna (1986) also found that low-achieving students liked books that were about either realistic, such as books about jungle animals and famous people, or strange topics, such as books about ghosts or magic. Cavazos-Kottke (2006) found, while examining the book selections of gifted, middle school boys, that adult science fiction and fantasy and mysteries and thrillers were popular subgenres. Amazingly, even within the popular topics, no two students picked out the same text. One might surmise from analyzing high-achieving students' subgenre interests that these students tend to prefer to read for entertainment. Analysis of low-achieving students provides a less-clear understanding of reading purpose. It seems that by choosing books on cars and trucks, drawing, or realistic texts, these students are

interested in reading to gather information or learn something. Yet, some low-achievers may also read for entertainment, as the preference for strange topics may suggest.

Some students' reading interests lay outside the realm of books. For some, magazines, newspapers, and articles on the Internet provide interesting reading material. The percentage of students engaging in voluntary reading may be higher when magazine, newspaper, and Internet readings are included (Hartlage-Striby, 2001). Even within magazines, topics of interest may still be divided. Gabriel et al. (2012) found that interests for certain topics of magazines were gender specific. Females tended to enjoy fashion or gossip magazines, while males enjoyed sporting or video gaming magazines. As Gabriel et al. (2012) interviewed middle-school students, they found that purposes for reading for both genders included gathering information and being entertained. Although student interests may be in formats outside of books, finding these formats to check out of the school library may be improbable. Worthy et al. (1996) found that librarians and teachers believed magazines fell apart too easily and were often stolen, requiring replacement too often. With a lack of access to magazines, newspapers, and Internet, the preferences of reading materials for some students may not be realized at some schools.

Students utilize information they have at hand to decide within a genre which text is of interest to them. For nonfiction texts, the knowledge that the student would gain from reading a particular book may influence his or her text selection (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006; Kragler & Nolley, 1999). Personal interest in the topic also can sway students to pick one book over another (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006; Moss & Hendershot, 2002; Samuels, 1989). Some students use their own knowledge of the specific book's subgenre or author when selecting a text (Moss & Hendershot, 2002). Others may utilize knowledge of awards the book has received or personal connections, such as ancestral relations, they have with the text's topic (Moss & Hendershot,

2002). Others use visual features of the text to decide which text to choose (Moss & Hendershot, 2002; Kragler & Nolley, 1999). As shown, students may utilize a variety of information to select a nonfiction text.

Students selecting a text from the fiction genre also use specific information when choosing a book. A particular subject addressed by the book or subgenre may influence a student's choice (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006; Reutzel & Gali, 1998; Samuels, 1989). Knowledge about characters in a book may also cause the student to choose a certain text (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006). Specifically, students may look for texts that portray real life or cause the reader to feel involved in the story (Samuels, 1989). Knowledge of the author's style of writing may be influential in text selection as well. For fiction and nonfiction genres, the reader's reason for selecting one book over another may depend upon the reader's background knowledge of the subgenre, subject, character, and author's writing style. More importantly, these influences also reflect the self-concept the reader has, knowing his or her own interests, needs, and reading purposes. The more the reader knows of his or her own likes and dislikes, reasons for reading, and knowledge requirements, the better the reader becomes at self-selecting his or her own text.

Authors. The role of the author of a text in its text selection oftentimes depends upon the student. For some students, the genre or subgenre of a text has more influence upon the adolescent than the author does (Hopper, 2005). However, even to these students, the author can still influence text choice, even if it is to a lesser extent. Often, students select texts based upon prior knowledge they have of the author (Hopper, 2005; Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). This knowledge may come from media sources (Worthy et al., 1999), from peer recommendations (Hopper, 2005), or from one's own experiences with other texts written by the same author

(Bang-Jensen, 2010). For students who select a book by an author of which they have read other books, the writing style and language use may feel familiar (Moss & Hendershot, 2002) and promote feelings of competence for the reader. For some readers, reading other books by the same author introduces them to new topics (Bang-Jensen, 2010). Students have the opportunity to read new information with the comfort of a familiar writing style and the feeling of competence they have, knowing that they have had reading success before with this author. Reading multiple works by the same author supports student competence.

Some students prefer to branch out and read authors new to them. With an overabundance of authors writing texts for children and young adults, students definitely have that option. Worthy et al. (1999) found that the 419 6th graders they surveyed and interviewed had over 50 favorite authors, with some authors, such as R.L. Stine and Stephen King, being named more often than others did. Having such a vast number of texts by different authors from which to choose, it is no wonder that some students prefer to experiment in their reading choices. Moss and Hendershot (2002) found in their study of 6th grade students' reasons for nonfiction text selections that some students preferred to read and explore books by authors that were new to them. This began to occur after students had gained some level of comfort in self-selecting texts and in reading nonfiction texts. It seems that taking a risk by reading texts by unknown authors may come after a student feels competent in making those text selections.

Although studies have focused on the text selection choices of students specifically regarding author influence, very few studies examine the relationships between race and gender to author choice. Hopper (2005) found in her study of adolescents' reading choices that some authors were only chosen by females and some only chosen by males. Hopper found that writers, such as Danielle Steele, Jacqueline Wright, and Roald Dahl, were chosen exclusively by females,

while Douglas Adams, R.L. Stine, and Louis Sachar were chosen exclusively by males. This may occur, perhaps, because of the topics usually addressed by each writer rather than because of the writer himself or herself. For instance, Jacqueline Wright's books tend to be issue-based, dealing with issues such as divorce. R.L. Stine's books are usually considered scary. It may be that the subgenres associated with these authors play a larger role in the exclusivity of reader choice by gender than with the author alone. Another possibility may be in the influence of one's peers on text selection. Students who turn to their peers for advice may choose authors whom their peers have mentioned. By acknowledging the advice of one's same-sex peer, authors may become delineated to one gender's preference rather than another. Obviously, the sparse offerings of studies on gender preference for authors, as well as the lack of studies that look at the relationship of race/ethnicity to author preference, require further research.

Character traits. In the fiction genre, readers want a connection with the characters in the text. For adolescents, some may not be specific in the connection they seek (Barry, 2013). Others, however, want to read about characters who are like them (Hughes-Hassell & Lutz, 2006). They want protagonists close to their own age or older (Johnson, Peer, & Baldwin, 1984). Some look for characters who share similar struggles as themselves (Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). As adolescents begin to form their own identities, they may seek out books that contain characters they see as their own possible selves (Richardson & Eccles, 2007; Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). For these adolescents, characters are reflections of certain aspects of themselves, affirmations for their own possible identities. Adolescents often also look for books where they feel committed to a character. Many adolescent readers want to empathize with a character, to feel what the character is feeling, and to root for the character through his or her endeavors (Hughes-Hassell & Lutz, 2006, Samuels, 1989). Some adolescents find connections

with characters through an association to their own background or the lives of those important to them. These connections could occur in fiction as well as some nonfiction texts, such as biography and autobiography. Students may select a text because the characters or people depicted in the book represent a student's lineage (Pitcher et al., 2007; Moss & Hendershot, 2002) or remind them of a friend (Moss & Hendershot, 2002). The desire for these connections to characters, either as a reflection of oneself, friend or family, may influence the student's text selection.

In looking for a connection with characters in a text, the gender of that character has not appeared to be an important factor. Research seems to paint a picture of uncertainty for this question. Beyard-Taylor and Sullivan (1980) found in their study of 576 7th-, 9th-, and 11th-grade students that males preferred male protagonists, a preference which became stronger with age. For female participants, the preference for female protagonist actually reduced with age. Johnson, Peer, & Baldwin (1984), however, found opposite results in their study of 4800 students in grades 4 through 10 nationwide. In their study, they found that the importance of the female protagonist for both male and female readers became stronger with student age, and the value of the male protagonist reduced for both sexes with age. In Williams' (2008) more recent study of African-American students aged 8 through 12, she found that female participants were more than twice as likely to select books portraying females on the cover than male participants. However, female participants also chose books with only males on the cover, suggesting that gender may not have been as much of an issue for females as for males. Because the results of these studies are in some conflict, further research is needed.

A connection to characters in a text may also require one that reflects the reader's racial or ethnic identity. Like the studies on gender importance, the results from research on the

importance of race and ethnicity of characters are also uncertain. Barry (2013) found in her study of 148 8th grade students of various races and ethnicities that 29% of male participants and 38% of female participants claimed they would read more if the protagonists were of the same race as they. In viewing the opinions of specific races or ethnicities, 67% of the Hispanic females and 88% of the African-American females in the study stated that they would read more if the protagonists were of their race or ethnicity. Some participants also voiced concern in the way their own race was portrayed in books, feeling that negative stereotypes of their race inundated texts. Not surprisingly, white participants reported more often that they were able to see themselves in the characters in books. Williams (2008), on the other hand, found that media and prior knowledge about series or characters played more of a role in text selection than racial identification with the characters. Black male participants were more likely to select texts that included white and black characters or people on the cover, and black female participants were more likely to choose books where famous people were displayed. As Williams' (2008) study demonstrated a lack of influence of race and ethnicity on book selection for the African-American participants and Barry's (2013) study found race and ethnicity of the protagonist to be an influence for the racially diverse participants, the influence of the protagonist's race on book selection may still need to be determined.

The importance of the character being "real" has been mentioned throughout research on student text-selection practices. Some students mention wanting to read "real stories" (Groenke et al., 2012). Others have demonstrated the need for real characters by their selection of certain books for award nominations (Chance, 1999; Samuels, 1989). Chance (1999) examined books on the Young Adult Choice Awards List of 1997, an awards program developed by the International Reading Association whose selections were voted on by students. She found that books on the

list were more often told from first person point of view. The stories were usually character driven, where the character changed over the course of the book. First person point of view may allow the reader to feel that the character is more real than a story told in third person point of view. As the character tells the story in first person point of view, the reader may be able to see the character in conversation with the reader, providing a closer connection with the character. Furthermore, the importance of real characters may be also realized by students selecting books for awards that have characters who change over the course of the story. This is also reflective of reality, as events in one's life tend to change and shape the individual.

Finally, some adolescents look for characters or people in texts that can serve as role models for them. Students have described wanting to read about characters who they want to be like or whom they admire. Some adolescents may desire to be funny like a certain character in a book (Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). Other adolescents may want to read about celebrities that they admire or people their own age who are remarkable (Hughes-Hassell & Lutz, 2006). Richardson and Eccles (2007) examined transcribed interviews from a longitudinal study that reflected how students, who were nearing the end of high school or who had just completed it, look to what they are reading to aid in forming their own identity. They found that students reference texts that provided the students with role models, specifically people who held similar values to themselves. These people in the books they read helped form the identity of the individual. This relationship with a character or person in a text to serve as a role model is obviously a profound one, demonstrating the deep connections adolescents may make with a text.

The desire for a connection to characters in a text may resemble the need for relatedness. This SDT-based psychological need requires an environment that provides warmth and a feeling of connection with others. Ryan and Deci (2002) referred to relatedness as also the need to feel

oneself. Seeing an aspect of oneself in or a connection to a character may help fulfill this need for relatedness. As demonstrated in the research, an adolescent's connection to characters in a text may be substantial.

Popular themes. As adolescents select texts for reading, many times they look for connections to their own lives. Young adult literature often reflects the problems teenage readers face, such as poverty, abuse, and depression (Carroll, 1997). These issues-based books have been popular with adolescent readers (Hopper, 2005). Issues-based books provide a possible reflection of reality, where the reader can identify with the character and the situation the character faces. However, adolescents tend to prefer these books to have positive endings (Beyard-Taylor & Sullivan, 1980). This is evidenced by the popularity of books portraying such themes as perseverance, the triumph of good over evil (Hopper, 2005; Samuels, 1989), self-awareness and responsibility of the individual (Chance, 1997), collaboration (Samuels, 1989), and tolerance (Hopper, 2005). These themes portray an ideal reality where characters' hard work pays off, where they learn about themselves and become better people, where people work together and are respectful and understanding of one another.

Because adolescents often prefer books with positive endings and themes that reflect positive outcomes, this preference may reflect their need for relatedness and competence. As previously stated, adolescents who look for books where characters are relatable to them or act as role models may be looking for affirmation of the person they are. By reading books about characters who must face obstacles in their lives, readers may find a positive environment that encourages them to face obstacles in their own lives. Identifying with others and feeling a sense of community is at the core of relatedness, and issues-based books can provide adolescents the community they need and the affirmation they seek in relation to the characters in the book. The

desire for a positive ending in these issues-based books may demonstrate the adolescent's need for competence. As adolescents relate to the characters and their trials in these books, they desire for these characters to overcome their obstacles. The characters conquering their problems may give adolescent readers given hope that they too can overcome the obstacles in their own lives. As with the influence of character traits on book selection, particular themes in texts may also guide readers' selections.

Reading level. For adolescents, the readability level of a book is not often cited as a reason for selection. Although some students admit they choose or like a book because it is easy to read (Samuels, 1989), few state that the reading level or "fit" of a book is the reason for its selection (Kragler & Nolley, 1996). This disregard for readability fit has concerned some researchers, such as Carver (1994) and Carver and Leibert (1995), that students, because of the possibility for selecting "easy" texts to read when engaging in voluntary reading, will not provide enough unknown words to expand their vocabulary. In fact, some studies have shown diversity in readability levels of texts chosen for pleasure reading. Cavazos-Kottke (2006) found that 8th grade gifted males' book selections for personal reading were of higher readability levels than the texts they were expected to read in school. Kragler and Nolley (1996) found of the books chosen for voluntary reading by their 4th grade participants that over 40% of the books were either at the students' instructional or frustration levels. The selections made by the students over time demonstrated no real pattern for moving from level to level. Some students' selections through the study continued from easy to difficult texts, while others began with difficult texts and moved gradually to easier texts. Other students jumped from easy texts to more difficult and back to easy texts. Kim and Guryan (2010) also found that the Latino/a students in their study generally picked books that were too difficult for them, especially when

the students were still struggling with decoding skills. It seems that students choose books based on influences other than reading level.

Although the results of these studies may paint a somewhat positive picture for incidental vocabulary acquisition through voluntary reading, still concerning is the number of students selecting texts that may be too difficult for them to comprehend. One may wonder if establishing an adolescent's reading level and limiting that student to texts within that level would be an appropriate measure to encourage students to select a book that "fits" their reading ability. However, by limiting the students' selections to books on a prescribed level runs the risk of limiting choice, and with that, possibly affecting student motivation for reading. Furthermore, some adolescents may worry, when assigned a reading level, about assumptions made by others regarding their reading ability (Bang-Jenson, 2010). Also not taken into account is the possibility that students' background knowledge may make him or her more capable of understanding a text that on the surface would seem too difficult for the students. Instead, it seems a better option may be to make sure school and classroom libraries are full of texts of a variety of interests and difficulty levels to ensure that a student's interest and reading ability are satisfied.

Influences of Physical Characteristics of Books

In order for a student to become interested in selecting a book for voluntary reading, he or she must see the book first. This requires the student to locate the book, and, if not searching directly for a specific book, look at features of the book that detail its topic. These features include, among others, the cover art and the back-of-book or book jacket information (BoB). Students may use the cover art and the BoB to decide if a book is right for them.

Cover Art. Students from elementary through high school often use cover art to get an initial opinion of whether to select a book or not. For elementary students, books that have

exciting cover art frequently affect their decision to read (Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006; Kragler & Nolley, 1996). Before opening a book, many elementary students first gauge their interest by looking at the cover art (Reutzel & Gali, 1998). For middle and high school students, cover art also factors into text selection. Bright attractive pictures on the cover usually draw adolescents to open the book or read the BoB summary (Hopper, 2005). Struggling adolescent readers, in particular, have prioritized the cover art as the most important factor used in book selection (Gordon & Lu, 2008) and have selected a book solely because of its cover art (Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). The visual appeal of the cover of a book influences students of various ages to select a book or to continue to gauge its interest level with other factors.

Besides an exciting or brightly colored picture on the cover, some adolescents are influenced by specific images found in the cover art. Williams (2008) found that covers featuring males or celebrities were the most popular books among her African-American, early adolescent participants. The gender of the characters or people depicted in the cover art also influenced text selection. Female participants were two times as likely as male participants were to select books with females on the cover. Male participants were twice as likely as female participants were to select texts with African-American and white people on the cover. Media seemed to affect female participants more as they often chose books with celebrities on the cover. Cover art, it seems, may offer students some insight into whether they could be interested in a particular text.

Back-of-book and book jacket summaries. Students of various ages and backgrounds also use BoB summaries when selecting texts to read. Elementary students often read the BoB summary to determine if the book would be an interesting read for them (Reutzel & Gali, 1998). Students for whom English is a second language also use BoB summaries as a way to gauge their interest (Howard, 2012). BoB summaries are also read by middle school students receiving

special education services to see if a book is intriguing and would hold their interest (Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). The BoB information is apparently used as an important factor for book selection.

Because of its influence over students when selecting books, it is vital that the summary be an accurate representation of the book it details and that students can accurately predict their interest in a text based on the summary. Rinehart, Gerlach, Wisell, and Welker's (1998) study had 8th grade students reading the BoB summary and, along with any other clues on the cover of the book, making judgments on their interest in reading the book. During and after reading the texts, students documented through writing the accuracy of their own judgment of their interest as well as the accuracy of the BoB summary. Rinehart et al. (1998) found that the participants were overwhelmingly accurate in their judgments of their own interests. The BoB summaries were also thought by the eighth graders to be accurate as well. Since BoB summaries are such an important factor in students' selections of texts, these findings provide evidence that adolescents may be aware of their own reading interests and that BoB summaries may be trusted to be accurate reflections of the texts they summarize.

Outside Influences

Some influences for text selection come from beyond the book itself. Students may be influenced by popular television show or movies associated with a book or series. Student selection may be influenced by the year the book was published and the likelihood of it being found in the school library. These aspects of the text are beyond the book itself but have some influence over whether the book may be selected or not.

Television shows and movies. Students may be influenced to choose a particular book because of its association with a television show or a movie. Media, such as these provide books

associated with them a sense of familiarity to the student (Williams, 2008; Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). Often, students will utilize prior knowledge about a book's topic or characteristics when selecting a text. This includes their knowledge of movies and television, particularly. The familiarity found in books upon which movies are based may provide the students with the background knowledge to make the student feel that they are competent enough to read that text.

Movies and television shows that are currently running may influence the popularity of associated books even more (Hopper, 2005). By reading the book as well as seeing the movie or television show, students can determine their place in the community of watchers and readers of that text. By reading the text associated with a current movie or TV show, students may be acting on their need for relatedness, for a sense of belonging. Some students, however, may choose to watch the movie or show before reading the text (Swartz & Hendricks, 2000). This may be so that they can compare the two or to find out more information than just what was found in the show. It may also allow students to add as much background knowledge as possible so that they can comprehend a text that may be a challenge for them to read. By watching the show first, then reading the book second, students may feel more confident when they engage in discussions about the book.

Awards. Many awards given to books are done so to determine exceptional books in a given field or genre. One would assume these books would reflect the readership makeup. This does not always seem to be the case. Some awards such as the Newbery—an award given to the author of “the most distinguished American children’s book” (Association for the Library Service to Children, 2014)—do not always reflect the diversity of race/ethnicity of its readership (Barry, 2013). Because of this, students may not look specifically for books that are award winning if they feel these books do not reflect their own experiences and backgrounds.

Award-winning books may also not reflect the interests of students. Ujiie and Krashen (2006) found that awards where adults were solely responsible for choosing the recipients were not very popular with children. Although these books were believed to be of high quality by the award judges, they did not reflect the interests of the intended readers—the children. Beach (2015) found in his study that there was very little overlap, 4.36%, of texts on the American Library Association’s Notable Children’s Books lists, which were chosen by librarians, and the International Reading Association’s Children’s Choices lists, which were chosen by children. This finding demonstrated that books that adults find as exceptional and noteworthy are not often the same as those children believe are engaging and interesting texts. As shown, not all book awards are alike. The pressure to provide “quality” books for one’s students may influence teachers and librarians to provide award-winning books in lieu of other texts (Worthy et al., 1999). Providing students with award-winning books is admirable if the books are also of interest to the students. If the texts are as Ujiie and Krashen (2006) found, where they do not reflect the interests of students, they are then just taking up space and money, both of which might be better suited for texts of high interest to the students.

For some students, however, certain book awards provide the student with a list of books almost guaranteed to be an interesting read (Bang-Jensen, 2010). For these students, book awards allow them to check out books with confidence, knowing experts have deemed the books worthy of reading. Awards, such as the Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award, which awards books based on students’ votes (Bang-Jensen, 2010), also provide students with the confidence that others like them found the books appealing. It seems that awards where students have a say to which books the award is given may be more appealing than those that do not consider the intended audience’s input. Regardless, one important note is that the term award winning is not

necessarily synonymous with high-interest. Caution, then, should be taken when choosing books for students or the library solely based on whether the book has won an award.

Year of publication. The influence of the year a book was published is twofold. First, the newness of a book may affect whether a student has seen or read a book before. Gabriel et al. (2012) acknowledged the high interest students had in magazines when each issue first arrived at the child's home. The novelty of the magazine engaged the reader. The same may hold true for books published more recently. Books that are so new others may not have read them yet may be an incentive for a child interested in being the first to know certain information. Whether it is the newest toy, movie, cell phone, or book, novelty can provide a great desire for attaining that object.

Second, the year a book was published may also affect the likelihood of the book being found in the school library. Most likely, books recently published would cost more than books that were published several years ago. Librarians and teachers may choose to purchase a higher quantity of books, saving newly published books to be purchased after a few years have gone by and the price of the book is cheaper. This may be especially true in poorer communities where school libraries (Pribesh, Gavigan, & Dickinson, 2011) and public libraries (Di Loarreto & Tse, 1999) add fewer volumes than wealthier communities do each year. Pribesh, Gavigan, & Dickinson (2011) found in their study of the difference between low-poverty and high-poverty schools that low-poverty schools tended to add 1400 volumes to their library each year, while high-poverty schools tended to add only 600. Not only would students in high-poverty schools be offered fewer new publications than students in low-poverty schools would be, they would be offered fewer choices for reading overall. Di Loreto and Tse (1999) studied the differences between children's sections in public libraries in high-poverty and low-poverty communities.

They found similar results as Pribesh et al. (2011). The children's section in the low-poverty community offered 60,000 texts to its clients, whereas the high-poverty community only housed 13,000 texts for children. Even though the low-poverty community had twice the population as the high-poverty community, it held nearly four times the number of children's texts as the high-poverty community did. This gap in volumes of children's texts would most likely continue to grow, as the library in the high-poverty community added only 7,000 children's texts each year, while the library in the low-poverty community added approximately 29,000 children's texts per year. Students in poorer communities and schools may have fewer options from which to choose, including newly published texts.

Although research has been steadfast in its study of adolescent reading interests, there are significant gaps in the research needing to be addressed. Although some studies have looked at the reading interests of specific demographics, few studies have compared the reader interests portrayed by schools based on the school's demographics, especially with interests in genres and subgenres, themes, cover art, and BoB summaries. Some studies have looked at the popularity of some authors with students, yet a comparison of the authors themselves is lacking in the literature. Character traits, such as race/ethnicity, age, and gender, have been analyzed for their importance to reader interest, yet few studies have looked beyond face value at the preference for particular character personalities that engage readers. The popularity of certain themes has been noted, yet most of these studies looked primarily at award-winning or award-nominated books. Lacking in the research is an analysis of themes across texts that have been shown to be most popular with readers. Although studies have indirectly identified the influence of a book's publication year on student interest, few have examined the years of publication for books found to be most popular at a given time. Rarer still are studies that observe the importance of book and

author participation in social media sites. Amongst all of these influences, including television shows and movies and awards, few studies have utilized library circulation to determine the strength of their influence. Finally, although studies have looked independently at several of these influences, few studies have looked at such a wide spectrum with middle school students. By studying the popularity, the commonalities and differences among these popular texts with middle school students, This study provides a deeper understanding of adolescent reading interests. The current study addresses the interconnected factors that make up a book's composition, its physical characteristics, and the outside factors that affect student interest and text selection. Moreover, it examines factors, such as character personality and the influence of social media that have rarely been part of the focus of any study with middle school students, let alone adolescents in general. As few studies have analyzed all of the factors influencing text selection in one study, this study provides a unique perspective by encompassing all of these factors. The current study adds to the current literature landscape an inclusive look at student interest in certain texts and an analysis of the commonalities and differences found among texts that middle school students of various backgrounds like to read.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study is to examine the texts that are popular among middle school students as evidenced by library checkouts and to provide analyses of these texts. This chapter was utilized to provide a theoretical framework that situates the study as well as to provide a review of the research that supports and influences this study. Beginning with current research on adolescent reading achievement, the chapter examined the lack of significant increase in adolescent achievement. This information was then coupled with the data on the reduction of time spent by adolescents in voluntary reading. Support for voluntary reading was then

addressed. Next, the theory framing this study—self-determination theory—was discussed, specifically, two of its mini-theories, cognitive evaluation theory and basic needs theory, as well as the three basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Environmental factors that support voluntary reading, such as opportunity to read, choice, and certain teacher behaviors, were examined. Then, the chapter discussed factors that influence students toward text selection. First, factors associated with a book’s composition, such as character traits and popular themes, were addressed. Research on the influence of cover art and back-of-book summaries, some of the physical characteristics of a book, provided another avenue of factors that affect student text selection. Outside factors, like television shows, movies, and awards, were examined for their effect on student interest in certain texts. Finally, the gaps in the literature that this study helps to fill were discussed. The researcher describes the methodology, including data collection and analysis, of the study in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3: Methods and Procedures

. The purpose of this study was to examine the most frequently circulated texts by students in a district's middle school libraries and the relationships among the demographics of the schools and the students' preferences for certain text characteristics. This study utilized an embedded case study design to answer the following research questions:

1. Of books checked out from middle school libraries, which genres, subgenres, or formats are most represented?
2. Are there common features these books share?
3. Is there a relationship among these factors and the school demographics (i.e.—school size, minority status, poverty level)?

Library circulation data taken from August 2013 through May 2014 from one school district were examined to determine the texts most frequently circulated by middle school students. The texts were then analyzed, primarily through a content analysis methodology, based upon the research questions presented, to provide both a rich understanding of the texts that are popular among middle school students, as well as to compare the similarities and differences in text choice among schools with variant demographics.

Study Design

The research design for this study was an embedded case study design. Green (2011) defines case study research as identifying patterns of behaviors or procedures in a natural setting. This research allows for deep description and analysis of a solitary unit of study. Gillham (2000) points out that the unit of study can be an individual, a group, or an institution. The case study generally involves a variety of evidence to inform the research questions. Yin (1981) provides that this evidence can come from archival records, field notes, observations, or combinations of these and can be of a qualitative or quantitative nature. Case studies also include a unit of

analysis, which defines what is being studied. The unit of analysis for this case study was one school district disaggregated by school and demographics. This study was specifically an embedded case study in that embedded within the study of the district was a study of school demographics and text popularity. Library circulation records and content analysis of the most popular texts provided a natural setting for examining student text preferences.

An embedded case study research design was appropriate for this study for several reasons. First, the design allows one to observe behaviors in a natural setting. Examining the frequency of library checkouts in a middle school provided a look at students' reading preferences without the chance for any contamination of the data that may be found in other methods of gathering evidence, such as with an experimental design. Second, the embedded case study research design allows for a more nuanced understanding of student text selection as it provides the opportunity to view the variety of factors that may go into choosing a text. By allowing the researcher the time and effort to focus on one case rather than spreading this time and effort among a larger sample, the data offered a more thoroughly developed understanding of student reading interest. Finally, since a case can be defined as an individual, group, or institution (Gillham, 2000), examining the popularity of texts in middle schools in one district allowed the researcher to demonstrate the commonalities and differences in text selection of schools with similar funding, parameters, and organization. This allowed the researcher to focus specifically on the interests of the students rather than on possible differences among different school districts that may affect student choice indirectly.

This case study examined a variety of factors as variables in influencing student selection of texts. The explanatory variables in this study were the following text factors and characteristics: the genre/subgenre/format, characteristics of the protagonist (gender,

race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, age, personality traits, family structure), themes, the status as an award-winning text, the year of publication, cover art, back-of-book information, author characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity), television series/movie relationship to the book, reading level, appearance on the district's novel list, appearance on the Young Adult Library Services Association's (YALSA) Teens Top 10 List, and possession of the text or author of a social media page (Facebook, Twitter). Each of these explanatory variables were examined for its link to the number of library checkouts of a text—the dependent variable. The study also included each school's demographics as an explanatory variable with the dependent variable being the frequency of checkouts of texts with each of the previously-stated factors.

Participants

In order to provide a rich understanding of the text selections of middle school students, it was important to have a variety of school types as participants. Because the purpose of this study was to examine the texts most frequently checked out of middle school libraries and to analyze the relationship of the school's demographics and the students' preferences for certain texts, the schools themselves were the participants for this study. To portray adequately the possible similarities and differences in text selection, a district with a relatively large number of middle schools that were of varying demographics was needed. Initially, the district was sampled from public school districts from a southeastern state in the United States. In order to provide a range of school sizes, it was determined that the district needed to house at least 10 middle schools to participate in the study. It was also important that the school participants demonstrated diversity in the socio-economic makeup of its students—ranging from schools with primarily low socio-economic status (SES) to schools with high SES. Likewise, schools that participated in the study needed a range of numbers of minority students, from schools with a low number of minorities to

schools with a high minority population. Finally, the district needed to have middle schools that were of a variety of sizes in student population. The size of the school may affect the size of the school library and its text collections. Thus, schools of various sizes were needed.

Because of the need for diversity among the participants, non-proportional quota sampling was used. Trochim (2006) defines non-proportional quota sampling as a nonrandom sampling of a population, selected to meet a certain quota. This type of sampling does not require a proportional match of the sample to the population. Instead, the sample is selected to ensure a certain number of participants will reflect each group in a population. Utilizing non-proportional quota sampling ensured that specific types of school demographics (e.g.—low SES or high minority) were represented. As this study's purpose was to identify the texts of most interest to middle school students, it was vital that the various demographics of public schools be represented in the sample. Non-proportional quota sampling also fit the case study research design well, as it allowed the researcher to focus the study upon one specific school district, housing a variety of schools. This type of sampling does have its drawbacks, as it may be difficult to generalize the results of the study (Huck, 2012). However, making sure that each demographic is represented seemed to enable the results to be more generalizable than a simple random sample.

In order to procure a sample for this case study, the researcher first accessed a southeastern state's Department of Education website. On this website, the researcher found the demographic statistics for each school district in the state. The researcher examined each district's demographics, looking specifically at the size and heterogeneity of the district, as well as the fit of the implemented definition of a middle school as containing only grades 6, 7, and 8. Districts that had fewer than 10 middle schools, did not follow the implemented definition for

middle school, or were going through a massive reconfiguration of school zones were eliminated from sampling. From the remaining districts, the district with the most diversity among the schools was selected for the sample.

Dotsam County Schools (a pseudonym) was selected based on its adherence to the parameters set by the researcher for sampling. Dotsam County School District (DCSD) has 89 schools within its district, 14 of which are middle schools serving grades 6 through 8. Over 13,000 students are enrolled in the school district's middle schools with a relatively diverse population. Of the students enrolled in DCSD in grades kindergarten through 12th grade, 2.0% identify themselves as Asian, 14% as African American, approximately 6% as Hispanic, and 2.7% as multi-racial. Combined, approximately 25% of DCSD's students are minorities. Individually, schools' minority population ranged from having only 6.2% minorities in the school population to nearly 80% of the population defined as minorities. The DCSD also provides education to students from low and high SES backgrounds. Approximately 48% of DCSD students receive free or reduced-price lunch. The district's schools included a range of SES levels from 18% receiving free or reduced-price lunch at one affluent school to a school with almost 92% economically-disadvantaged students. The district also has approximately 12% of its student population receiving special education services. Schools' percentage of students receiving special education services ranged from 7.6% to 20%. School sizes ranged from having approximately 340 to 1370 students. At the time of the study, the Dotsam County School District had no plans to restructure and had not been through any recent restructuring that could have affected the library circulation data.

Instrumentation

Three tools were utilized in data collection for this study. The Library Circulation Data Form (Appendix A) was used to document the library circulation data for each school received from the school district. The Book Characteristics Data Collection Form (Appendix B) was completed for each of the texts most frequently checked out from the school libraries. Finally, the Fictional Text Analysis Form (Appendix C) was completed for only those texts that are fiction. A pilot study with two additional investigators was conducted, using the three instruments to ensure validity and reliability.

Library Circulation Data Form

Once the circulation data from each middle school were procured, the Library Circulation Data (LCD) form was completed for each school library. This form included a place to assign a letter to the school to anonymize the information. Characteristics about the school and its library, such as the number of students in the school, the number of books in the library, the hours the library was open to students, and the number of books and time allowed for checkouts, were documented to provide a picture of the availability of texts to the students and to demonstrate the size of the school. The number of students in the school was taken from the state's 2013 report card, found on the state's Department of Education website. The hours the library was open and the number of books and time allowed for checkouts were found on the schools' websites or through emailing the school librarians.

The total number of books in each library was taken from the library's circulation data. Along with this information about the school, the 10 most popular texts were identified. The title of the book, author's name, the call number, the total number of checkouts for August 2013 through May 2014, as well as the individual number of checkouts for each month, were

documented for each text. This information was taken also from the library circulation data received from each middle school library in the district. These data provided the researcher with the information needed to procure the texts for content analysis, as well as the checkout totals, indicating the popularity of the text. Additionally, the call number for each text provided the school library's identification of the genre for each text, although library records did not differentiate among fiction's subgenres. Reliability of the form was analyzed using Krippendorff's alpha, chosen because of its capability to be used with different levels of measurement, sample sizes, and the presence of missing data (Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007). The Krippendorff's alpha score for Form A was undefined as the research and the two investigators had complete agreement in the selection of most-popular texts. The average pair-wise percent agreement was 100%.

Rationale for library circulation records. Library circulation records were utilized to document the popularity of texts among adolescents. Several studies have utilized such records to determine text popularity. Ujiie and Krashen (2006) analyzed the circulation of award-winning texts in public libraries. They found that few award-winning books were popular among the patrons. Abrahamson and Carter (1992) discussed studies that utilized library circulation records to determine interests in nonfiction texts. Ladd (2011) examined the library circulation of picture books that had television tie-ins. Finally, Pierce (2003) looked at the lack of circulation in libraries of texts that had tended to be of high interest to students, inferring that texts uncirculated may also provide evidence of the text's popularity through the theft of the book. These studies indicate that library circulation data can be used to determine the popularity of texts among the library's patrons.

Book Characteristics Data Collection Form

The Book Characteristics Data Collection (BCDC) form was utilized to document the text characteristics that apply to each text based on the research questions. First, the form provided text-identifying information, such as the title of the book and author, yet it anonymized the school for whom the text was popular through the use of a letter assignment. Second, the researcher initially completed the form for each text, identifying the genre, subgenre/format, awards earned, the most current year of publication, placement on the YALSA's Teens Top 10 List, and reading level. Because each characteristic required different means of identifying needed information, the researcher followed a prescribed routine and utilized a variety of means to garner the data.

Determining the appropriate identification for each characteristic of the popular texts required the researcher to use multiple sources. The researcher documented the genre assignment for each text as assigned by the school library, the county library within which the school resides, and, because of its size, the New York City library. By using the genre assignment of the county library as well as the New York City library, the point was to corroborate the genre assignment made by the school library. Three sources were also used to determine subgenre/format for each text. First, because the school library did not assign subgenres to fictional texts, the county library, with the corroboration of the New York City library and the website Goodreads, determined the text's subgenre. The awards the text has received were determined by an examination of the book, followed by examining the county library's website and the website Goodreads. An examination of the text itself provided the original year of publication of the text. An examination of the YALSA website, specifically its section on the Teens Top 10 list for each publishing year, provided whether the text appeared on the list or not. Finally, the readability

level for each text was determined using the Lexile Framework for Reading, a software program that measures the semantic and syntactic features of a text (The Lexile Framework for Reading, 2014). For texts that can be found in the database of the Lexile Framework for Reading website, the Lexile level given for the text was used. For texts not found in the database, 1000 words from the beginning, middle, and end of the text were analyzed by the Lexile Analyzer program used by the Lexile Framework for Reading. An average of the three scores was taken to determine the text's Lexile level. Availability of the text in the *Accelerated Reader* Program was checked by locating the book on the *Accelerated Reader* website. For those available, the points given for successful completion of an assessment was documented. To ensure accurate, reliable data, the two additional investigators also completed the form for 10% of the texts, following the same procedures the researcher utilized, as depicted in the Book Characteristics Data Collection Instructions Sheet (Appendix D). Interrater reliability using Krippendorff's alpha was determined to be undefined as there was complete agreement among the researcher and investigators regarding the text factors. Average pair-wise percent agreement was 100%.

Fictional Text Analysis Form

The researcher completed the Fictional Text Analysis (FTA) form for each fictional text in the study. This form required the researcher to identify the text by title and author, as well as analyze the cover art, back-of-book or book jacket information, author characteristics, protagonist characteristics, and theme of the text. The researcher also examined the movie or television show tie-in of the text, the placement of the text on the district's approved classroom novels list, and the location of a Facebook or Twitter account for the text or author. To determine if the cover art of popular texts were in any way similar, the researcher examined the cover art to determine if the most prominent feature were people, other species, inanimate objects, or abstract

in design. The back of the book and/or the book jacket was examined to determine if the blurb about the book were either a summary, a snippet from the actual text, or a list of other titles in the series. Examining the author's blurb found usually in the back of the book, the researcher determined the author's gender and, if presented, the author's race/ethnicity.

To determine the characteristics of the protagonist, such as gender, race/ethnicity, SES, family structure, and personality, and the theme of the book, the researcher read each text first. Then, the researcher coded the text for words and phrases associated with the characteristic. For gender, SES, age, family structure, and personality, categories were already established upon which the codes were sorted. For gender, male and female were the two categories used. For SES, low, middle, and high SES were established. Age was categorized as under 10 years of age, 10 to 14 years of age, and 15 years of age and above. These three categories of age were chosen as they depict the age one would usually be prior to middle school, the age one would usually be during middle school, and the age one would usually be after middle school. Family structure consisted of the categories single-parent, two-parent, guardian besides parent, and no parent or none mentioned to describe the household in which the protagonist lives. Finally, the categories associated with personality were those from the Five Factor Model of Personality, which provides five factors—extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to change, and emotional stability—into which personality can be divided (McCrae & John, 1990). For each of these personality factors, codes were categorized. For the race/ethnicity of the protagonist and the theme of the book, categories were not pre-established. Instead, words and phrases were coded first, and categories were established from the codes. Analyses of these categories provided the picture of the protagonist and the theme of the book.

In order to examine the text's tie-in relationship with movies or television, the placement of the book on the county's approved classroom novel list, and the location of the book or author with a Facebook or Twitter account, the researcher looked again outside of the text. To determine if the text had been made into a movie or television show, the researcher looked at sites such as *Yahoo! Movies* for a connection to the text. On the school district's website, the list of novels approved for use in the middle school classroom was printed out and examined. The researcher identified the texts from the schools' top 10 checkouts on the list of texts that were approved for use by the district within classrooms for 6th, 7th, and 8th grades. The websites of Facebook and Twitter, two social media outlets, were searched by typing in the title of the book and the author to determine if the book or author had an account with either media site. Finally, a place for the investigators to document unique aspects of particular books was given to allow other aspects of the texts to be examined for those not specifically addressed in the previous questions. As the FTA form had a variety of analyses and data collection occurring, it was vital to ensure the reliability of the information collected. Along with the researcher, two investigators also completed the form, following the same procedure as the researcher, as documented on the FTA form, for 10% of the popular fictional texts selected. Interrater reliability was determined by Krippendorff's alpha as undefined since the researcher and investigators had complete agreement for the text features. Average pair-wise percent agreement was 100%.

Procedures

To ensure external validity, it is vital that the research study be replicable (Yin, 2009). Thus, it is necessary for the study's procedures to be documented fully and completely. The current study included the attainment of a sample, resources, data collection, and analyses. The sample was purposefully determined as a school district in the southeastern United States. As

stated, the sample was selected for its size, diversity, fit to the middle school operational definition, and constancy of school zoning. Once found, the researcher sought approval for research by the university's Internal Review Board (IRB). Following university approval, the research department for the school district was contacted via email with a research proposal. All IRB and school district research guidelines were followed throughout the study.

Once approval from the IRB and school district were received, the researcher requested from the library supervisor for the school district the library circulation records for each middle school. The researcher requested that the records indicate the title, author, call number, and circulation frequencies for each text for the months of August 2013 through May 2014. This timeframe provided enough time for several checkout cycles to occur. Two schools in the district were dropped from the study. One school's library suffered extensive water damage during the year, which affected the materials available for checkout and the timeframe for library accessibility. The second school's library data for August through December 2013 were lost to the district in a move to a new library circulation system. It was determined that the remaining 12 schools still demonstrated the variety in school size, minority status, and SES status to be able to differentiate the reading selections among the varying demographics.

Once library circulation data for each of the 12 middle schools within the district were received, the researcher identified the 10 most frequently circulated texts from each middle school library. Because of the use of circulation frequency as a determinant of popular texts, several books had the same number of checkouts, causing there to be a tie for the 10 most circulated books. When this occurred, the researcher utilized the following selection process. First, texts that had multiple copies counted as only one text. Furthermore, the total number of checkouts for all of the copies was added and then divided by the total number of copies to

determine the average number of checkouts for that text. Although one may question the need for averaging the frequency of checkouts, since the checking out of multiple copies shows the text to be popular, it is important to note that books that have only one copy have a smaller, finite number of opportunities to be checked out. Had the text with only one copy be one of multiple copies, it may have had even more checkouts than in actuality. Second, texts in a series were only counted as one text. For example, several books from the graphic novel series *Naruto* were part of the 10 most frequently checked out books for one school; only one of these books was used in the 10 most popular for that school. The one selected was the most-frequently circulated text of the series for that school. The reasoning for this came from the desire to distinguish the traits of a protagonist that are popular with middle school students. Selecting only one text from a series allowed for the analysis of more protagonists and provided more information about the protagonists popular with middle school readers. Finally, if there were still a tie among texts for placement on the top 10 list, the remaining texts were chosen at random from these to complete the top 10 list. Tables A1 through A7 in Appendix E provide the selected texts for the study, while Table A8 in Appendix F provides a list of the observed top 10 books for each school without the removal of books based on being part of a series or having duplicate texts that could reduce the number of checkouts when averaged together.

Once the 10 most circulated texts from each middle school were comprised, the researcher completed the LCD form for each school. To ensure that the information on the form was reliable, two investigators followed the same procedures as the researcher in identifying the texts and also completed the LCD form. The two researchers were experts in the field of literacy, as having taught language arts or reading in middle schools for 10 or more years. Both investigators had conducted action research of their own, following the protocols and guidelines

set forth by their own college. Furthermore, both investigators held advanced degrees in education. The researcher also provided explanation for each step of the data collection process to the investigators, answered any questions the investigators had, and provided a discussion among the two investigators and the researcher to ensure understanding of each step of the research study. Once the researcher and the investigators completed the LCD forms for each school, inter-rater reliability was assessed, using Krippendorff's alpha. Because there was agreement among the research and the two investigators with the information on the LCD form, Krippendorff's alpha was undefined. Likewise, the average pair-wise percent agreement was 100%.

After each school's 10 most circulated texts had been documented, the researcher purchased these texts for analysis. Prior to reading the texts for the study, the researcher chose three texts that were not selected for the study to use as a pilot study. These texts were read by the researcher and a BCDC form was completed for each. Once all three texts were read and a form completed, the researcher instructed the investigators to read the same three books and complete the BCDC form for each. Once all three books were read and forms completed, the researcher analyzed the forms for inter-rater reliability, using Krippendorff's alpha. As both investigators and the researcher had complete agreement on the BCDC forms, the Krippendorff's alpha was undefined. This section of the pilot study allowed the researcher to determine what needed to be addressed with the data collection form. With no significant changes needing to be made on the BCDC form, the researcher completed the FTA form for the two fictional texts in the pilot study. The researcher then instructed the two investigators in completing the FTA form for the two texts as well. Inter-rater reliability for the completed forms was analyzed using

Krippendorff's alpha (Krippendorff's Alpha=undefined). Because there was no variance in the form's completion by the researcher and investigators, no changes were made to the form.

After the pilot study was completed, the researcher purchased all of the schools' 10 most frequently circulated texts from an online source. Because there were 20 books that made the top 10 list for multiple schools, the total number of books for analysis was 100. The researcher ensured that the copy purchased was the same as the text found in the library whenever possible. Any differences between texts purchased and those found in the school library were noted. Once the texts were available, the researcher read the text and completed the BCDC form. Then, the investigators read 10% of the texts, chosen randomly, and completed the BCDC forms for them. For reliability purposes using Krippendorff's alpha, the three completed BCDC forms for each text that the two investigators and the researcher analyzed were compared. Following the completion of the BCDC forms for all texts, the researcher completed an FTA form for each fictional text. The two investigators were then instructed in completing the FTA form and completed forms for 10% of the texts that were selected to read. Having the investigators read 10% of the texts allowed the form to be assessed for validity and reliability, as the investigators each read 10 books. Krippendorff's alpha was again used to determine inter-rater reliability—producing an undefined score since the researcher and investigators demonstrated complete agreement.

Prior to analysis, data were cleaned. As school data were anonymized at the beginning of data collection by assigning letters to each school, this remained constant for the duration of the study. Because Krippendorff's alpha has flexibility with missing or absent data, no data was purged from the study. In order to be analyzed, however, data needed to be in categorical or interval forms. Thus, the data for genre, subgenre, protagonist characteristics, theme, awards,

cover art, back of book information, author characteristics, movie/television show tie-ins, location on district appropriate classroom novels list, placement on the, YALSA's Teens Top 10 List, and possession of a Facebook or Twitter account by the book or author were made as tally marks for frequency.

Treatment of the Data

Once data from the books were collected using the LCD, BCDC, and FTA forms, several statistical tests were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. First, tallies were counted for each category of each text characteristic. For some of the characteristics, such as the protagonist's personality trait of openness to change, placement of the text on the YALSA Teens Top 10 list, and the possession of a social media page for the book or author, the categories for the characteristic were simply "Yes" or "No," depending upon whether the text provided that characteristic. Other characteristics had 2 or more categories for tallying, such as the genre of the text ("Fiction" or "Nonfiction") or the race/ethnicity of the protagonist ("Asian," "African-American," "Hispanic," "White," or "Not Given"). Still, other data were not categorical but provided an interval variable instead, such as the Lexile level of the text or the text's year of publication. For these, the data were also tallied and counted. Table 3.1 provides the statistical tests used, along with the specific text characteristics as variables being assessed, as well as the purpose for the statistical test.

Table 3.1 indicates each of the six statistical tests conducted in the study. In answering Research Question 1, an independent samples t-test was used to compare the averages of fiction versus nonfiction texts' prevalence in the top 10 texts circulated for each school. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used to assess the prevalence of certain subgenres in the top 10.

Table 3.1

Text Characteristics, Categories, and Statistical Tests

Statistical Test	Text Characteristics Assessed	Purpose of Test
Independent Samples T-Test	Genre Series Protagonist Personality Traits Protagonist Gender Author Gender Social Media Connection Award-Winning Teens Top 10 Placement District Novels List Placement Availability on Accelerated Reader Made into Movie/Television Show Made from Movie/Television Show	To compare the average value placed for each text characteristic, specifically between the characteristic's possible two categories.
One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA)	Protagonist SES Protagonist Family Structure Protagonist Age Main Theme of Text Main Image in Cover Art Types of Awards Won Accelerated Reader Points to School Demographics	To compare the average value placed for each text characteristic, specifically among the characteristic's multiple possible categories.
Kruskal-Wallis H-Test	Subgenres Protagonist Race/Ethnicity Back of Book Information Author Race/Ethnicity	To compare the average value placed for each text characteristic specifically among the characteristic's possible categories. Used instead of One-Way ANOVA when the assumption of normality was violated.
Pearson's Correlation	Lexile Level of Text Accelerated Reader Points	To determine if there is a correlation between readability level and text popularity
Spearman's Rho	Year of Publication	To determine if there is a correlation between the year of publication and text popularity. Used instead of Pearson's Correlation as data were categorized into equal groups of years.
Chi Square Test for Association	All previously stated characteristics when comparing across school demographics, except for Lexile level, Accelerated Reader points, and year of publication	To determine if there is an association between each characteristic listed and school size, minority percentage, and SES.

In answering Research Question 2, independent samples t-tests were used to compare the prevalence of certain text characteristics, such as protagonist and author gender, protagonist personality traits, and placement of the text on the district's approved novels list, in the top 10 texts per school. One-way ANOVA tests were also used to answer Research Question 2 by assessing the preference for certain characteristics of the protagonist, such as being from a particular family structure or of a certain age. Kruskal-Wallis H-tests were used for the same purpose as the one-way ANOVA for data, such as the author's race or the subgenre of the text, that violated the assumption of normality. Pearson's Correlation test was used to assess whether there was a correlation between popularity and the Lexile level of the texts, as well as assessing any correlation between the popularity of the text and the Accelerated Reader points assigned to the text. Spearman's rho assessed the correlation between the year the text was published and its popularity.

For Research Question 3, the same variables were assessed, yet this time the comparison was made among schools grouped by similar demographics. Schools were grouped by school size, minority percentage, and SES. Each school's size was compared to the district's middle school average size. Those one standard deviation or more above the mean were considered large schools. Those falling one standard deviation or more below the mean were considered small schools. Those within one standard deviation above or below the mean were considered average-sized schools. This same procedure was done for grouping schools based on percentage of minority students. For SES, the percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch for the school was used with those schools one standard deviation or more above or below the district's average considered low SES and high SES, respectively. After each grouping, the variables were tested and analyzed. For most of the variables, the Chi Square Test for

Association was utilized to compare the differences in text popularity among the various demographics.

In Chapter 3, the researcher provided the research design, sampling methodology, instrumentation, procedures, and statistical analyses for the study. Chapter 4 will address the results of the study's analyses, while Chapter 5 will provide a discussion of those results.

Chapter 4: Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the most frequently circulated texts by students in a district's middle school libraries and the relationships among the demographics of the schools and the students' preferences for certain text characteristics. Specifically, the following questions were addressed:

1. 1. Of books checked out from middle school libraries, which genres, subgenres, or formats are most prevalent?
2. Which common composition and physical characteristics, as well as external influences, do these texts share?
3. Is there a relationship among these factors and school demographics (i.e.—school size, minority status, poverty level)?

To address this purpose, the researcher reviewed the literature currently available on the importance of voluntary reading, the environmental effects that support it, and the compositional, physical, and external influences on text choice for voluntary reading. Following the review of the literature, the researcher contacted a school district in the southeastern United States to procure library circulation records from its middle school libraries. The researcher identified the most frequently circulated texts from each of the 12 participating middle schools. Succeeding a pilot study with two investigators to determine the validity and reliability using Krippendorff's alpha of three forms—the Library Circulation Data form, the Book Circulation Data Collection form, and the Fictional Text Analysis form—used to collect data, the researcher completed each form. The Library Circulation Data form was completed for each school to house the library circulation data for the top 10 most-circulated texts. The Book Circulation Data Collection form was completed for each of the top 10 books for each school—100 texts in total due to some

books being on multiple school lists—to collect the data for common characteristics all texts would have, such as genre and Lexile level. Finally, the Fictional Text Analysis form was completed for each of the fiction texts to house data collected on common characteristics fictional texts would share, such as protagonist’s age and theme.

Once all three forms were completed for the texts, the data were analyzed using SPSS software. Due to the variety of statistical data, several tests were used including independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA tests, Kruskal-Wallis H-tests, Pearson’s Correlation and Spearman’s rho tests, and Chi Square Tests for Association. This chapter presents the findings and analyses of the data collected to answer the three research questions presented in the study’s purpose. The findings and analyses are organized by each research question. Following the findings and analyses, a summary of the findings is presented.

Research Question One Findings

Genre

The first research question asked, “Of books checked out from middle school libraries, which genres, subgenres, or formats are most represented?” To address this question, first texts were categorized by genre as being fiction or nonfiction texts. The researcher used call numbers for the text from the school library, the county public library, and the New York City public library to determine if the text were fiction or nonfiction. Texts that were on multiple schools’ top 10 lists were tallied for each placement on the lists. Of the 120 texts, 103 texts were fiction and 17 were nonfiction. A box plot indicated there were no outliers. For both fiction and nonfiction genres, the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality was conducted to determine that there was a normal curve ($p=0.059$). Homogeneity of variances was met as determined by Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances ($W=1.00$). As the data met the assumptions needed, an independent

samples t-test was conducted to determine if the discrepancy between fictional texts and nonfiction texts on the schools' top 10 lists were statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference in popularity scores between fiction and nonfiction texts, with fiction scoring significantly higher than nonfiction, $M=7.16$, $t(22)=15.075$, $p=0.00$, $d=6.146$. In other words, there were significantly more fiction books on the top 10 lists than nonfiction books.

Subgenres/Formats

The preference for certain subgenres/formats as demonstrated through frequency of circulation was also assessed. For each text, since subgenres were not listed in the call numbers for most texts at the school library level, county library records, New York City library records, and designations made by readers from the website Goodreads.com were used. Table 4.1 indicates the subgenres prevalent in the top 10 lists, along with the total number of texts in that subgenre.

Table 4.1

Subgenres Represented

Subgenre	Number of Texts on Top 10 Lists
Drawing/Decorative Arts—Nonfiction	4
Encyclopedia/Book of Facts—Nonfiction	5
Graphic Novel/Humor—Fiction	4
Graphic Novel/Science Fiction and Fantasy—Fiction	40
Historical Fiction—Fiction	2
History of the Ancient World—Nonfiction	1
Horror—Fiction	2
Manufacturing/Hardware—Nonfiction	1
Military Engineering—Nonfiction	2
Realistic Humor—Fiction	8
Realistic Sports—Fiction	1
Realistic Romance—Fiction	2
Recreation/Performing Arts--Nonfiction	2
Science Fiction/Fantasy—Fiction	42
Spy—Fiction	2
Zoologic/Animals—Nonfiction	2

Two subgenres were well-represented in the top 10 lists—science fiction/fantasy novels and graphic novels—science fiction/fantasy. Although several outliers were found by box plot, they remained in the analysis as they depicted the overall interests of the students, which were important to the study. Normal curves for the subgenres were assessed using Shapiro-Wilk test for normality, where graphic novel-science fiction/fantasy and science fiction/fantasy novels did not follow a normal curve. Because the data violated the assumption of normality, one-way ANOVA was not used. Instead the Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used to determine whether popularity scores among the subgenres were different. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test found that the distributions of popularity scores were not similar for all groups as assessed by a visual inspection of a box plot. The mean ranks of popularity scores were statistically significant between groups, $\chi^2(15)=92.706$, $p=0.000$. Pair-wise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted p-values are presented. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences between graphic novel/science fiction and fantasy (mean rank=169.96) and the following subgenres: fictional sports (mean rank=75.96, $p=0.000$), history of the ancient world (mean rank=75.96, $p=0.000$), manufacturing/hardware (mean rank=75.96, $p=0.000$), zoologic/animals (mean rank=77.62, $p=0.000$), historical fiction (mean rank=77.62, $p=0.000$), recreation/performing arts (mean rank=82.92, $p=0.000$), military/engineering (mean rank=82.92, $p=0.000$), realistic romance (mean rank=82.92, $p=0.000$), drawing/decorative arts (mean rank=91.54, $p=0.002$), graphic novel/humor (mean rank=91.54, $p=0.002$), and encyclopedia/book of facts (mean rank=88.50, $p=0.004$). The post hoc analysis also revealed statistically significant differences between science fiction/fantasy novels (mean rank=175.38) and the same subgenres with the same p-values, except with drawing/decorative arts ($p=0.000$), graphic novel/humor ($p=0.000$), and

encyclopedia/book of facts ($p=0.002$). Comparisons among other subgenres were not statistically significant.

Like subgenres, the number of books that were part of a series was assessed. Books were determined as being part of a series if the book was part of a trilogy or higher number of books with the same characters. Of the 120 total texts, 101 were series books, with 19 not being part of a series. For each school's top 10 list, the average number of series books on the list was $M=8.42$, $SD=1.165$ and non-series books $M=1.58$, $SD=1.165$. A boxplot indicated that there were two outliers among the data, but the outliers were kept within the analysis as they were not extreme. The Shapiro-Wilk's test for normality indicated a normal curve for books in a series and books not in a series ($p=0.282$). Levene's test for equality of variances indicated a homogeneity of variances for the number of texts for series and non-series books ($p=1.00$). The difference between the mean scores for series and non-series frequencies on the top 10 lists was 6.84. There was a statistically significant difference between the mean frequency of series books on the top 10 list and non-series books, $t(22)=14.374$, $p=0.000$.

Summary of Research Question One Findings

The data demonstrated a preference for certain genres and subgenres/formats as shown in the popularity of texts in frequency of circulation. The independent samples t-test results indicated a preference for fiction over nonfiction texts. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test indicated that some subgenres/formats were more popular than others. Following Dunn's (1964) procedure of a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons in a pair-wise comparison, graphic novels/science fiction and fantasy and science fiction/fantasy novels were significantly more popular than other subgenres.

Research Question Two Findings

Author Gender and Race/Ethnicity

The second research question asked, “Which common composition and physical characteristics, as well as external influences, do these texts share?” To answer the portion of the question regarding composition characteristics, the researcher identified author and protagonist traits, the main theme in the books, and the Lexile levels of the texts. Author traits included gender and race/ethnicity. These were determined by looking at the author blurb and picture or checking the author’s social media page. There were duplicate listings, as previously discussed, across the schools’ top 10 lists, and some authors had multiple books across the lists, as well. Because some of the nonfiction texts had no single author but instead had companies listed as the author, only the 103 fiction books were used to determine author race/ethnicity. Of the 103 fiction texts, there were multiple listings by the same author, where 51 unique authors were represented. The 103 fiction book authors were tallied individually to represent the overall preferences from the top 10 lists. There were 37 female and 66 male authors. The frequency of male or female authors on the top 10 lists were analyzed using an independent samples t-test. Using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, the researcher found that there was a normal curve for male ($p=0.073$) and female ($p=0.213$) authors. Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances demonstrated that homogeneity of variance was met ($W=0.460$). There was a statistically significant difference in the representation of male authors to female authors on the lists, $M=2.500$, $t(22)= 3.915$, $p=0.001$, $d=1.598$. The top 10 lists had significantly more male authors than female authors.

Data about the race/ethnicity of each author were also gathered to determine if one race/ethnicity were more represented in the top 10 lists than others. Race/ethnicity information

was taken from either the author photograph in the back of the book, or, if one was not provided, on the author's social media page. Because some of the nonfiction texts had no single author but rather had a company or publisher listed as the author, it was decided to use only the fiction texts to determine prevalence of author race/ethnicity. Of the 103 fictional text authors on the lists, there were 84 white authors, 2 African-American authors, 16 Asian authors, and 1 author of unknown ethnicity. Shapiro-Wilk test for normality found that the normality assumption was violated for African-American ($p=0.000$), Asian ($p=0.006$), and ethnically unknown ($p=0.000$) authors. Thus, data were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H-test. Distributions of popularity scores were not similar for all groups as assessed by visual inspection of a box plot. The distributions of popularity scores were statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi^2(3)=36.551$, $p=0.000$. Pair-wise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted p-values are presented. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences in popularity scores between white authors (mean rank=42.25) and unknown-ethnicity authors (13.88) ($p=0.000$), white authors and African-American authors (15.25) ($p=0.000$), and white and Asian authors (26.62) ($p=0.000$), but not between unknown-ethnicity and Asian authors ($p=0.10$) or any other groups. White authors were significantly more represented on the top 10 lists than other races/ethnicities.

Protagonist Traits

A book's composition also includes traits about the protagonist. Protagonist traits analyzed included the protagonist's gender, race/ethnicity, race, family structure, SES, and personality. To determine the traits exhibited by each protagonist, the researcher read each fiction book on the list, keeping tallies of each trait's categories. Because nonfiction texts tend

not to have a protagonist in the story, unless the text is narrative, only the 103 fictional texts were analyzed.

Protagonist Gender. In analyzing the prevalence of certain protagonists' gender, texts that had multiple protagonists, specifically texts with both a male and female protagonist were also left out of the analysis. The reasoning for this decision was that the male and female counterparts would cancel one another out in the analysis. In all, of the 103 fictional texts, 97 had single protagonists, while 6 of the remaining fictional texts had multiple protagonists. Of the 97 fictional texts with single protagonists, 54 of the protagonists were male and 43 were female. The Shapiro-Wilk test for normality indicated a normal curve for males ($p=0.187$) and females ($p=0.060$). Levene's Test for Equality of Variances found that homogeneity of variance was met ($W=0.383$). The prevalence of male protagonists on the list was assessed using an independent samples t-test. The test found that there was not a statistically significant difference between the number of male and female protagonists on the top 10 lists, although the scores approached significance, $M=0.917$, $t(22)=1.925$, $p=0.067$, $d=0.2379$.

Protagonist Race/Ethnicity. To determine if there was commonality in the protagonists' race/ethnicity on the top 10 lists, 101 of the 103 fictional texts were used. The two texts left out of the analysis had multiple protagonists because of multiple stories. The four fictional texts that had a male and female protagonist were counted in the analysis as one tally since both protagonists were of the same race/ethnicity. Of the 101 texts, 71 of the protagonists were white, 14 were non-human, 10 were Asian, 1 was Native American, and 1 protagonist had no information given to determine race/ethnicity, called not given in future references. Shapiro-Wilk test for normality indicated that the data for white protagonists demonstrated a normal curve ($p=0.390$), while the data for nonhuman ($p=0.030$), Asian ($p=0.002$), Native American

($p=0.000$), and not given ($p=0.000$) showed the curve to be not normal. Because some of the data violated the test of normality, Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used. Distributions of the popularity scores were not similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a box plot. A Kruskal-Wallis H-test was run to determine if there were differences in prevalence scores among the five groups of protagonist races/ethnicities. The distribution of prevalence scores were statistically significant: $\chi^2(4)=42.814$, $p=0.000$. Pair-wise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted p -values are presented. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences in prevalence between white (mean rank 54.12) and Native American (mean rank=17.29) protagonists ($p=0.000$), white and not given (mean rank=17.29) protagonists ($p=0.000$), and white and Asian (mean rank=28.04) protagonists ($p=0.001$), but not between white and nonhuman (mean rank=35.75) protagonists ($p=0.056$), or any other pairs. Since there were no African-American protagonists in the study, no comparison was made between white and African-American characters. As with the prevalent race/ethnicity of authors, significantly more white protagonists were on the top 10 lists than any other race/ethnicity.

Protagonist Age. Prevalence for certain ages of protagonists was also analyzed. To find out if the students preferred to read about protagonists who were older, younger, or around the same age as themselves, the researcher determined three categories for protagonist age: below middle school age (under age 10), middle-school age (age 10-14), above middle-school age (above age 15), and not given (texts that never mentioned an age of the protagonist). The fictional texts with either single protagonists or multiple protagonists within the same age group were used, totaling 101 fictional texts, with each text counting as one tally. Of the 101 texts, 3 had protagonists who were below middle-school age, 43 were of middle-school age, 48 were

above middle-school age, and 7 were not given. A Shapiro-Wilk test for normality indicated that the middle-school age group demonstrated a normal curve ($p=0.370$), while below middle-school age ($p=0.000$), above-middle school age ($p=0.005$), and not given ($p=0.004$) did not. Further analysis using the z-score and skewness and kurtosis for each group indicated that normality was met for the remaining groups: below middle-school age with a skewness of $z=-2.038$ and kurtosis of $z=0.423$, above middle-school age with a skewness of $z=1.154$ and kurtosis of $z=0.423$, and not given with a skewness of $z=1.154$ and a kurtosis of $z=-0.15$. The homogeneity of variance was violated as assessed by Levene's Test, $W=0.002$. Thus, Welch's ANOVA test was used to determine if there was a preference for a certain age group of protagonists, as shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Protagonist Age and Popularity with Welch's

ANOVA Test

	Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
Welch	30.098	3	22.325	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

The popularity of protagonists by age was statistically significantly different between the different age groups, Welch's $F(3,44)=30.098$, $p<0.0005$. The test indicated that there was a difference in the number of texts in the top 10 lists that had protagonists that were below middle-school age, middle-school age, or above middle-school age.

A post-hoc analysis using the Games-Howell test for multiple comparisons revealed several differences, shown in Table 4.3. The popularity of middle-school age and above middle-school age protagonists over texts with below middle-school age protagonists was assessed.

Table 4.3

Protagonist Age and Popularity Differences

Test	(I) Protagonist Age	(J) Protagonist Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Games-Howell	below middle school	middle school	-3.333 [*]	.437	.000	-4.61	-2.05
		above middle school	-3.417 [*]	.514	.000	-4.93	-1.90
		not given	-.333	.233	.496	-.99	.32
	middle school	below middle school	3.333 [*]	.437	.000	2.05	4.61
		above middle school	-.083	.649	.999	-1.89	1.72
		not given	3.000 [*]	.459	.000	1.68	4.32
	above middle school	below middle school	3.417 [*]	.514	.000	1.90	4.93
		middle school	.083	.649	.999	-1.72	1.89
		not given	3.083 [*]	.534	.000	1.54	4.63
	not given	below middle school	.333	.233	.496	-.32	.99
		middle school	-3.000 [*]	.459	.000	-4.32	-1.68
		above middle school	-3.083 [*]	.534	.000	-4.63	-1.54

^{*}The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

There was an increase in prevalence of middle-school age protagonists ($M=3.58$, $SD=1.443$) over below middle-school age protagonists ($M=0.25$, $SD=0.452$), a mean difference of 3.33, which was a statistically significant increase ($p=0.000$). There was a difference between middle school protagonists and age-not-given protagonists ($M=0.58$, $SD=0.669$), a mean difference of 3.00, which was statistically significant ($p=0.000$). There was a decrease in the prevalence score of middle-school age protagonists compared to above middle-school age ($M=3.67$, $SD=1.723$), a mean difference of -0.083 , which was not a statistically significant decrease ($p=0.999$). There

was increase in prevalence of above middle-school age protagonists over below middle-school age with a mean difference of 3.417, which was statistically significant ($p=0.000$). There was a difference in prevalence of above middle-school age protagonists over age-not-given protagonists, with a mean difference of 3.083, which was statistically significant ($p=0.000$). Finally, there was a difference of prevalence of protagonists with no age given over below middle-school age protagonists with a mean difference of 0.333, which was not significant ($p=0.496$), $w^2=0.637$. Thus, books whose protagonists were above middle-school age or middle-school age were more often on the top 10 lists than books whose protagonists were below middle-school age.

Protagonist Family Structure. The protagonist's family structure for each text was also analyzed. The fictional texts that were only one story and not a collection of stories were used, making the total 101 fictional texts for analysis. For the protagonists, the parent/guardian status was tallied as one of the following categories: guardian, one parent, two parent, no parent/not mentioned. In sum, 9 protagonists were cared for by guardians, 39 by single parents, 34 by two parents, and 19 were either orphans or had no parents mentioned in the text. To determine if one of the family structures was more prevalent, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted, as found in Table 4.4. First, to assess for normality, Shapiro-Wilk tests were conducted with each category. Three of the categories were found by the Shapiro-Wilk test to have a normal curve: one-parent structure ($p=0.284$), two-parent structure ($p=0.372$), and no those parent/not mentioned ($p=0.059$). The guardian structure category did not pass the Shapiro-Wilk test ($p=0.002$); however, the skewness ($z=-0.322$) and kurtosis ($z=-1.91$) demonstrated a normal curve. Using Levene's statistic, it was determined that the homogeneity of variance was met ($p=0.084$).

Table 4.4

Protagonist Family Structure and Popularity of Texts

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	52.099	3	17.366	14.483	.000
Within Groups	51.561	43	1.199		
Total	103.660	46			

The one-way ANOVA found that there was a statistically significant difference among the prevalence on the top 10 lists for family structure, $F(3,43)=14.483$, $p<0.0005$. In other words, certain types of family structures for the protagonist's family were more often found within the top 10 lists than others.

A post hoc analysis using Tukey's test, as presented in Table 4.5, showed that there were significantly more protagonists with single parents ($M=3.25$, $SD=1.288$) than those cared for by guardians ($M=0.55$, $SD=0.522$) with a mean increase of 2.705, $p=0.0005$. There were more one-parent protagonists than two-parent protagonists ($M=2.93$, $SD=1.193$), with a mean increase of 0.417, which was not statistically significant ($p=0.788$). One-parent protagonists were significantly more prevalent than no parent/parent not mentioned protagonists ($M=1.58$, $SD=1.165$), with a mean increase of 1.667, $p=0.003$. Two-parent protagonists were more prevalent than protagonists cared for by a guardian, with a mean increase of 2.288, which was statistically significant ($p=0.0005$). Two-parent protagonists were more prevalent than no parent/parent not mentioned protagonists, with a mean increase of 1.250, which was statistically significant ($p=0.037$). However, although no parent/parent not mentioned protagonists were more prevalent than guardian protagonists, with a mean increase of 1.038, it was not statistically significant ($p=0.121$), $w^2=0.463$.

Table 4.5

Protagonist Family Structure Compared by Average Number on Top 10 Lists

	(I) Family Structure	(J) Family Structure	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	Guardian	1-Parent	-2.705*	.457	.000	-3.93	-1.48
		2-Parent	-2.288*	.457	.000	-3.51	-1.07
		None/Not Given	-1.038	.457	.121	-2.26	.18
	1-Parent	Guardian	2.705*	.457	.000	1.48	3.93
		2-Parent	.417	.447	.788	-.78	1.61
		None/Not Given	1.667*	.447	.003	.47	2.86
	2-Parent	Guardian	2.288*	.457	.000	1.07	3.51
		1-Parent	-.417	.447	.788	-1.61	.78
		None/Not Given	1.250*	.447	.037	.06	2.44
	None/Not Given	Guardian	1.038	.457	.121	-.18	2.26
		1-Parent	-1.667*	.447	.003	-2.86	-.47
		2-Parent	-1.250*	.447	.037	-2.44	-.06
		None/Not Given	1.250	.481	.072	-.09	2.59
	None/Not Given	Guardian	1.038	.371	.058	-.03	2.10
		1-Parent	-1.667*	.501	.015	-3.06	-.27
		2-Parent	-1.250	.481	.072	-2.59	.09

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Protagonist Personality Traits. Personality traits for the protagonists were also assessed. Using the Five Factor Model of Personality, each of the 101 protagonists was assessed for extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and emotional stability (McCrae & John, 1990). For each trait, there were two categories—the trait itself or its opposite. For example, extroversion's opposite was introversion. Tally marks were kept for each personality trait. For extroversion, 79 protagonists demonstrated this trait within the text while

22 did not. An independent samples t-test was conducted. Shapiro-Wilk's test for normality indicated that both extroversion ($p=0.412$) and introversion ($p=0.242$) were normally curved. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated that homogeneity of variances was met ($W=0.242$). There was a statistically significant difference between protagonists who were considered extroverted and those who were not, $M=4.750$, $t(22)=7.673$, $p=0.000$, $d=2.067$. Significantly more protagonists in the books on the top 10 lists were extroverted individuals

For the personality trait agreeableness and its opposite disagreeableness, 84 of the protagonists were agreeable in nature and 17 were disagreeable. An independent samples t-test was to be used. Using the skewness and kurtosis of each data's curve to assess normality, agreeable protagonists had a normal curve with skewness ($z=-1.27$) and kurtosis ($z=-0.0495$), and disagreeable protagonists had a normal curve with skewness ($z=2.284$) and kurtosis ($z=-1.127$). The assumption of homogeneity was violated as assessed by Levene's test ($W=0.028$). Because of this, Welch's t-test was used. There was a statistically significant difference between the prevalence of agreeable protagonists versus disagreeable protagonists, $M=5.583$, $t(15.325)=11.929$, $p=0.000$, $d=4.24$.

The personality trait of conscientiousness was also assessed. Protagonists were deemed either conscientious or unconscientious. Of the 101 protagonists, 91 demonstrated conscientious behaviors while 10 demonstrated unconscientious behaviors. Normality of the data curve was assessed using skewness and kurtosis. Conscientious protagonists had a skewness of $z=0.15$ and a kurtosis of $z=-0.69$, while unconscientious protagonists had a skewness of $z=0.41$ and a kurtosis of $z=-0.56$. Levene's Test for Equality of variances determined that the assumption of homogeneity was violated ($W=0.010$), so the Welch's t-test was used instead of the independent samples t-test. The Welch's t-test found a statistically significant difference between the

prevalence of conscientious protagonists over unconscientious protagonists, $M=6.750$, $t(15.757)=14.023$, $p=0.000$, $d=4.867$.

A protagonist's openness to experience was addressed. Protagonists were found to be either open to experience or closed to experience. Of the 101 protagonists, all were found to be open to experiences. The data demonstrated a normal curve as evidenced by skewness ($z=-0.43$) and kurtosis ($z=-1.24$). Assumption of homogeneity was violated as determined by Levene's test ($W=0.000$). Because of this, the Welch's t-test was used. A statistically significant difference in the prevalence of open-to-experience protagonists over those closed to experience was found, $M=8.417$, $t(11)=25.038$, $p=0.000$, $d=5.725$.

Finally, each protagonist's personality was assessed for emotional stability. 90 of the 101 protagonists demonstrated emotional stability while 11 demonstrated behaviors that were determined to be neurotic. A normal curve for both emotionally stable protagonists and neurotic protagonists was demonstrated via skewness and kurtosis of the curves. Emotionally stable protagonist data had a skewness of $z=-0.83$ and kurtosis of $z=-0.678$, while neurotic protagonist data had a skewness of $z=1.25$ and kurtosis of $z=-1.03$. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances demonstrated that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated ($W=0.014$). Therefore, Welch's t-test was used. Welch's t-test found a statistically significant difference in the prevalence of emotionally stable protagonists over neurotic protagonists, $M=7.08$, $t(16.825)=13.045$, $p=0.000$, $d=5.32$.

Protagonist Socio-Economic Status. The socio-economic status (SES) of each protagonist was also determined in order to identify commonalities of the protagonists. This was done by determining if protagonists were considered poor, middle class, or upper class. Protagonists that were considered poor did not have their needs for survival always met.

Protagonists that were considered middle class had most of their needs met but would still have monetary parameters to negotiate to achieve their wants. Upper-class protagonists had their needs met and rarely had to worry about how to afford their wants. Of the 101 protagonists, 63 were middle class, 25 were considered poor, and 13 were considered upper class. A one-way ANOVA was utilized to determine if there were a difference among the three classes, as shown in Table 4.6. Shapiro-Wilk's test for normality demonstrated a normal curve for poor ($p=0.487$) and upper class ($p=0.080$), and middle class demonstrated a normal curve via skewness ($z=0.823$) and kurtosis ($z=-1.033$). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met as demonstrated by Levene's test ($W=0.623$).

Table 4.6

Protagonist SES and Popularity of Texts

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	113.556	2	56.778	46.744	.000
Within Groups	40.083	33	1.215		
Total	153.639	35			

A statistically significant difference was found among the three SES categories, $F(2,33)=46.744$, $p=0.000$. Tukey's post hoc analysis was conducted to determine which SES classes were more prevalent for the protagonist among the books on the top 10 lists, as shown in Table 4.7. The test demonstrated that the prevalence of middle-class protagonists ($M=5.25$, $SD=1.215$) were significantly different than poor protagonists ($M=2.08$, $SD=1.084$), a mean difference of 3.17, which was statistically significant ($p=0.0005$). Middle-class protagonists also were more

prevalent on the top 10 lists than upper-class protagonists ($M=1.08$, $SD=0.996$) with a mean difference of 4.167; this was statistically significant ($p=0.000$). There were more poor protagonists than upper-class protagonists, with a mean difference of 1.00; however, the difference was not statistically significant, yet it approached significance ($p=0.082$).

Table 4.7

Protagonist SES and Popularity of Each Class in the Top 10 Lists

		(I) Protagonist SES	(J) Protagonist SES	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
								Lower Bound
								Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	Poor	Middle Class		-3.167*	.450	.000	-4.27	-2.06
		Upper Class		1.000	.450	.082	-.10	2.10
	Middle Class	Poor		3.167*	.450	.000	2.06	4.27
		Upper Class		4.167*	.450	.000	3.06	5.27
	Upper Class	Poor		-1.000	.450	.082	-2.10	.10
		Middle Class		-4.167*	.450	.000	-5.27	-3.06

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Theme

Analysis of the popular texts also included themes in the literature. Texts were read to determine the most prominent theme depicted in the literature. Four main themes were found: belief in the self, good versus evil, the importance of relationships, and the importance of perseverance. Of the 101 texts utilized, 10 had belief in the self as the most prominent theme; 26 had good versus evil as its main theme; 17 had the importance of relationships, and 48 had perseverance. A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in the prevalence of certain major themes in the books on the top 10 lists, as shown in

Table 4.8. A one-way ANOVA test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among themes, $F(3,44)=18.446$, $p=0.000$.

Table 4.8

Five Major Themes and Popularity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	68.229	3	22.743	18.446	.000
Within Groups	54.250	44	1.233		
Total	122.479	47			

As Table 4.9 shows, Tukey's post hoc analysis indicated several significant differences among the themes. Themes of perseverance and good versus evil were found more often in the top 10 lists than other themes. Perseverance ($M=4.00$, $SD=1.537$) was significantly more prevalent than belief in the self ($M=0.83$, $SD=0.718$) with a mean difference of 3.167, $p=0.000$, and good versus evil ($M=2.17$, $SD=0.937$) with a mean difference of 1.833, $p=0.000$.

Perseverance was also significantly more prevalent than the importance of the relationship theme ($M=1.42$, $SD=1.084$] with a mean difference of 2.583, $p=0.000$]. The good versus evil theme was significantly more prevalent than belief in the self with a mean difference of 1.333, $p=0.026$, $w^2=0.522$. No other comparisons were significantly different.

Table 4.9

Five Themes and the Prevalence of Each in the Top 10 Lists

	(I) Theme	(J) Theme	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	Believe in Self	Good vs Evil	-1.333 [*]	.453	.026	-2.54	-.12
		Importance of Relationship	-.583	.453	.576	-1.79	.63
		Perseverance	-3.167 [*]	.453	.000	-4.38	-1.96
	Good vs Evil	Believe in Self	1.333 [*]	.453	.026	.12	2.54
		Importance of Relationship	.750	.453	.360	-.46	1.96
		Perseverance	-1.833 [*]	.453	.001	-3.04	-.62
	Importance of Relationship	Believe in Self	.583	.453	.576	-.63	1.79
		Good vs Evil	-.750	.453	.360	-1.96	.46
		Perseverance	-2.583 [*]	.453	.000	-3.79	-1.37
	Perseverance	Believe in Self	3.167 [*]	.453	.000	1.96	4.38
		Good vs Evil	1.833 [*]	.453	.001	.62	3.04
		Importance of Relationship	2.583 [*]	.453	.000	1.37	3.79

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*

Lexile Levels

The texts' Lexile levels, or readability score, were assessed. Lexile levels were found by the Lexile level provided by the Lexile® Framework for Reading (2015) or, if not provided, by copying three 1000-word sections of the text into the Lexile analyzer found on the same website. Two of the 120 texts were drawing reference books and thus had no words to analyze for Lexile level. The analysis, then, was conducted on the rest of the 118 books. The levels ranged from a score of 270 to 1573. The lowest scores coincided with texts that could be read at the 1st to 2nd grade level. The highest scores coincided with texts that could be read at the 12th grade level. To determine if there was a correlation between the Lexile level of a text and its prevalence in the

120 most popular texts in the school district, Pearson's correlation was utilized. There was a significant, negative correlation between Lexile level and prevalence of the text on the top 10 lists, $r = -0.245$, $p = 0.044$.

Cover Art and Back-of-Book Information

The physical characteristics of the books were also assessed to determine if there were any significant commonalities among the texts. Physical characteristics included cover art and the back-of-the-book information. In order to determine if certain images in the cover art were more prevalent in the popular texts, the researcher viewed the cover art of each book and categorized and tallied the most prominent feature of the cover art. Five categories of prominent features emerged from the study: abstract concepts, inanimate objects, landscape images, nonhuman characters, and person/people. Of these features, 5 texts had abstract concepts as their prominent features in cover art.; 7 had inanimate objects, 8 had landscape images, 13 had nonhuman characters depicted, and 87 had a person/people as the prominent feature in the cover art. A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences among the cover art prominent features. The normality assumption was assessed using each categories' skewness and kurtosis. Abstract concepts had a skewness of $z = 0.609$ and kurtosis of $z = -1.837$. Landscape had a skewness of $z = 0.689$ and kurtosis of $z = -0.274$. Nonhuman characters had skewness of $z = 1.567$ and kurtosis of $z = -0.377$. Inanimate objects had skewness of $z = 1.567$ and kurtosis of $z = -0.377$. Person/people were assessed using Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p = 0.495$). Homogeneity of variance assumption was met as assessed by Levene's test ($W = 0.068$). The one-way ANOVA test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the prevalence in the different types of images depicted in the cover art, $F(4,54) = 156.401$, $p = 0.000$.

Post hoc analysis using Tukey's test demonstrated several statistically significant differences. Cover art depicting people as its most prominent feature ($M=7.25$, $SD=1.215$) was more significantly prevalent than abstract concepts ($M=0.42$, $SD=0.515$) with a mean difference of 6.833, $p=0.000$. It was also more significantly prevalent than landscape cover art ($M=0.67$, $SD=0.651$) with a mean difference of 6.583, $p=0.000$. Person/people was also significantly more prominent than the depiction of inanimate objects ($M=0.58$, $SD=0.793$) with a mean difference of 6.667, $p=0.000$. No other comparisons among the categories were significant.

The back-of-the-book or book jacket information for each book was read, categorized, and tallied. Most of the books contained either a snippet—or example piece—of the text or a brief summary of the story. Of the 120 texts in the study, 113 had a summary for information given on the back of the book or on the book jacket; 6 used a snippet on the back or on the book jacket, and 1 only had other titles in the series written. Skewness and kurtosis showed that the data violated the normality assumption with the summary data having skewness of $z=-3.053$ and kurtosis of $z=3.547$, snippet data having skewness of $z=3.471$ and kurtosis of $z=4.32$, and other titles having skewness of $z=5.438$ and kurtosis of $z=9.740$. Thus, data were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H-test. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was run to determine if there were differences in the prevalence of certain information types: snippet, summary, or other titles in a series. Distributions of popularity scores were not similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. The distribution of popularity scores were statistically significantly different between groups, $H(2)=28.293$, $p=0.000$. Pairwise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted p-values are presented. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences in prevalence between summary (mean rank=30.50) and snippet (mean rank=14.04) ($p=0.000$) and

summary and other titles (mean rank=10.96) ($p=0.000$), but not statistically different between snippet and other titles ($p=1.00$).

External Influences

Possible external influences on a text's popularity were also addressed. These included the year of publication for the text, awards the text has earned, placement of the text on the Young Adult Library Services Association's (YALSA) Teens Top 10 list, the school district's approved novels list, or as an Accelerated Reader text, the making of the text either into or from a television series or movie, and the existence of a social media page for the text or its author. All of these factors, except the publication year of the text, had two categories of "Yes" as addressing the text in the affirmative for the factor, and "No" as stating the text did not assert that factor. For the year of publication, the earliest publication year was recorded for each text. For the earning of awards, tallies were kept for each type of award—state, panel-chosen, or reader-chosen—a text received along with a tally for "Yes" or "No," depending upon whether the text had won any awards or not.

Year of publication. As stated, the text's year of publication was recorded by the first publication date given. The 120 texts ranged with publication dates from 1982 to 2013. Publication years were grouped into seven categories to determine if the relative "newness" of a text had any relation to its prevalence in the 120 popular texts listed. Publication years were categorized as follows: 2013 to 2009, 2008 to 2004, 2003 to 1999, 1998 to 1994, 1993 to 1989, 1988 to 1984, and 1983 to 1979. Using Spearman's correlation, there was a strong positive correlation between publication year and the prevalence of the text on the popularity list, $r_s(82)=0.744$, $p<0.01$.

Award-winning texts. Another possible external influence assessed was whether each text was award-winning and, if so, what type of awards were won. First, texts were tallied in the “Yes” category if they had won at least one award, such as an award presented by a state or panel. If no award was found associated with the text, a tally was placed in the “No” category. The researcher searched the book jacket, the website Goodreads.com, and the county library online catalog for mention of awards earned as these three locations were known to have this information and were deemed to be reputable sources. Of the 120 texts, 32 had won at least one award, while 88 had no awards listed. Shapiro-Wilk’s test of normality demonstrated a normal curve for both categories, $p=0.378$. Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances determined that the homogeneity of variance assumption was also met ($W=1.00$). An independent samples t-test showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the prevalence of award-winning texts and not-award winning texts, $M=-5.167$, $t(22)=-8.090$, $p=0.000$, $d=-3.299$.

The awards won by each text were categorized as state, panel-chosen, or reader-chosen awards. State awards were awards given at the state level, such as the Dorothy Canfield Fisher Children’s Book Award, which is associated with Vermont. Panel-chosen awards are those where the committee deciding which text earns the award is made up of key individuals rather than young adult readers of the texts, such as YALSA’s Michael L. Printz Award for Young Adult Literature. Reader-chosen awards are those where the public’s input is used to determine the winner of the award, such as the Goodreads Choice for Children’s Book award. Among the 32 award-winning texts, there were 13 state awards, 14 panel-chosen awards, and 14 reader-chosen awards received. Shapiro’s test for normality demonstrated that the normality assumption was violated with state award data ($p=0.004$) and panel-chosen award data ($p=0.002$), but not for reader-chosen award data ($p=0.006$). Thus the data were analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis H-

test. This test was conducted to determine if there were differences in the prevalence between the three different types of awards. Distributions were similar for all groups as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. The differences among the groups were not statistically significant, $\chi^2(2)=0.771$, $p=0.680$.

Teens Top Ten. YALSA's Teens Top 10 annual lists were also searched for any of the popular texts from the study. YALSA's list was selected because the texts that make the list were nominated by teens. Of the 120 texts, 5 were on the Teens Top 10 list and 115 were not. The data demonstrated a normal curve with those appearing on the top 10 list, demonstrating skewness of $z=1.34$ and kurtosis of $z=-0.074$ and those not appearing on the list with skewness of $z=-1.97$ and kurtosis of $z=1.077$. Levene's test indicated that homogeneity was met ($W=0.683$). An independent samples t-test found that there was a statistically significant difference between the prevalence of texts on the YALSA Teens Top 10 list and those not on the list, $M=-7.250$, $t(22)=-14.445$, $p=0.000$, $d=-5.899$.

District's approved novels list. The school district that housed the current study provided its teachers with a list of books approved to be used in the classroom. The list, found on the school's website, contained texts separated by grade level with approximately 15 to 20 texts each. To determine if texts from the approved book lists for middle school grades were among the popular texts from each library's top 10 list, the researcher checked to determine if each of the 120 individual texts were on the 6th, 7th, or 8th grade level district's approved lists. Tallies were made under two categories: "Yes" for texts on the district's list and "No" for texts not on the district's lists. Of the 120 possible texts, 5 were found on the district's list, while 115 were not. With skewness of $z=2.284$ and kurtosis of $z=1.127$ for the "Yes" category and skewness of $z=-2.284$ and kurtosis of $z=1.127$, the data met the assumption for normality. Homogeneity of

variance was also met as indicated by Levene's test ($W=1.00$). An independent samples t-test found a statistically significant difference between the prevalence of texts on the district's list and those not on the list, $M=-9.167$, $t(22)=-33.585$, $p=0.00$, $d=-13.69$.

Accelerated Reader. Whether a text is within the Accelerated Reader (AR) program may also affect a text's popularity. Texts were tallied first into two categories as "Yes" being in the AR program and "No" not being in the program. To determine if the texts were in the program, the researcher typed the title of each text into the AR website to see if the system located the text and provided the number of points the book received. Of the 120 books, 90 were in the AR program and 30 texts were not. The data demonstrated a normal curve as demonstrated by Shapiro-Wilk's test of normality, $p=0.293$. Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met ($W=1.00$). An independent samples t-test found a statistically significant difference between those texts in the AR program and those not, $M=-6.00$, $t(20)=-11.24$, $p=0.000$, $d=-4.74$. To determine if the number of points associated with the texts that were in the AR system correlated with the prevalence of the texts on the popularity lists, the researcher documented the assigned number of points given by AR for each of the 90 texts on the AR program. The number of points assigned to the books ranged from 0.5 to 23 points, depending upon the difficulty of the book. Pearson's correlation was to be used but data violated the assumption of linearity required for the test and violated the assumption of monotone for Spearman's correlation, so no correlation was found between the AR points and the prevalence of certain point assignments on the popularity list.

Movies or television connection. Another external influence that may make a text popular is its connection to a television show or movie. For each text, the researcher searched the internet, using website sources such as IMDb, to determine if the text had been made from a

movie or television show or into a movie or television show. If there was a movie or television show with the same name and plot as the text, the beginning date of the movie or television show's release was documented and compared with the initial publishing date of the text. For texts that had movies or television shows with release dates after the text's initial publishing date, it was determined that the text had been made into the movie or television show. For texts that had movie or television show release dates before the text's initial publishing date, it was determined that the text had been made from the movie or television show. Tally marks were made under the categories of "Yes" if the text was made into a movie/TV show or "No" if it was not. The same categories were used for the determination of texts made from television and movies. Of the 120 texts, 43 had been made *into* movies or television shows and 77 had not. A Shapiro-Wilk's test showed that both categories had a normal curve ($p=0.363$). Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity was met ($W=1.00$). An independent samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in the prevalence of texts not made into television shows or movies over those made into the media, $M=2.833$, $t(22)=4.281$, $p=0.000$, $d=1.75$. Of the 120 texts, only one text had been made *from* a television show or movie. The assumption of normality was violated as shown by the skewness ($z=-5.44$) and kurtosis ($z=9.74$) of the data. The homogeneity of variance assumption was met, as indicated in Levene's test ($W=1.00$). An independent samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in prevalence of texts not made from television or movies to those made from the media, $M=9.833$, $t(22)=83.439$, $p=0.00$, $d=34.05$.

Social media pages. Finally, the prevalence of texts with social media pages of the text or its author were assessed. The researcher searched two social media sites, Facebook and Twitter, to determine if the text or its author had a page on either site. If the text or author had a

page, a tally was made in the “Yes” category. If no page was found on either site, a tally was made in the “No” category. Of the 120 tests, 103 had a page for the text or its author on either Facebook and/or Twitter while 17 did not. Both categories had a normal curve with the “Yes” category having skewness of $z=-1.049$ and kurtosis of $z=0.75$ and the “No” category having skewness of $z=1.049$ and kurtosis of $z=0.75$. Levene’s test indicated that homogeneity was met ($W=1.00$). An independent samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference between the prevalence of texts and/or its authors having social media pages and those that did not, $M=7.333$, $t(22)=23.074$, $p=0.000$, $d=9.43$.

Summary of Research Question Two Findings

There were certain characteristics that were more prevalent than others regarding the texts most popular among the middle school students. Composition features specifically demonstrated preferences. First, the authors of the texts tended to be white males. The protagonists also tended to be white. Those that were of middle school age or above were preferred over those who were younger than middle school age. The protagonist tended to come from a one- or two-parent, middle class home. The protagonist also tended to exude a healthy personality, being emotionally stable, extroverted, agreeable, conscientious, and open to experiences. The themes of the book were often regarding showing perseverance or the struggle of good versus evil. Texts that were more prevalent had a tendency to score at a lower Lexile level although the Lexile levels of the texts did have a rather large range, from 1st grade to 12th grade level texts.

Physical characteristics also demonstrated key preferences in the popular texts. The cover art of the texts more frequently exhibited a person or people as the most prominent feature. People were significantly more prevalent in cover art than those primarily depicting landscapes,

nonhuman characters, abstract designs, or inanimate objects. Like the cover art of the text, the back-of-the-book or book jacket information had a significant preference displayed in the popular texts. Books that gave a brief summary of the text on the book jacket or back were more prevalent among the popular texts than those that offered a snippet of an actual section of the text or the other books available in a series.

Finally, possible external influences on the popularity of a text also exhibited certain preferences of the middle school students. First, students usually preferred texts published in recent years. Although some texts on the list were more than 20 years old, a significant portion of the texts were published within 5 years of the study. External influences could also include a text's selection for an award, a district's approved novels list for in-classroom use, or inclusion in the Accelerated Reader (AR) program. The data showed that the majority of the popular texts were not award winners. These texts were not linked to state, panel-chosen, or reader-chosen awards. Of those texts that were award-winning, the type of award made little difference in the text's selection. The popular texts were also seldom found on the school district's approved novels list, which were texts generally used in the middle school classroom. However, a majority of the texts were part of the Accelerated Reader program with those not in the AR program consisting mostly of graphic novels and nonfiction. The number of points a student would receive for reading an AR book did not affect the prevalence of the text on the top 10 lists. Possible media influences were also analyzed. Many of the texts did not have a movie or television connection. The minority of texts that did had mostly movies or television shows made from them. Finally, most of the texts on the top 10 lists had a social media page attributed to them or the author of the text. Those that did not have a Facebook or Twitter page tended to be

nonfiction texts. These findings indicate that certain composition and physical features and external influences are more prevalent in the popular texts than others.

Research Question Three Findings

The third research question asked if there were a relationship among the factors associated with texts and school demographics. The demographics identified in response to the question were the size of the school, the percentage of minorities the school had, and the socioeconomic status (SES) of the school. The division of schools into categories is shown in Table 4.10. Schools were grouped into categories of small, average, and large for school size. The population of each school was taken from the state's department of education website for the 2012-2013 school year, the latest data available at the time of the study. The schools' population numbers were averaged to get the mean number of middle school students in a school for the district ($\mu=919$, $s=281.95$). Schools that were at least one standard deviation below the mean were considered small schools. Schools with a population at least one standard deviation above the mean were considered large schools. Those schools that were within one standard deviation above or below the mean were considered average in size. Of the 12 middle schools, 2 schools were small schools, 9 were average-sized, and 1 was large. The small schools had 341 and 601 students. The large school had 1368 students. The average-sized schools ranged in size from 780 to 1196.

Schools were grouped by minority level by determining the average percentage of non-white students for the middle schools in the study ($\mu=28.125$, $s=20.33175$). Schools whose percentage of non-white students was one standard deviation above the mean were grouped under the term "High," regarding their percentage of non-white students. Schools whose percentage of non-white students was one standard deviation below the mean were grouped

together under the term “Low,” regarding their percentage of non-white students. Schools whose percentage fell within one standard deviation of the mean were considered “Average” in their percentage of non-white students. Of the 12 schools in the study, 1 had a low percentage of minorities in the school, 2 had a high percentage of minorities present, and 9 had an average percentage of minorities present.

Table 4.10

Schools Categorized by Size, Minority Percent Level, and SES Level

School	Size (No. of Students in the School)	Minority Level (Percent of Non-White Students)	SES Level (Percent of Students Considered “Economically Disadvantaged”)
A	Average (1196)	Average (38.5)	Average (55.4)
B	Average (796)	Average (16.1)	Average (62.7)
C	Small (601)	Average (28.5)	Average (40.8)
D	Large (1368)	Average (17.6)	High (15.4)
E	Average (796)	Average (24.2)	Average (52.6)
F	Average (1113)	Low (6.2)	Average (37.8)
G	Average (854)	Average (23.3)	Average (56)
I*	Average (780)	High (48.5)	Low (79.2)
J	Average (1017)	Average (8.8)	Average (42.9)
K	Average (1025)	Average (29.2)	Average (71.5)
L	Small (341)	High (80.4)	Low (87.7)
M	Average (1140)	Average (16.2)	High (16.6)

**School H was dropped from the study due to incomplete data.*

Schools, finally, were grouped by SES level by determining the average percentage of students considered “economically disadvantaged” ($\mu=51.55$, $s=22.44$). These students received free or reduced-price lunch. Schools whose percentage of students considered “economically

disadvantaged” was one standard deviation above the mean were grouped into a category called “Low” SES. Those one standard deviation below the mean were grouped into a category called “High” SES to portray the school’s high percentage of students not receiving free or reduced-price lunch. Finally, schools whose percentages fell within one standard deviation of the mean were considered average in the number of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch. Of the 12 schools in the study, 2 schools had low SES, 2 schools had high SES, and 8 schools had average SES.

School Size and the Text Variables

The schools in the study were categorized by school size into three categories: small school size, average school size, and large school size. The 2 small schools had 601 and 341 students. The 9 average schools had a range from 780 to 1192 students and an average of 969 students. The 1 large school had 1368 students.

School size and genre. First, the possible correlation between a school’s size and the prevalence of certain text composition features were addressed. To determine if the size of a school correlated to the prevalence of a certain genre on the top 10 lists, texts were tallied as being fiction or nonfiction. The tallies were marked for each category and grouped according to the school’s size of small, average, or large. Large schools had 8 fiction and 2 nonfiction texts on the list, average-sized schools had 79 fiction and 11 nonfiction texts, and small schools had 16 fiction and 4 nonfiction. A chi-square test for association was conducted between school size and genre prevalence. Two cells (33.3%) had expected cell frequencies of less than 5. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and genre prevalence, $\chi^2(2)=2.309$, $p=0.315$.

School size and subgenres/formats. A comparison of the prevalent subgenres on the top 10 list and school size was also considered. The subgenre breakdown and numbers are depicted in Table 4.11

Table 4.11

School Size and Text Subgenre

Subgenre	Large-- Number of Texts	Average-- Number of Texts	Small--Number of Texts
Drawing, Instructional	0	3	1
Encyclopedia/Book of Facts	0	2	3
Graphic Novel: Humor	0	3	1
Graphic Novel: Science Fiction/Fantasy	2	34	4
Historical Fiction	0	2	0
History of the Ancient World	0	1	0
Horror	0	1	1
Manufacturing	0	1	0
Military Engineering	0	2	0
Realistic Humor	0	7	1
Realistic Sports	0	1	0
Realistic Romance	0	1	1
Recreation/Performing Arts	0	2	0
Science Fiction/Fantasy	5	29	8
Spy Thriller	1	1	0
Zoological/Animal Nonfiction	2	0	0

A chi-square test for association was conducted between school size and subgenre prevalence on the top 10 list. Forty-three cells (89.6%) had expected cell frequencies of less than 5. There were differences in the expected number of texts for certain subgenres and the real number of texts. For the average group, it was expected that there would be 30 science fiction/fantasy graphic novels where there were 34, and 31.5 science fiction/fantasy novels were expected when there

were only 29 in reality. For the small school-size group, there were expected to be 6.7 science fiction/fantasy graphic novels when in reality there were only 4. For this same group, there were expected to be 7 science fiction/fantasy novels when there were 8 on the list. There was a statistically significant association between school size and subgenre prevalence, $\chi^2(30)=44.901$, $p=0.039$.

An association between school size and the prevalence of books that were part of a series was analyzed. Out of the 120 texts, 101 were books that were parts of series. As Table 4.12 demonstrates, a chi square test for association was conducted to determine if the size of the school was associated with the number of series books on the top 10 lists.

Table 4.12

School Size and the Number of Series Books in Top 10 Lists

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.190 ^a	2	.075
Likelihood Ratio	8.281	2	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.703	1	.192
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.58.

The test indicated that the association between school size and the prevalence of series books on the top 10 lists was not statistically significant, although it neared asymptotic significance, $\chi^2(2)=5.190$, $p=0.075$. The data showed small differences between the expected number of series books and the observed number of series books on the top 10 lists. The small school group was expected to have 16.8 series books, but instead the group had all 20 books on the list as books in a series. The average-size school group was expected to have 75.8 series books on the lists, but

the group only had 72. Finally, the large-size school group was expected to have 8.4 series books on the list but had 9 series books instead.

School size and author gender. An association between the school size and prevalence of male or female authors was also assessed using the chi-square test for association. Because some of the nonfiction texts had a corporation rather than one person as the author, only the 103 fiction texts were assessed. For the large school-size group, there were four female and four male authors of the fictional texts. For the average school-size group, there were 26 females and 53 males. The small school-size group had seven females and nine males. Small differences between expected numbers and the real numbers were found. For the small group, male authors were expected to be found with 10.3 of the books, but only 9 were on the list in reality. Correspondingly, the number of female authors expected to be represented in the small group's list was 5.7 when 7 were actually on the list. For the average school-size group, 50.6 males were expected to be on the list when in reality there were 53. The average group's female author expectation was 28.4, when the list only had 26. Finally, the large school-size group was expected to have 5.1 males on the list when there were only 4, and 2.9 females when there were 4 as well. One cell had expected counts less than 5. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and author gender prevalence, $\chi^2(2)=1.426$, $p=0.490$.

School size and author's race/ethnicity. The association between school size and the prevalence of a certain race/ethnicity regarding the author of the text was conducted using the fictional texts. Because one of the authors of the texts had an undetermined ethnicity, the text was not used in the assessment, leaving 102 fictional texts. For the large group, there were seven white authors and one Asian author. The average school-size group had 63 white authors, 14 Asian authors, and 1 African-American author. The small group had 14 white authors, 1 Asian

author, and 1 African-American author. A chi-square test for association was used to determine if there was an association between school size and a prevalence of a certain author race/ethnicity. There were small differences among some of the associations. The small group was expected to have 13 white authors and 2.5 Asian authors when, in reality it had 14 white authors and 1 Asian author. The average group was expected to have 64.4 white authors and 12.3 Asian authors when, in reality, it had 63 white authors and 14 Asian authors. Eight cells had expected counts less than 5. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and author race prevalence, $\chi^2(6)=3.489$, $p=0.745$.

School size and protagonist gender. The association between school size and the prevalence of male or female protagonist was also assessed by the chi-square test for association. Of the 103 fictional texts to be assessed, 4 of them had both a male and a female protagonist. These were not included in the assessment since they would cancel one another out. Also left out of the assessment were two books that were anthologies, which had multiple protagonists. The large school-size group's eight fictional texts had four male and four female protagonists. The average school-size group had 31 female and 43 male protagonists. The small school-size group had eight female and seven male protagonists. No real differences were found between the expected numbers and reality. A chi-square test for association was conducted between school size and protagonist gender prevalence. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and protagonist gender prevalence, $\chi^2(2)=0.775$, $p=0.679$.

School size and protagonist race/ethnicity. An association between school size and the prevalence of a particular race/ethnicity of the protagonist was assessed using chi-square test for association. The races/ethnicities found were Asian, Native American, white, nonhuman, and not

identified. For the large group, there were 1 Asian, 1 nonhuman, and 6 white protagonists. The average group had 8 Asian, 1 Native American, 11 nonhuman, and 57 white protagonists. The small group had 1 Asian, 2 nonhuman and 12 white protagonists with 1 protagonist's race/ethnicity not given or identified. There were no real differences between expected numbers of races/ethnicities and reality. A chi-square test for association was conducted between school size and protagonist race/ethnicity prevalence. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and protagonist race prevalence, $\chi^2(8)=5.957$, $p=0.65$.

School size and protagonist age. The age range of the protagonist and the size of the school were also assessed for an association. The age of each protagonist was tallied in the following categories: under middle-school age, middle school age, above middle-school age, and not given. Under middle-school age was considered under age 10, middle-school age was age 10 to 14 years old, and above middle-school age was considered above age 14. There were some protagonists whose age was never given; these were tallied under the category not given. For the large school-size group, there were no protagonists below middle-school age, three middle-school age, and five above middle-school age. For the average school-size group, there were 2 protagonists below middle-school age, 34 middle-school age, 35 above middle-school age, and 6 whose age was not given. The small school-size group had one protagonist below middle-school age, six middle-school age, eight above middle-school age, and one whose age was not given. A chi-square test for association was conducted. There were small differences between expectation and reality for the numbers found for the average and large groups. The average school-size group had differences between expectation and reality with the above middle-school age protagonists expected to be 36.6 when in reality there were 35. Middle-school age protagonists were expected to be 32.8 in number but were 34 for the average group. The large group had a

small difference in expectation and reality as well. The expectation for the prevalence of protagonists who were above middle-school age was 3.8 when reality had 5 protagonists above middle-school age. Six cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and protagonist age prevalence, $\chi^2(6)=2.159$, $p=0.905$.

School size and protagonist SES. The prevalence of the protagonists' SES levels as poor, middle class, and upper class were assessed for associations with school size. The large school-size group had two poor, five middle-class, and one upper-class protagonists. The average group had 17 poor, 49 middle-class, and 11 upper-class protagonists. The small group had six poor, nine middle-class, and one upper-class protagonists. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expectation and reality for the small group's poor protagonists—4 and 6 respectively, and the average group's poor protagonists—19 and 17 respectively. Five cells had expected counts less than five. There was no statistically significant association found between school size and prevalence of SES level for the protagonists, $\chi^2(4)=2.055$, $p=0.726$.

School size and protagonist family structure. An association between school size and the protagonists' family structures was assessed using a chi-square test for association. Family structures were identified as households with one parent, two parents, guardians, or no parents/not named. The large school-size group had one protagonist with a guardian, four with one parent, one with two parents, and two with no parents named. The average school-size group had 7 protagonists with guardians, 30 with 1 parent, 26 with 2 parents, and 14 with no parents named. The small school-size group had one guardian, five one-parent, seven two-parent, and three no parent protagonists. The chi-square test found small differences between expectation and reality for the small school-size group with one-parent protagonists expecting to be 6.2 in

number but in reality only had 5 on the list. The two-parent protagonists were expected to be 5.4 in number but were 7 in reality. The large group also had one difference between expectation and reality with two-parent protagonists expected to be 2.7 in number with 1 on the list in reality. Six cells had expected counts of less than five. No statistically significant association was found, $\chi^2(6)=2.469$, $p=0.872$.

School size and protagonist personality traits. The prevalence of certain personality traits of the protagonists and school size were compared also using chi-square test for association. The protagonists' personality traits were tallied by the following dual categories: extroverted versus introverted, agreeable versus disagreeable, conscientious versus unconscientious, open to experience versus closed to experience, and emotionally stable versus neurotic. Table 4.13 demonstrates the findings of the personality traits for the protagonists in each school-size group.

Table 4.13

School Size and Personality Traits of the Protagonist

Personality Traits	Large School Size	Average School Size	Small School Size
Extroverted/Introverted	8/0	60/17	11/5
Agreeable/Disagreeable	7/1	63/14	14/2
Conscientious/Unconscientious	7/1	68/9	16/0
Open to Experience/Closed to Experience	8/0	77/0	16/0
Emotionally Stable/Neurotic	7/1	69/8	14/2

There were some differences among the personality traits regarding expectations and reality. For the small school-size group, the expectation was for 12.5 extroverted and 3.5 introverted protagonists but reality had 11 extroverted and 5 introverted protagonists. The small

group also had expected counts of 14.4 conscientious and 1.6 unconscientious protagonists when reality was 16 conscientious and 0 unconscientious protagonists. The average school-size group had expected counts of 64 agreeable and 13 disagreeable protagonists but in reality had 63 agreeable and 14 disagreeable protagonists. Expectations for the average group were also different than reality for the conscientious protagonist with numbers expected at 69.4 for conscientious and 7.6 for unconscientious with reality counting 68 conscientious and 9 unconscientious protagonists. The large school-size group had expected counts of 6.3 extroverted and 1.7 introverted protagonists when in reality there were 8 extroverted and 0 introverted protagonists. Chi-square tests for association between each personality trait and school size was conducted. For extroversion, there was no statistically significant association between school size and protagonist extroversion prevalence, $\chi^2(2)=3.074$, $p=0.215$. For agreeableness, there were two cells that had expected counts less than five. There was no statistically significant association between school size and protagonist agreeableness prevalence, $\chi^2(2)=0.422$, $p=0.810$. For conscientiousness, there was no statistically significant association between school size and prevalence of conscientious protagonists, $\chi^2(2)=0.351$, $p=0.351$. For emotionally stable protagonists, there were two cells that had expected counts of less than five. There was no statistically significant association between the school size and the prevalence of emotionally stable protagonists, $\chi^2(2)=0.84$, $p=0.959$. Because closed to experience had no tallies, where all protagonists were considered open to experience, the association between school size and prevalence of open-to-experience protagonists was not computed.

School size and theme. Another composition feature assessed was theme. Four themes were found among the 103 fiction texts: belief in the self, the struggle of good versus evil, the importance of relationships, and the importance of perseverance. For the large school-size group,

four books had as their main theme the struggle of good versus evil, one had the importance of relationships, and three had the importance of perseverance. For the average school-size group, 18 books' themes were the struggle of good versus evil, 13 had the importance of relationships, 39 had the importance of perseverance, and 7 had the belief in the self. For the small school-size group, four had the struggle of good versus evil, three had the importance of relationships, six had the importance of perseverance, and three had the belief in the self. A chi-square test for association showed small differences in each group's theme prevalence. For the small group, the theme of belief in the self had expected numbers of 1.6 but in reality had 3 texts; the importance of perseverance was expected to have 7.6 texts on the list but instead of 6. For the average group, the struggle of good versus evil was expected to have 19.8 texts but only had 18, and the importance of perseverance was expected to have 36.6 but had 39 texts. For the large group, the struggle of good versus evil was expected to have 2.1 texts but instead had 4. Seven cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and theme prevalence, $\chi^2(6)=4.898$, $p=0.557$.

School size and Lexile level. The Lexile level of the text was also assessed to determine if school size was correlated to the difficulty level of the text. For the large school-size group, the range of Lexile levels was from 390 to 1093. The range of Lexile levels for the average school-size group was from 270 to 1573. The range of Lexile levels for the small school-size group was from 390 to 1380. Each of the Lexile level scores for the schools were grouped according to the school size. Spearman's rho was used to determine that there was not a significant correlation between school size and Lexile levels, $r_s(116)=-0.14$, $p=0.876$.

School size and cover art. Physical features of the text were also assessed for a prevalence of certain characteristics associated with school size. The primary cover art used on

the 120 popular texts were categorized into 5 categories: abstract design, inanimate objects, landscape design, nonhuman characters, and person/people. For the large school-size group, seven books depicted a person/people as the focal point of the cover art, two books depicted nonhuman characters, and one depicted a landscape design. For the average school-size group 68 depicted a person/people, 8 depicted nonhuman characters; 6 focused on a landscape design, 4 used inanimate objects, and 4 had an abstract design. The small school-size group had 12 depicting a person/people, 3 a nonhuman character; 1 had a landscape design, 3 had an inanimate object, and 1 had an abstract design. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expectation and reality for some of the categories. There was a small difference in the prevalence of inanimate objects and person/people for the small group with inanimate objects expecting to have 1.2 texts but having 3 in reality and person/people expecting to have 14.5 text with 12 in reality. The average school-size group had expectations for the inanimate object to have 5.3 texts, nonhuman characters to have 9.8 texts, and person/people to have 65.3 texts when in reality the inanimate objects had 4, the nonhuman characters 8 and the person/people 68. Nine cells had expected counts of less than five. There was no statistically significant association between school size and cover art prevalence found, $\chi^2(8)=6.444$, $p=0.598$.

School size and back-of-book information. Another physical feature that was assessed was the back-of-the-book or book jacket information. The information from the 120 books was categorized as a summary, a text snippet, or a listing of other titles in the series. The large school-size group had seven books with summaries and three with snippets on the back or book jacket. The average group had 87 summaries, 2 snippets, and 1 listing of other titles in the series. The small group had 19 summaries and 1 snippet. A chi-square test of association showed differences between the expected number and real number for the average and large groups. The

expectation for the average group's snippet type was to be 4.5 and summary with 84.8, when reality has the snippet at only 2 and summary at 87. For the large group, the expectation was for the summary to have 9.4 and snippet 0.5, when in reality the summary books for the large group had 7 and the snippet books had 3. There were six cells that had expected counts of less than five. There was a statistically significant association between school size and the back-of-book/book jacket information, $\chi^2(4)=14.904$, $p=0.005$.

School size and publication year. External influences were also assessed for an association with school size. One external influence observed was the first year of publication for the books. The initial publication year for each of the 120 books was documented, as shown in Table 4.14. Overall, the books on the top 10 lists ranged in publication year from 1982 to 2013. The large school-size group's most popular texts ranged in publication year from 2008 to 2013. For the average school-size group, the years ranged from 1982 to 2013. The small group ranged from 1999 to 2011. A chi-square test for association found differences among the prevalence of publication years for the small and average school-size groups than what would be expected. The large school-size group had similar expected and observed counts. For the small group, the expectation of the number of books on the list from the publishing years of 1999 to 2003 was 0.7, from 2004 to 2008 as 5.7, and 2009 to 2013 as 13.2. However, the realistic numbers for 1999 to 2003 were 4 texts, 2004 to 2008 as 7, and 2009 to 2013 as 9. The small school-size group, as the data showed, had higher-than-expected numbers of older texts on the lists and lower-than-expected numbers of newer texts. For the average school-size group, 3 books published from 1999 to 2003 were expected to be on the list, along with 25.5 books from 2004 to 2008, and 59.3 books from 2009 to 2013. Instead, there were no books from 1999 to 2003 on the list for the average group, 24 from 2004 to 2008 and 63 from 2009 to 2013.

Table 4.14

School Size and Publication Year Expected and Observed Counts

		Publication Year						Total
		1979- 1983	1984- 1988	1994- 1998	1999- 2003	2004- 2008	2009- 2013	
School Size	Small	Count	0	0	0	4	7	20
		Expected Count	.2	.2	.2	.7	5.7	20.0
		% within schoolsize	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	35.0%	100.0%
		% within pub.year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	20.6%	16.7%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	5.8%	16.7%
	Medium	Count	1	1	1	0	24	90
		Expected Count	.8	.8	.8	3.0	25.5	90.0
		% within schoolsize	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	26.7%	100.0%
		% within pubyear	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	70.6%	75.0%
		% of Total	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	20.0%	75.0%
	Large	Count	0	0	0	0	3	10
		Expected Count	.1	.1	.1	.3	2.8	10.0
		% within schoolsize	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		% within pubyear	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	8.3%
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	8.3%
Total		Count	1	1	1	4	34	120
		Expected Count	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	34.0	120.0
		% within schoolsize	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	3.3%	28.3%	100.0%
		% within pubyear	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	3.3%	28.3%	100.0%

The average school-size group had higher-than-expected numbers of newer books on the list and lower-than-expected numbers of older books. The large school-size group had expected counts similar to the observed counts. Thirteen cells had expected counts less than five. There was a statistically significant association between school size and the year of publication, $\chi^2(10)=22.994$, $p=0.011$.

School size and Teens Top Ten. School size and the prevalence of books on the top 10 lists that were also on YALSA's Teens Top 10 was also assessed. All of the books on the study's top 10 lists for the schools were checked for on the YALSA's Teens Top 10 lists since its beginning in 2003 (YALSA, 2015). For each school-size group, a tally was placed for each of the books on both the study's top 10 lists as well as the YALSA's Teens Top 10 lists. For the large school-size group, one book was on the YALSA list and nine were not. For the average school-size group, 12 were on the YALSA list and 78 were not. For the small school-size group, 5 were on the YALSA list and 15 were not. A chi-square test for association was used to determine if there were differences among the groups. Small differences were found for the small and average school-size groups. For the small group, it was expected for there to be 3 books on the list and 17 books not on the list, yet there were 5 on the list and 15 not. For the average group, there were expected to be 13.5 on the list and 76.5 not; however, there were 12 on the list and 78 not. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and the prevalence of texts from the Teens Top 10 lists, $\chi^2(2)=1.961$, $p=0.375$.

School size and award-winning texts. Another external influence assessed was whether a text was award-winning. Using the book cover, the district's county public library system, and the website Goodreads, tallies were made for each text that had won an award. Tallies were also

made to determine what types of awards each book had won. Three categories were made regarding award type—state awards, which were awards that were at the state level; panel awards—which were awards where a panel of people chose the award winner; and reader-chosen awards—which were awards where the readers nominated and/or selected the award winner. The large school-size group had three award-winning books and seven that had won no awards. The average group had 19 award-winning books and 71 that had won no awards. The small group had 7 award-winning books and 13 that did not. Of the award-winning texts, the large group had two books that had one state awards and one that had won a panel-chosen award. The average group had 7 state awards, 8 panel-chosen awards, and 11 reader-chosen awards. The small group had four state awards, 5 panel-chosen, and 3 reader-chosen awards. Two chi-square tests for associations were conducted to determine, first, if there was an association between school size and the prevalence of award-winning texts and, second, to determine if there was an association between school size and the prevalence of certain types of awards won. The tests indicated small differences among the groups. For the small group, expectations were that there would have been 4.8 award-winning texts and 15.2 non-award winners on the list, yet there were 7 award winners and 13 non-award books. For the average group, the expectation was that there would be 21.8 award winners and 86.3 non-award books, yet there were 19 award winners and 71 non-award books. For the first test, there were two cells that had expected counts less than five. There were also small differences in the expectations and realizations of the types of awards won. For the average group, it was expected that there would be 8.2 state awards and 8.9 reader-chosen awards, but there were 7 state awards and 11 reader-chosen awards. For the large group, the expectations were that there would be 1 state award and 1 reader-chosen award, yet there were 2 state award and no reader-chosen awards. Six cells had expected counts less than five in the

second test. Neither the association between school size and prevalence of award-winning texts ($\chi^2(2)=19.25$, $p=0.382$) nor the association between school size and the prevalence of a specific award type ($\chi^2(4)=3.466$, $p=0.483$) were statistically significant.

School size and district's approved novels list. The prevalence of texts from the district's list of approved novels for classroom use was assessed to determine if there was an association with this and the size of the school. The district's lists for the texts approved for classroom use in middle schools were taken to compare to the list of the study's popular texts. For the large group, only 1 of the 10 books was on the district's list. For the average group, 2 of the 90 books were on the list, and only 2 of the 20 books from the small group's lists were on the district's list. A chi-square test for association found small differences among the groups. The small group's expectation for books on the district's list was 0.8 when it had 2 instead. The average group was expected to have 3.8 on the list but only had 2. Three cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and the prevalence of books from the district's approved novels list, $\chi^2(2)=3.409$, $p=0.182$.

School size and Accelerated Reader. The prevalence of books on the top 10 lists that were also AR books was assessed to determine if there was an association between the AR books and school size. Of the 120 books, 90 were AR books. For the large school-size group, seven books were AR books, three were not. For the average school-size group, 68 were AR books, while 22 were not. For the small group, 15 were AR books and 5 were not. A chi-square test for association found no real differences between expectation and reality for the AR books. One cell had an expected count less than five. There was not a statistically significant difference between school size and the prevalence of AR books, $\chi^2(2)=0.148$, $p=0.929$.

The points that each book is designated through AR were also assessed to see if there was a correlation between the number of AR points for the books and the size of the school. Overall, the AR points ranged from 0.5 to 23 points for the books on the study's lists. For the large school-size group, the AR points ranged from 1 to 20. The average school-size group's points ranged from 0.5 to 23, and the small school-size group ranged from 1 to 19 points. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if there was a correlation. For each group—small, average, and large—there was a normal curve of the data, with skewness and kurtosis used to determine normality for the small ($z=-0.138$, $z=-1.514$, relatively) and average ($z=1.491$, $z=-2.272$, relatively) groups and Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p=0.982$) for the large group. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met as determined by Levene's test, $W=0.414$. However, there was not a statistically significant correlation between AR points and school size, $F(2,87)=43.339$, $p=0.632$.

School size and movies/television connection. To determine if school size and a prevalence of books made into or made from television/movies was associated, two chi-square tests for association were conducted. Using websites such as IMDb to determine if books had been made into or from movies or television, tallies were made in two of four categories: Yes—Made Into Movie/TV, No—Not Made Into Movie/TV, Yes—Made From Movie/TV, No—Not Made From Movie TV. Books that had been made into movies or television shows were assessed first. There was one book in the large school-size group that had been made into a movie or television show and nine that had not. There were 34 books in the average group made into movies or television shows and 56 that had not. For the small school-size group, there were eight books made into movie/television shows with only two that had not. The chi-square test showed small differences between the expectations and real numbers of the average and large groups. It

was expected that the average group would have 32.3 books that had been made into movies/television shows and 57.8 that had not, but the group had 34 books that had been made into the media and 56 that had not. The large group was expected to have 3.6 books on their lists that had been made into movies or television shows and 6.4 that had not. In reality, the large group had only one book made into a movie/television show and nine that had not. One cell had an expected count less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and the prevalence of books that had been made into movies/television shows, $\chi^2(2)=3.201$, $p=0.202$.

For books made from movies or television shows, only one book overall had been made from a television show. The large school-size group and the small group had no books made from movies or television. The average school-size group had 1 out of 80 books. The chi-square test found no real difference between the groups. Three cells had expected counts less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and the prevalence of books made from movies or television, $\chi^2(2)=0.336$, $p=0.845$.

School size and social media. Finally, the prevalence of books with a social media page for the text or the author and its possible association with school size was assessed using the chi-square test for association. Overall, 103 of the 120 texts on the lists had social media pages—specifically Facebook or Twitter pages. The large school-size group had seven of its texts with a social media page with three books not having a page. For the average school-size group, there were 77 books with a social media page and 13 without. The small group had 19 books with a social media page and one without a page. The chi-square test found small differences in the expectation and reality of the numbers. The small group was expected to have 17.2 books with social media pages when it actually had 19 books. The large group was expected to have 8.6

books with a Facebook or Twitter page when it had only 7. Two cells had expected counts less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between school size and the prevalence of books with social media pages, $\chi^2(2)=3.449$, $p=0.178$

Minority Percentage Levels and Text Variables

As previously stated, schools were grouped also by their percentage of non-white students into categories titled Low Minority Level (LML), Average Minority Level (AML), and High Minority Level (HML). The LML consisted of 1 school, which had 6.2% of its population as non-white students. The AML consisted of 9 schools that had a range of 8.8% to 38.5% of the population for the schools as non-white students and an average of 22.49% non-white student population. The HML group had 2 schools with a high minority level in each of their student populations, 48.5% and 80.4%.

Minority level and genre. Composition features of the texts, such as genre, subgenre, protagonist and author characteristics, were analyzed to determine if there were an association between the feature and the minority level of the schools. First, an association between minority level and genre prevalence was addressed. For the LML school, there were 7 fiction texts and 3 nonfiction texts on the school's top 10 list. For the AML schools, there were 79 fiction and 11 nonfiction texts on the lists. The HML schools had 17 fiction and 3 nonfiction texts on the lists. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the LML and AML groups and the genre prevalence. The LML group's expected number of fiction texts on the list was 8.6 when in actuality it had 7; its expected number of nonfiction texts was 1.4 but in reality it had 3. There was an expectation for the AML group to have 77.3 fiction and 12.8 nonfiction texts on the list, but it had 79 fiction and 11 nonfiction texts. Two cells had expected counts of less than

five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and genre prevalence, $\chi^2(2)=2.353$, $p=0.308$.

Minority level and subgenres/formats. Subgenre prevalence in association with the minority level of the schools was also analyzed. Table 4.15 depicts the subgenres of the texts on the top 10 lists and the prevalence of that subgenre on the top 10 list for each of the minority level groups. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expectation and realization of subgenres for all three groups.

Table 4.15

Number of Texts for Subgenre by Minority Level Group

Subgenre	High Minority Level	Average Minority Level	Low Minority Level
Drawing/Decorative Arts	1	3	0
Encyclopedia/Book of Facts	2	2	1
Graphic Novel-Humor	0	4	0
Graphic Novel-Science Fiction/Fantasy	8	26	6
Historical Fiction	0	2	0
History of the Ancient World	0	1	0
Horror	1	1	0
Manufacturing/Weaponry	0	0	1
Military/Engineering	0	1	1
Realistic Humor	2	6	0
Realistic Romance	1	1	0
Realistic Sports	0	1	0
Recreation/Performing Arts	0	2	0
Science Fiction/Fantasy Novel	5	36	1
Spy Thriller	0	2	0
Zoologic/Animals	0	2	0

The LML group had expectations for 3.3 graphic novel-science fiction/fantasy books and 3.5 science fiction/fantasy novels to be on the list. However, the LML group instead had six graphic

novel-science fiction/fantasy and one science fiction/fantasy novel on its list. The AML group was expected to have 3.8 encyclopedia/book of facts, 30 graphic novel-science fiction/fantasy, and 31.5 science fiction/fantasy novels. Instead, it had only 2 encyclopedia/book of facts, 26 graphic novel-science fiction/fantasy books, and 36 science fiction/fantasy novels on the lists. The HML group was expected to have 0.8 encyclopedia/book of facts, 6.7 graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy, and 7 science fiction/fantasy novels, yet the group had 2 encyclopedia/book of facts, 8 graphic novel-science fiction/fantasy, and only 5 science fiction/fantasy novels. Forty-three cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and subgenre prevalence, $\chi^2(30)=34.367$, $p=0.266$.

An association between minority level and the number of series books on the top 10 lists was assessed. A chi square test for association was conducted to determine if the percentage of minorities within the school was associated with the number of series books on the top 10 lists. The test indicated that the association between minority level and the prevalence of series books on the top 10 lists was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(2)=2.147$, $p=0.342$. The data showed small differences between the expected number of series books and the observed number of series books on the top 10 lists. The group with the high percentage of minority students was expected to have 16.8 series books, but instead the group had 19 books on the list as books in a series. The group that had an average number of minority students was expected to have 75.8 series books on the lists, but the group only had 74. Finally, the group with the low percentage of minority students was expected to have 8.4 series books on the list but had 8 series books instead.

Minority level and author gender. The gender of the author was also assessed for the 103 fictional texts alone since some of the nonfiction texts had corporations as authors. The

HML group had 12 male and 5 female authors of the books on their lists. The AML group had 47 male and 32 female authors, while the LML group had 7 male and 0 female authors of the texts. A chi-square test for association indicated small differences between the expectations of the male/female ratio and the reality of the study. The HML group was expected to have 10.9 male and 6.1 female authors but instead had 12 male and 5 female. The AML group was expected to have 50.6 male and 28.4 female authors, but they had 47 male and 32 female. For the LML group, expectations were that there would be 4.5 male and 2.5 female authors, whereas there were 7 males and 0 female authors. Two cells had expected counts less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and author gender prevalence; however, it approached significance, $\chi^2(2)=4.958$, $p=0.084$.

Minority level and author race/ethnicity. The 103 fictional texts were also assessed for each author's race/ethnicity. A chi-square test for association was also used to determine if there was an association between minority level and the prevalence of a certain race/ethnicity for the authors of the texts. The LML group had five Asian and two white authors of its fictional texts. The AML group had 1 African-American, 7 Asian, 70 white authors, and 1 author that did not reveal his race/ethnicity through pictures or descriptions. The HML group had 1 African-American, 4 Asian, and 12 white authors of fictional texts. The chi-square test indicated differences between the expectations and observations for author race/ethnicity for each group, as shown in Table 4.16. The LML group was expected to have 1.1 Asian authors and 5.7 white authors but instead had 5 Asian and 2 white authors of the fictional texts. The AML group's expectation of 12.3 Asian and 64.4 white authors was different from the reality of 17 Asian and 70 white authors.

Table 4.16

Minority Level and Author Race Expected and Observed Counts

		Author Race				Total	
		Black	Asian	White	Not Given		
Minority Level	Low	Count	0	5	2	0	7
		Expected Count	.1	1.1	5.7	.1	7.0
		% within Minority Level	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Author Race	0.0%	31.3%	2.4%	0.0%	6.8%
		% of Total	0.0%	4.9%	1.9%	0.0%	6.8%
	Average	Count	1	7	70	1	79
		Expected Count	1.5	12.3	64.4	.8	79.0
		% within Minority Level	1.3%	8.9%	88.6%	1.3%	100.0%
		% within Author Race	50.0%	43.8%	83.3%	100.0%	76.7%
		% of Total	1.0%	6.8%	68.0%	1.0%	76.7%
	High	Count	1	4	12	0	17
		Expected Count	.3	2.6	13.9	.2	17.0
		% within Minority Level	5.9%	23.5%	70.6%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Author Race	50.0%	25.0%	14.3%	0.0%	16.5%
		% of Total	1.0%	3.9%	11.7%	0.0%	16.5%
Total	Count	2	16	84	1	103	
	Expected Count	2.0	16.0	84.0	1.0	103.0	
	% within Minority Level	1.9%	15.5%	81.6%	1.0%	100.0%	
	% within Author Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	1.9%	15.5%	81.6%	1.0%	100.0%	

The LML group was expected to have 1.1 Asian authors and 5.7 white authors but instead had 5 Asian and 2 white authors of the fictional texts. The AML group's expectation of 12.3 Asian and 64.4 white authors was different from the reality of 17 Asian and 70 white authors. The HML

group was expected to have 2.6 Asian and 13.9 white authors, but the group had 4 Asian and 12 white authors, instead. Eight cells had expected counts of less than five. There was a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of certain author race/ethnicity, $\chi^2(6)=22.170$, $p=0.001$.

Minority level and protagonist gender. Along with author characteristics, protagonist characteristics were also addressed. First, a prevalence of a certain protagonist gender was analyzed for a possible association with the schools' minority levels. The HML group had nine male protagonists and eight female protagonists. The AML group had 39 male and 34 female protagonists. The LML group had six male and one female protagonist. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected count for male or female protagonists in the LML and AML groups. The LML group was expected to have 3.9 male and 3.1 female protagonists but had 6 male and 1 female, instead. The AML group was expected to have 40.6 male and 32.4 female but instead had 39 male and 34 female protagonists. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and prevalence of protagonist gender, $\chi^2(2)=2.761$, $p=0.251$.

Minority level and protagonist race/ethnicity. The race/ethnicity of each protagonist was also addressed for each of the 101 fictional books that only had 1 protagonist. Race/ethnicity was determined by the description given by the author in the text and, if available, pictures on the cover art of the depicted protagonist. There were five categories for the races/ethnicities depicted in the texts: Asian, Native American, White, Nonhuman Character, and Not Given—for those characters where no description or picture is given to determine race or ethnicity, as shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17

Minority Level and Protagonist Race Expected and Observed Counts

		Protagonist Race					Total
		Asian	Native American	White	Not Human	Not given	
Minority Level	Low	Count	4	0	2	1	7
		Expected Count	.7	.1	5.2	1.0	7.0
		% within Minority Level	57.1%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	100.0 %
		% within Protagonist Race	40.0%	0.0%	2.7%	7.1%	0.0%
		% of Total	4.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.0%	6.9%
	Average	Count	4	1	62	10	77
		Expected Count	7.6	.8	57.2	10.7	77.0
		% within Minority Level	5.2%	1.3%	80.5%	13.0%	100.0 %
		% within Protagonist Race	40.0%	100.0%	82.7%	71.4%	0.0%
		% of Total	4.0%	1.0%	61.4%	9.9%	76.2%
	High	Count	2	0	11	3	17
		Expected Count	1.7	.2	12.6	2.4	17.0
		% within Minority Level	11.8%	0.0%	64.7%	17.6%	100.0 %
		% within Protagonist Race	20.0%	0.0%	14.7%	21.4%	100.0%
		% of Total	2.0%	0.0%	10.9%	3.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	10	1	75	14	101
		Expected Count	10.0	1.0	75.0	14.0	101.0
		% within Minority Level	9.9%	1.0%	74.3%	13.9%	100.0 %
		% within Protagonist Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %
		% of Total	9.9%	1.0%	74.3%	13.9%	1.0%

. The HML group had 2 Asian, 11 white, and 3 nonhuman protagonists, as well as 1 protagonist whose race/ethnicity was not given. The AML group had 4 Asian, 1 Native American, 62 white, and 10 nonhuman protagonists. The LML group had four Asian, two white, and one nonhuman protagonist. A chi-square test for association found differences among the expected and real counts for the races/ethnicities among the three groups. The HML group was expected to have 12.6 white protagonists but had only 11. The AML was expected to have 7.6 Asian and 57.2 white protagonists but instead had 4 Asian and 62 white protagonists. The LML group was expected to have 0.7 Asian and 5.2 white but had 4 Asian and only 2 white protagonists. Ten cells had expected counts of less than five. There was a statistically significant association between minority level and prevalence for certain protagonists' race/ethnicity, $\chi^2(8)=25.616$, $p=0.001$.

Minority level and protagonist age. Another characteristic of the protagonist that was assessed was the protagonist's age. For 101 fictional texts, there were four possible categories for age: below middle school (age 9 and under), middle school (age 10 to 14), above middle school (age 15 and older), and not given (no age was identified). The HML group had seven middle-school age protagonists, eight above middle-school age protagonists, and two whose age were not given. The AML group had 3 below middle-school age, 35 middle-school age, 34 above middle-school age protagonists, and 5 whose ages were not given. The LML group had one middle-school age and six above middle-school age protagonists. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected counts and the reality of the study. The AML group was expected to have 32.8 protagonists at the middle-school age and 36.6 above middle school. Instead, the group had 35 middle-school and 34 above middle-school protagonists. The LML group was expected to have 3 middle-school age and 3.3 above middle-

school age protagonists. The group instead had one middle-school age and six above middle-school age protagonists. There was not, however, a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of protagonist's age, $\chi^2(6)=5.821$, $p=0.444$.

Minority level and protagonist SES. The SES level of the protagonist was also assessed for 101 fictional texts. The SES categories for the protagonists were called poor, middle class, and upper class. A chi-square test for association was conducted. The HML group had 5 poor and 12 middle-class protagonists. The AML group had 19 poor, 46 middle-class, and 12 upper-class protagonists. The LML group had one poor, five middle-class, and one upper-class protagonist. There were small differences between the expected count and reality of the study for protagonist SES. The AML group was expected to have 48 middle-class and 9.9 upper-class protagonists but had 46 middle-class and 12 upper-class in the study. The HML group was expected to have 10.6 middle-class and 2.2 upper-class protagonists; however, in reality the HML group had 12 middle-class and 0 upper-class protagonists. There was not a statistically significant association, though, between minority level and prevalence of certain protagonist SES, $\chi^2(4)=3.460$, $p=0.484$.

Minority level and protagonist family structure. The family structure of the protagonists was another characteristic addressed. Four categories were used to describe the protagonist's family structure: having a guardian, having one parent, having two parents, and having no parents or none mentioned. The HML group had one protagonist with a guardian, five who lived in one-parent households, seven who lived in two-parent households, and four who had no parents or the parents were never mentioned. The AML group had 7 protagonists with a guardian, 32 in 1-parent households, 24 who lived with 2 parents, and 14 who had no parents or none were mentioned. The LML group had one protagonist with a guardian, two in one-parent

households, three in two-parent households, and one who had no parents. A chi-square test for association revealed small differences between the expected and real counts for family structure. The AML group was expected to have 29.7 protagonists in 2-parent households and 25.9 with no parents or none mentioned. Instead, they had 32 in 2-parent households and 24 no-parent protagonists. The HML group was expected to have 6.6 in 2-parent households and 5.7 with no parents or none mentioned. They instead had five in two-parent households and seven with no parent or none mentioned. Six cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of certain protagonist family structure, $\chi^2(6)=2.030$, $p=0.917$.

Minority level and protagonist personality traits. The protagonist's personality traits of extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and emotional stability, and their opposites, were also observed in 101 fictional texts. Table 4.18 indicates the number of protagonists for each group whose behavior exemplified the trait.

Table 4.18

Minority Level and Protagonist Personality Traits

Personality Traits	HML Group	AML Group	LML Group
Extroversion	12	62	5
Introversion	5	15	2
Agreeable	14	66	4
Disagreeable	3	11	3
Conscientious	16	69	6
Unconscientious	1	8	1
Open to Experience	17	77	7
Close to Experience	0	0	0
Emotionally Stable	14	70	6
Neurotic	3	7	1

Chi-square tests of association revealed small differences between the expected counts of the traits and what was observed. For the LML group, the expected count for agreeable protagonists was 5.8 and disagreeable protagonists 1.2; however, the actual counts were 4 for agreeable protagonists and 3 for disagreeable. The AML group had expected counts for extroverted protagonists of 60.2 and introverted at 15, but the study had 62 extroverted and 15 introverted protagonists for the group. There were also differences between the expected and real counts in the AML group for agreeableness and disagreeableness and for emotional stability and neurosis traits. The expected count for agreeableness was 64 with the real count being 66; the expected count for disagreeableness was 1.2 but instead was 3. The expected count for emotional stability was 68.6 but was instead 70, and the expected count for neurotic protagonists was 8.4 but there were only 7.

The HML group also had small differences between the expected and real counts. The expected numbers of extroverted protagonists were 13.3 but instead there were only 12; the expected number of introverted protagonists was 3.7, but the group had 5. The expected count for emotionally stable protagonists was 15.1 but only 14 were found, and the expected number of neurotic protagonists was 1.9 but 3 were found. The chi-square tests for association found no statistically significant association between minority level and extroversion ($\chi^2(2)=1.010$, $p=0.604$, $\Phi_c=0.604$), agreeableness ($\chi^2(2)=3.752$, $p=0.153$), conscientiousness ($\chi^2(2)=0.479$, $p=0.787$), and emotional stability ($\chi^2(2)=1.140$, $p=0.566$). Since all protagonists in the study were found to be open to experience, no association to minority level was computed.

Minority level and theme. Besides characteristics of the protagonist and author, another element of the text—theme—was assessed for any association with a school's minority level. Four common themes were found as the main focus of 101 fictional texts: belief in the self, the

struggle of good versus evil, the importance of relationships, and the importance of perseverance. The HLM group had two texts with the theme of belief in the self, five with the struggle of good versus evil, three with the importance of relationships, and seven with the theme of perseverance. The AML group had 7 texts with the theme of belief in the self, 19 with the struggle of good versus evil, 14 with the importance of relationships, and 37 with the importance of perseverance. The LML group had one text with the theme of belief in the self, two with the struggle of good versus evil, and four text that had perseverance as a main theme. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected and real counts. In the LML group, 1.2 texts were expected to have the theme of the importance of relationships when there were no texts with this theme. The AML group was expected to have 13 texts with the importance of relationships but instead had 14. The HML group was expected to have 8.1 texts with the perseverance theme but only had 7. Some cells had expected counts less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of a theme, $\chi^2(6)=1.945$, $p=0.925$.

Minority level and Lexile level. Finally, the Lexile level of the text—another composition feature—was evaluated for any association with minority level. For the LML group, the Lexile levels ranged from 323 to 1380. The AML group's Lexile levels ranged from 280 to 1450. The Lexile levels for the HML group ranged from 323 to 1380. A chi-square test for association found there was not a statistically significant association between minority level and Lexile level but approached asymptotic significance, $\chi^2(136)=158.531$, $p=0.091$.

Minority level and cover art. An association between minority level and each of the physical features of the texts was determined. Five categories of cover art images were found for all 120 texts: abstract designs, inanimate objects, landscapes, nonhuman characters, and a person

or people. The HML group had 1 text with an abstract design, 1 with an animate object prominent in the cover art, 3 with nonhuman characters, and 15 with a person or people. The AML group had 3 abstract covers, 4 with inanimate objects, 8 with landscapes, 10 with nonhuman characters, and 65 with a person or people on the cover. The LML group had one cover with an abstract design, two with inanimate objects, and seven that had a person or people as the cover art's main subject. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected and real counts. For the LML group, the expected count for books with inanimate objects as the cover art's focal point was 0.6, but, in reality, there were 2. For nonhuman characters, the expected count was 1.1, but there were none of this type. For the AML group, the expectation for cover art with inanimate objects was 5.3, but, instead, there were 4. The expected count for cover art with landscapes as the main focus was six, but there were eight of these. The HML group was expected to have 1.3 texts with landscapes as the cover art, but they had none. Nine cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of certain cover art, $\chi^2(8)=8.866$, $p=0.354$.

Minority level and back-of-book information. Another physical feature assessed was the back-of-book or book jacket information. Three types of information were presented on the book jacket or back cover of the book most prominently for all 120 books: a brief summary of the story/topic, an actual snippet of text from the book, or other titles from a series. The HML group had 19 texts with summaries and 1 with a snippet. The AML group had 84 texts with summaries and 5 texts with a snippet. The LML group had all 10 texts with summaries. A chi-square test for association found no real differences between the expected and real counts. Six cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association

between the back-of-the-book or book jacket information and minority level, $\chi^2(4)=0.933$, $p=0.920$.

Minority level and publication year. Besides the composition and physical features, certain external influences may have an association with a school's minority level. The earliest year of publication for each of the 120 texts was documented. Years were categorized into four-year sections of time: 1979 to 1983, 1984 to 1988, 1989 to 1993, 1994 to 1998, 1999 to 2003, 2004 to 2008, and 2009 to 2013. Table 4.19 portrays the number of texts each group had in each of the four-year categories.

Table 4.19

Texts' Years of Publication in Four-Year Sections and Minority Level

Minority Level Group	1979 to 1983	1984 to 1988	1989 to 1993	1994 to 1998	1999 to 2003	2004 to 2008	2009 to 2013
HML	0	0	0	0	4	5	11
AML	1	1	0	1	0	23	64
LML	0	0	0	0	0	6	4

A chi-square test for association showed differences between expected and real counts. For the LML group, the expected count for texts published in 2004 to 2008 was 2.8 and 2009 to 2013 was 6.6, but the group had 6 in 2004 to 2008 and 4 in 2009 to 2013. The AML group was expected to have 3 texts published in the years 1999 to 2003 but had no books published during those years. The group also had lower numbers than expected for the years 2004 to 2008, where the expected count was 25.5 and the real count was 23. Instead, the AML group had more than the expected count for texts published in 2009 to 2013 with the expected count at 59.3 and the real count at 64. The HML group also demonstrated differences. The group had an expected

count of 0.7 texts published in 1999 to 2003, but the real count was 4. The expected count for texts published in 2009 to 2013 was 13.2, but the HML group had only 11 texts that had been published in those years. There were 13 cells with counts less than 5. There was a statistically significant association between minority level and publication year, $\chi^2(10)=26.614$, $p=0.003$.

Minority level and award-winning texts. The prevalence of award-winning texts on the top 10 lists was examined as well for its association with a school's minority level. Tally marks were given in the categories of "Yes" if a text was award-winning and "No" if it had not won any awards. Tallies were also used to show the number of texts that had received a state, panel-chosen, or reader-chosen award. The HML group had 3 award-winning texts and 17 that had not won an award. The three award-winning texts had won, in total, two panel-chosen and three reader-chosen awards. The AML group had 26 award-winning texts and 64 texts without awards. The 26 award-winning texts shared 13 state, 12 panel-chosen, and 11 reader-chosen awards. The LML group had none of their 10 texts with awards. Two chi-square tests for association showed small differences between expected and real counts. The HML group was expected to have 4.8 award-winning texts, but they only had 3. Instead of having 15.2 texts that were not award-winning as expected, the group had 17. The AML group was expected to have 21.8 award-winning texts; however, they had 26. Their expected count for texts with no awards was 68.3, but they had only 64. The LML group was expected to have 2.4 award-winning texts, but they had none. The group was expected to have 7.6 texts without awards, but they had 10. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of award-winning texts, although it approached significance, $\chi^2(2)=5.199$, $p=0.074$.

There were also small differences found between expected and real counts for the three types of awards. The AML group was expected to have 11.4 texts that had won state awards, but they had 13. It was expected for the group to have 12.3 texts with reader-chosen awards; however, they had 11. The HML group was expected to have 1.6 texts that had won state awards, but they had none. They were also expected to have 1.7 texts with reader-chosen awards, but they had 3. Three cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of texts that won certain types of awards, $\chi^2(2.977, p=0.226)$.

Minority level and Teens Top Ten. The YALSA Teens Top 10 list was another external influence that may be associated with a school's minority level. Each of the 120 texts on the district's top 10 lists of the most popular books was cross-referenced with YALSA's Teens Top 10 list and tallied whether they were on the list or not. The HML group had 2 texts on the YALSA list and 17 that were not on the list. The AML group had 15 on the list and 75 not on the list. The LML group had none of their 10 texts on the YALSA list. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected counts and the real counts. The LML group was expected to have 1.5 texts also on the YALSA list but had none. The AML group was expected to have 13.5 texts on the Teens Top 10 list but had 15 instead. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of texts that were also on the YALSA Teens Top 10 list, $\chi^2(2)=1.961$, $p=0.375$.

Minority level and district's approved novels list. An association between a school's minority level and the prevalence on the top 10 list of texts from the district's test of approved novels for classroom use was also addressed. The 120 texts from the study were cross-checked

with the district's list of books that were approved for use in teaching in the classroom for grades 6, 7, and 8. For the HML group, none of the 20 texts were from the district's list. The AML group had 5 of their 90 books on the list. The LML group also had none of their 10 books on the list. A chi-square test for association found a small difference between the expected count for texts on the district's list (3.8) and the real count of 5. Three cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of texts from the district's approved novels list, $\chi^2(2)=1.739$, $p=0.419$.

Minority level and Accelerated Reader. The Accelerated Reader (AR) program was another possible external influence on the popular texts in the study. Each of the 120 books' titles were looked up on the AR website to determine if the book was considered an AR book and the number of points the book was valued within the AR program. The HML group had 14 AR books of its 20 books. The AML group had 74 of its 90 books found in the AR program. The LML group had two AR books and eight texts that were not in the AR program. A chi-square test for association found differences between the expected and real counts of AR texts, as presented in Table 4.20. The LML group was expected to have 7.5 AR books on the list but only had 2. The AML group was expected to have 67.5 texts from AR, but they had more with 74 AR books. The HML group had small differences between the expected 15 AR books and the real number of 14 in the AR program. One cell had an expected count of less than five. There was a statistically significant association between minority level and the prevalence of AR texts in the top 10 lists, $\chi^2(2)=18.904$, $p=0.000$.

Table 4.20

Minority Level and Accelerated Reader Expected and Observed Counts

		<u>Accelerated Reader</u>		Total
		Yes	No	
Minority Level	Low	Count	2	8
		Expected Count	7.5	2.5
		% within minoritylevel	20.0%	80.0%
		% within accelreader	2.2%	26.7%
		% of Total	1.7%	6.7%
	Average	Count	74	16
		Expected Count	67.5	22.5
		% within minoritylevel	82.2%	17.8%
		% within accelreader	82.2%	53.3%
		% of Total	61.7%	13.3%
	High	Count	14	6
		Expected Count	15.0	5.0
		% within minoritylevel	70.0%	30.0%
		% within accelreader	15.6%	20.0%
		% of Total	11.7%	5.0%
Total		Count	90	30
		Expected Count	90.0	30.0
		% within minoritylevel	75.0%	25.0%
		% within accelreader	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	75.0%	25.0%

A correlation between the point value of the AR book and the school's minority level was also studied. The HML group's 15 AR books ranged in point value from 1 to 19. The AML group had 74 AR books ranging from 0.5 points to 23. The LML group's two AR books were valued at 1 point and 19 points. The AML and HML groups' data had a normal curve as demonstrated by skewness and kurtosis. The HML group's data had a skewness of $z=1.00$ and kurtosis of $z=-1.245$. The AML group's data had a skewness of $z=1.007$ and kurtosis of $z=-$

2.380. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met according to Levene's test ($W=0.374$). A one-way ANOVA indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between minority levels and the AR points, $F(2, 87)=24.648$, $p=0.771$.

Minority level and movie/television connection. A possible association between a school's minority level and the prevalence of texts that were made into or from television and movies was assessed. Each of the 120 texts were checked through websites such as IMDb to determine whether it had been made into a movie/television shows or not, and whether the text had been made from a movie or television show or not. The HML group had 9 texts made into movies or television shows and 11 that were not. The group had no books made from movies/television. The AML group had 30 texts made into movies/television shows and 60 that had not. The group had only 1 book made from a television show and 89 that were not. The LML group had four books made into movies/television shows and six that were not. The group had no books that were made from movies or television. Two chi-square tests for association were conducted to determine if there was an association between the school's minority level and the prevalence of texts made into television shows/movies that were on the top 10 lists and if there was an association between the minority level and the prevalence of texts made from movies or television shows on the top 10 lists. One test indicated that there were small differences between expected counts and reality for texts made into movies/television shows. The AML group had expected counts of 32.3 texts that were made into movies/television shows, yet only 30 were found in the study. The HML group had expected counts of 7.2 texts that were made into movies or television shows; however, 9 of the actual texts were made into these media. One cell had an expected count of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' minority levels and the prevalence of texts on the top 10 lists that were made into

movies/television shows, $\chi^2(2)=1.051$, $p=0.591$. For the one text that was made from a movie/television show, there were no real differences found with the chi-square test for association between the expected counts and real counts. Three cells had a count of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' minority levels and the prevalence of texts on the top 10 lists that were made from movies/television, $\chi^2(2)=0.336$, $p=0.845$.

Minority level and social media. Finally, a possible association between a school's minority level and the prevalence of texts with social media pages for the text or the author was evaluated. Two social media sites, Facebook and Twitter, were searched for pages associated with either the text or the author of the 120 texts. The HML group had 18 texts with social media pages and 2 without them. The AML group had 76 texts with pages and 14 without them. The LML group had nine texts with social media pages and one without one. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected and real counts for the AML group. This group was expected to have 77.3 texts with social media pages, but it had only 76. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' minority levels and the prevalence of texts on the lists with social media pages, $\chi^2(2)=0.571$, $p=0.752$.

Socio-Economic Status and the Text Variables

To determine if the socio-economic status (SES) for schools had any association with the text variables that were prevalent in the texts of the top 10 lists, the schools were assigned to three groups: High SES, Average SES, and Low SES. From the state's department of education website, the percentage of students for each school in the study's district that were labelled "Economically Disadvantaged" were averaged together to get a mean score of 51.55%. Schools

whose percentage of “Economically Disadvantaged” students were one standard deviation or more below the mean was in the High SES group. Schools whose percentage of students was one standard deviation or more above the mean were in the Low SES group. The schools within one standard deviation of the mean were the Average SES group. There were two schools in the High SES group with 15.4% and 16.6% of students labelled “Economically Disadvantaged.” There were two schools in the Low SES group with 79.2% and 87.7% of its students receiving free or reduced-price lunch. The Average SES group had eight schools with a range of 37.8% to 71.5% of the students labelled “Economically Disadvantaged.”

SES level and genre. The first test to determine an association between school SES and a text variable was the genre of the text. Texts were tallied as either fiction or nonfiction. The High SES group had 17 fictional texts and 3 nonfiction texts in their top 10 lists. The Average SES group had 69 fictional texts and 11 nonfiction texts. The Low SES group had 17 fiction and 3 nonfiction texts. A Chi-square test for association found no real differences between the expected and real counts for fiction or nonfiction texts. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant difference between schools’ SES levels and the prevalence of a genre in the top 10 lists, $\chi^2(2)=0.034$, $p=0.983$.

SES level and subgenres/formats. The subgenre of the text was assessed next for an association to schools’ SES levels. Table 4.21 shows the number of texts for each subgenre for each of the SES groups. A chi-square test for association indicated small differences between expected and real counts of subgenres. The low SES (LS) group was expected to have 0.8 encyclopedia/book of facts texts but instead had 2. It was also expected to have 6.7 graphic novels—science fiction/fantasy but had 8 instead.

Table 4.21

Number of Texts per Subgenre and School SES Level

Subgenre	High SES Level	Average SES Level	Low SES Level
Drawing/Decorating	0	3	1
Encyclopedia/Book of Facts	0	3	2
Graphic Novel-Humor	0	4	0
Graphic Novel-Science Fiction/Fantasy	7	25	8
Historical Fiction	0	2	0
History of the Ancient World	1	0	0
Horror	0	1	1
Manufacturing/Weaponry	0	1	0
Military/Engineering	0	2	0
Realistic Humor	1	5	2
Realistic Romance	0	1	1
Realistic Sports	0	1	0
Recreation/Sports	0	2	0
Science Fiction/Fantasy	8	29	5
Spy Thriller	1	1	0
Zoological/Animal	2	0	0

The LS group was expected to have more science fiction/fantasy texts—seven—than the five that were on the list. The average SES (AS) group was expected to have 2.7 graphic novels—humor on the list, but the group had 4. They were expected to have 26.7 graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy and 28 science fiction/fantasy novels, but they had 25 graphic novels that were science fiction/fantasy and 29 science fiction/fantasy novels. The high SES (HS) group were expected to have 7 science fiction/fantasy novels, but they had 8. They were also expected to have only 0.3 zoological/animal books, but they had 2. Forty-one cells had expected values of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between SES and the prevalence of certain subgenres, $\chi^2(30)=31.200$, $p=0.406$.

Assessed also was the association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of series books on the top 10 lists. Of the 120 texts, 101 were books within series. A chi square test for association was conducted to determine if the SES level of the school was associated with the number of series books on the top 10 lists. The test indicated that the association between SES level and the prevalence of series books on the top 10 lists was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(2)=3.314$, $p=0.191$. The data showed small differences between the expected number of series books and the observed number of series books on the top 10 lists. The group with the high SES level was expected to have 16.8 series books, but instead the group had 18 books on the list as books in a series. The group that had an average SES level was expected to have 67.3 series books on the lists, but the group only had 64. Finally, the group with the low SES was expected to have 16.8 series books on the list but had 19 series books instead.

SES level and author gender. Features related to the composition of a text were analyzed next to determine an association between these features and a school's SES level. First, the association between the schools' SES levels and the author's gender were assessed. This assessment addressed the 103 fiction texts as the nonfiction texts had several books with corporations as authors. The HS group had nine female authors and eight male authors. The AS group had 23 female and 46 male authors. The LS group had 5 female and 12 male authors. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected counts and the reality of the study. For the LS group, 10.9 male authors were expected along with 6.1 female authors, yet there were 12 male and 5 female authors. For the AS group, 44.2 male and 24.8 female authors were expected, but there were 46 male and 23 female authors in the study. The HS group was expected to have 10.9 male and 6.1 female, but there were 8 male and 9 female authors instead.

There was not a statistically significant association between SES and the prevalence of an author gender, however, $\chi^2(2)=2.653$, $p=0.265$.

SES level and author race/ethnicity. The race/ethnicity of the author was also addressed for its association with the schools' SES levels. Author's race/ethnicity was determined by the picture found on the book or the author's social media/web page. There were four categories found for the author's race/ethnicity: Asian, African-American, White, and Not Given for authors that did not provide a picture or race/ethnicity information. The HS group's texts had 3 Asian and 14 white authors. The AS group had 9 Asian, 1 African-American, and 58 white authors and 1 whose information was not given. The LS group had 4 Asian, 1 African-American, and 12 white authors. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected and real counts for the author's race/ethnicity. The LS group was expected to have 2.6 Asian and 13.9 white authors, but the group had 4 Asian and 12 white authors. The AS group had 9 Asian and 58 white authors when it was expected to have 10.7 Asian and only 56.3 white authors. Eight cells had expected counts less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES and the prevalence of a certain race/ethnicity for the author, $\chi^2(6)=3.598$, $p=0.731$.

SES level and protagonist gender. Along with the author's gender and race, protagonists' characteristics were also assessed. First, the gender of the protagonists was documented. The analysis included texts with a single protagonist, which characterized 97 of the fictional texts. For the MS group, there were eight male and nine female protagonists. The AS group had 37 male and 26 female protagonists, and the LS group had 9 male and 8 female protagonists. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected and real counts for the gender of the protagonists. The AS group was expected to have 35.1 male and 27.9

female protagonists, yet the group had 37 male and 26 female protagonists. The HS group was expected to have 9.5 male and 7.5 female, but they had 8 male and 9 female protagonists. All cells had expected counts more than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the school's SES and the prevalence of a certain protagonist gender, $\chi^2(2)=0.801$, $p=0.670$.

SES level and protagonist race/ethnicity. The race/ethnicity of the protagonist was also assessed for its association with a school's SES level. There were five categories found for the racial/ethnic makeup of the protagonists in the 101 fictional texts used: Asian, Native American, Nonhuman, White, and Not Given for the protagonist whose racial/ethnic makeup was not directly stated or implied. These texts had either a single protagonist or multiple protagonists with the same racial/ethnic makeup. The HS group had 3 Asian, 1 nonhuman, and 13 white protagonists. The AS group had 5 Asian, 1 Native American, 10 nonhuman, and 51 white protagonists. The LS group had 2 Asian, 3 nonhuman, and 11 white protagonists with 1 protagonist whose race was not given. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected and real counts for the race/ethnicity of the protagonist. The LS group was expected to have 12.6 white protagonists but only had 11. The AS group was expected to have 6.6 Asian and 49.8 white protagonists; instead, the group had 5 Asian and 51 white protagonists. The HS group was expected to have 1.7 Asian and 2.4 nonhuman protagonists but only had 3 Asian and 1 nonhuman. Ten cells had expected counts less than five. There was no statistical significance associated between the school's SES and the prevalence of a race/ethnicity for the protagonist, $\chi^2(8)=8.203$, $p=0.414$.

SES level and protagonist SES level. The protagonist's SES was also examined for its association with the school's SES. Each of the 101 fiction texts had its protagonist's SES

categorized into one of three categories: poor, middle class, or upper class. The HS group had five poor, nine middle-class, and three upper-class protagonists. The AS group had 15 poor, 42 middle-class, and 10 upper-class protagonists. The LS group had 5 poor, and 12 middle-class protagonists. A chi-square test for association determined small differences between expected and real counts in the SES of the protagonist. The LS group was expected to have 10.6 middle-class protagonists and 2.2 upper-class protagonists but instead had 12 middle-class and no upper-class protagonists. The AS group was expected to have 16.6 poor and 8.6 upper-class protagonists; instead, the group had 15 poor and 10 upper-class protagonists. The HS group was expected to have 10.6 middle-class protagonists but had only 9. Four cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the school's SES and the protagonist's SES, $\chi^2(4)=3.586$, $p=0.465$.

SES level and family structure. The family structure of the protagonist was analyzed with 101 of the fictional texts for its connection to the schools' SES levels. The family structure was determined as the parental or guardian influence and care situation afforded the protagonist. Four possible categories were determined: guardian, one parent, two parent, or no parent/none mentioned. The HS group had two protagonists with a guardian, seven with a one-parent household, six within a two-parent household, and two who had no parents or none were mentioned. The AS group had 6 protagonists with guardians, 27 in 1-parent households, 21 in 2-parent households, and 13 with no parents or none mentioned. The LS group had one protagonist being cared for by a guardian, five in one-parent households, seven in two-parent households, and four with no parent or none mentioned. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected and real counts of the family structure of the protagonist. The LS group was expected to have 6.6 protagonists living in 1-parent households and 5.6 living in 2-

parent households. Instead, the group had 5 in 1-parent households and 7 in 2-parent households. The AS group was expected to have 25.9 protagonists living in a 1-parent household and 22.6 living in a 2-parent household, but the group had 27 living in a 1-parent home and 21 living in a 2-parent home. The HS group was expected to have 3.2 protagonists with no parent or none mentioned and only had 2 in this situation. Four cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of certain family structures of the protagonist, $\chi^2(6)=1.849$, $p=0.933$.

SES level and protagonist personality traits. The personality traits of the protagonist were the last characteristics of the protagonist to be analyzed. Five personality traits and their counterparts were identified: extroversion/introversion, agreeableness/disagreeableness, conscientiousness/unconscientiousness, emotional stability/neuroses, and openness to experience/closed to experience. Table 4.22 shows the number of texts of the 101 fictional texts used where the protagonist exhibits the identified personality trait.

Table 4.22

Protagonist Personality Traits and School SES Level Groups

Personality Traits	HS Group	AS Group	LS Group
Extroversion	13	54	12
Introversion	4	13	5
Agreeableness	15	55	14
Disagreeableness	2	12	3
Conscientiousness	15	60	16
Unconscientiousness	2	7	1
Emotional Stability	16	60	14
Neuroses	1	7	3
Openness to Experience	17	67	17
Closed to Experience	0	0	0

Four chi-square tests for association showed small differences between expected and real counts of personality traits. The LS group was expected to have 13.3 protagonists who were extroverted and instead had 12. The LS group was also expected to have 15.1 protagonists who were emotionally stable, but the group had 14 instead. The AS group was expected to have 52.4 protagonists who were extroverted and instead had 54. Each of the five personality traits—extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to change—had two cells with expected counts less than five. For extroversion, the chi-square test for association did not find a statistically significant association between extroversion and the schools' SES levels, $\chi^2(2)=0.834$, $p=0.659$. The chi-square test for association for agreeableness did not find a statistically significant association between agreeableness and the schools' SES levels, $\chi^2(2)=0.376$, $p=0.829$. The chi-square test for association for conscientiousness did not find a statistically significant association between conscientiousness and the schools' SES levels, $\chi^2(2)=0.396$, $p=0.820$. The chi-square test for association for emotional stability did not find a statistically significant association between emotional stability and the schools' SES levels, $\chi^2(2)=1.253$, $p=0.535$. Because there were no protagonists found as being closed to experience in the study, no association was computed between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of protagonists who demonstrated openness to experience.

SES level and theme. The theme of the text was also assessed. For the 103 fiction texts, there were four main themes found: belief in the self, the struggle of good versus evil, the importance of relationships, and the importance of perseverance. The HS group had one text that had the theme of belief in the self, five with the struggle of good versus evil, two with the importance of relationships, and nine with the importance of perseverance. The AS group had 7 texts with the theme of belief in the self, 16 with the struggle of good versus evil, 12 with the

importance of relationships, and 32 with the importance of perseverance. The LS group had two texts with belief in the self as their most prominent theme, five with the struggle of good versus evil, three with the importance of relationships, and seven with the importance of perseverance. A chi-square test for association found small differences between expected and real counts for theme. The LS group was expected to have 8.1 texts with the theme of the importance of perseverance but had only 7. The AS group was expected to have 17.2 texts with the theme of the struggle of good versus evil but had 16 instead. Six cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the themes of the texts, $\chi^2(6)=1.187$, $p=0.978$.

SES level and Lexile level. Finally, the last text composition feature addressed for its association with the schools' SES levels was the Lexile level of the text. The Lexile Framework for Reading (2015) website was searched for the 101 fictional texts that were singular stories and not anthologies. For those with a Lexile score within the Lexile system, the Lexile level was documented. Some of the texts, however, were not in the Lexile system; instead, the first, middle, and last 1000 words were entered into the Lexile analyzer available on the website with the three scores averaged to get an average Lexile level. The HS group's texts ranged in Lexile level from 323 to 1443, with 2 texts having Lexile levels of 750 and 2 with 390. The AS group's texts ranged from 270 to 1573, with 6 texts having Lexile levels of 340, 5 with 660, and 4 with levels of 700. The LS group's texts ranged from 323 to 1330, with 2 texts having Lexile levels of 770 and 2 with levels of 820. A chi-square test for association determined there was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the Lexile level of a text, $\chi^2(36)=150.449$, $p=0.188$.

SES level and cover art. The physical features of a text were also assessed for associations with the schools' SES levels. First, the cover art of each of the 120 texts was evaluated for the most prominent characteristic. These characteristics were classified into five categories: abstract designs, inanimate objects, landscapes, nonhuman characters, and person or people. The HS group had 3 landscapes, 2 nonhuman characters, and 15 person/people for the cover art of the texts. The AS group had 4 abstract designs, 6 inanimate objects, 5 landscapes, 8 nonhuman characters, and 57 person/people. The LS had 1 abstract design, 1 inanimate object, 3 nonhuman characters, and 15 person/people. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected counts and real counts. The LS group was expected to have 1.3 texts with a landscape prominent in the cover art, but the group had none. The AS group was expected to have 4.7 covers with inanimate objects but had 6, instead. The group was also expected to have 58 covers depicting a person or people but had 57 instead. The HS group was expected to have 1.2 covers with inanimate objects and 1.3 with landscapes, but the group had no covers with inanimate objects prominently displayed and had 3 with landscapes. Ten cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of certain cover art, $\chi^2(8)=6.445$, $p=0.597$.

SES level and back-of-book information. The other physical feature assessed for its association with the schools' SES levels was the back-of-book or book jacket information. The back of the book or the book jacket for each of the 120 texts was examined to determine if the most prominent information was a snippet from the actual text of the book, a brief summary of the book, or a list of other titles in the series. The HS group had 3 texts with a snippet from the text most prominently displayed and 17 with summaries. The AS group had 2 with snippets, 77 with summaries, and 1 with other titles from the series. The LS group had 1 with a snippet, and

19 with a summary. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected and real counts for the back-of-book or book jacket information. The AS group was expected to have 4 snippets and 75.3 summaries but instead had 2 snippets and 77 summaries. The HS group was expected to have 1 snippet and 18.8 summaries, but they had 3 snippets and 17 summaries. Six cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the back-of-book or book jacket information, $\chi^2(4)=5.717$, $p=0.221$.

SES level and publication year. As with composition and physical features, some external influences were also examined for their association with the schools' SES levels. First assessed were the texts' years of publication. The initial year of publication for each of the 120 texts was found. Overall, the texts' publication years ranged from 1982 to 2013. The years were grouped into categories of five-year sections: 1979 to 1983, 1984 to 1988, 1989 to 1993, 1994 to 1998, 1999 to 2003, 2004 to 2008, and 2009 to 2013, as shown in Table 4.23. The HS group had 1 text in the 1994 to 1998 category, 5 that were published between 2004 to 2008, and 14 that were published between 2009 to 2013. The AS group had 1 book published in the 1979 to 1983 category, 1 in the 1984 to 1988 category, 4 that were published between 1999 to 2003, 5 between 2004 and 2008, and 11 between 2009 and 2013. The LS group had 4 that were published between 1999 and 2003, 5 between 2004 and 2008, and 11 between 2009 and 2013. A chi-square test for association found differences between expected and real counts for the years of publication. The LS group was expected to have 0.7 texts published in 1999 to 2003 but had 4 instead.

Table 4.23

SES Level and Year of Publication Expected and Observed Counts

		Year of Publication Groups						Total
		1979- 1983	1984- 1988	1994- 1998	1999- 2003	2004- 2008	2009- 2013	
Low	Count	0	0	0	4	5	11	20
	Expected Count	.2	.2	.2	.7	5.7	13.2	20.0
	% within SES	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	25.0%	55.0%	100.0%
	% within yearofpub	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	14.7%	13.9%	16.7%
	% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	4.2%	9.2%	16.7%
SES Average	Count	1	1	0	0	24	54	80
	Expected Count	.7	.7	.7	2.7	22.7	52.7	80.0
	% within SES	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	67.5%	100.0%
	% within yearofpub	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	70.6%	68.4%	66.7%
	% of Total	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	45.0%	66.7%
High	Count	0	0	1	0	5	14	20
	Expected Count	.2	.2	.2	.7	5.7	13.2	20.0
	% within SES	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	25.0%	70.0%	100.0%
	% within yearofpub	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	14.7%	17.7%	16.7%
	% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	4.2%	11.7%	16.7%
Total	Count	1	1	1	4	34	79	120
	Expected Count	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	34.0	79.0	120.0
	% within SES	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	3.3%	28.3%	65.8%	100.0%
	% within yearofpub	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	3.3%	28.3%	65.8%	100.0%

The group also was expected to have 13.2 that were published in 2009 to 2013 but instead had 11. The AS group was expected to have 2.7 books that were published between 1999 and 2003 but had no books that were published in this time period. The group was also expected to have 52.7 texts that were published from 2004 to 2008 but had 54 instead. Twelve cells had expected counts of less than five. There was a statistically significant difference between the schools' SES levels and the texts' years of publication, $\chi^2(10)=26.678$, $p=0.003$.

SES level and award-winning texts. The awards the texts may have earned were also assessed. Tallies were made for each of the 120 texts that had won a state, panel-chosen, and/or reader-chosen award. The HS group had 5 texts that had won awards and 15 that had not. The AS group has 21 texts that were award-winning and 59 that were not. The LS group had 3 texts that had won awards and 17 that had not. Tallies were also made whether the text won a state, panel-chosen, or reader-chosen award. For texts that had won more than one type of award, tallies were made per award type. The HS group had texts that had won 2 state awards, 2 panel-chosen awards, and 2 reader-chosen awards. The AS group had texts that earned 11 state awards, 9 panel-chosen awards, and 9 reader-chosen awards. The LS group had texts that won 3 panel-chosen and 3 reader-chosen awards. Two chi-square tests for association found small differences between expected and real counts for awards won. The LS group was expected to have 4.8 texts that had won awards, yet they had only 3. It was expected that these awards would include 1.6 state awards, yet the group had no state awards for the popular texts. The AS group was expected to have 19.3 texts that had won awards, but they had 21. The group was expected to have 9.4 state awards earned by the texts, but there were 11. It was also expected that the group would have 10.2 reader-chosen awards associated with the texts, but there were only 9. In determining if there was an association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts that had

won awards, the chi-square test showed that there was not a statistically significant association, $\chi^2(2)=1.114$, $p=0.573$. For this test, test there were two cells that had expected counts of less than five. For determining the association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of a certain type of award for the texts, the chi-square test for association found no statistically significant association, $\chi^2((4)=3.024$, $p=0.554$. There were six cells that had expected counts of less than five for this assessment.

SES level and Teens Top 10 list. The 120 texts were also cross-referenced with YALSA's Teens Top 10 list for its association with the schools' SES levels. The HS group had 4 texts that were on YALSA's list and 16 that were not. The AS group had 11 on the YALSA list and 69 that were not. The LS group had 3 on the Teens Top 10 list and 17 that were not. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected and real counts for the Teens Top 10 list. The AS group was expected to have 12 texts on the list but had only 11. The HS group was expected to have three texts on the list but had four. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts on YALSA's Teens Top 10 list, $\chi^2(2)=0.490$ $p=0.783$.

SES level and district's approved novels list. The school district for the study provides a list of approved texts to teachers for use in classroom instruction. The lists are arranged from kindergarten through 12th grade. The middle school lists—grades 6, 7, and 8—were evaluated to determine the number of popular texts from the study were on the district's approved novels list. Of the 120 texts, overall, only 5 texts were found on the district's approved novels list. The HS group had 1 text on the list and 19 that were not. The AS group had 4 texts on the list and 76 that were not. The LS group had none of their 20 texts on the list. A chi-square test for association found no real differences between the expected and real counts for texts on the district's novel

list. Three cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts on the district's approved novels list, $\chi^2(2)=1.043$, $p=0.593$.

SES level and Accelerated Reader. The Accelerated Reader program is another possible external influence for text selection. The number of the study's popular texts found within the program were evaluated for an association between the prevalence of AR texts and the schools' SES levels. To determine if a text was considered to be an AR text, an AR website search was conducted. The HS group had 7 of its 20 texts in the AR program. The AS group had 63 of its 80 texts in the program. The LS group had 14 of its texts in the program. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected and real counts for AR texts. The LS group was expected to have 15.2 AR texts but only had 14. The AS group was expected to have 60.7 AR texts but had 63 instead. The HS group was expected to have 15.2 AR texts but had 14. Two cells had expected counts of less than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts that were AR, $\chi^2(2)=1.114$, $p=0.573$.

An association between the number of points of which an AR text was valued and the schools' SES levels was also examined. The 84 AR texts in the study had a point value ranging from 0.5 to 23. The HS group had texts with AR points ranging from 1 to 23. The AS group had AR points ranging from 0.5 to 20. The LS group had points ranging from 1 to 19. A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine if the number of points the texts were valued correlated with the schools' SES levels. A Shapiro-Wilk's test determined the data to have a normal curve for the HS group ($p=0.660$). Z-scores for skewness and kurtosis demonstrated a normal curve for the AS and LS groups, with the AS group having $z=0.987$ for skewness and $z=-$

2.467 for kurtosis and the LS group having $z=1.002$ for skewness and $z=-1.245$ for kurtosis. Levene's statistic indicated that the assumption of homogeneity was met ($W=0.928$). There was not a statistically significant correlation, however, between the schools' SES levels and the point-value of the AR books, $F(2, 87)=89.021$, $p=0.387$.

SES level and movie/television connection. The prevalence of texts made into or from movies and television and the association with the schools' SES levels was also assessed. In searching the 120 text titles through websites such as IMDb, it was found that, overall, 43 texts had been made into movies or television and 1 text had been made from a movie or television show. The HS group had 7 of its 20 texts that had been made into movies or television shows. The AS group had 27 of its 80 texts that had been made into the media. The LS group had 9 made into movies or television. The AS group was the only group to have any texts made from a television show or movie, and the group had just one. Two chi-square tests for association were performed to determine if texts made into movies or television were associated with the schools' SES levels and to determine if a text made from a movie or television show was associated with the schools' SES levels, as well. The chi-square tests found small differences between the expected and real counts of texts made into or from movies and television. The LS group was expected to have 7.2 texts that had been made into movies/television, but they had 9. The AS group was expected to have 28.7 texts that had been made into the media, but the group had 27. All of the cells had expected counts more than five. There was not a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts that had been made into movies/television, $\chi^2(2)=0.888$, $p=0.641$. For the text made from a movie/television show, there were no real differences found between the expected counts and real counts. There were three cells with expected counts less than five. There was not a statistically significant association

between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts made from television or movies, $\chi^2(2)=0.504$, $p=0.777$.

SES level and social media. The final external influence assessed was the prevalence of a social media page for the texts. Facebook and Twitter pages were searched for each of the 120 texts to determine if the text or its author had a social media page. Of the 120 texts, 103 had a social media page. The HS group had 15 texts that had a social media page dedicated to itself or its author. The AS group had 70 texts with a social media page, and the LS group had 18. A chi-square test for association found small differences between the expected counts and the real counts for texts with social media pages. The AS group was expected to have 68.7 texts with social media pages, but the group had 70. The HS group was expected to have 17.2 texts with social media pages, and it had 15. There was not, however, a statistically significant association between the schools' SES levels and the prevalence of texts with social media pages, $\chi^2(2)=2.399$, $p=0.301$.

Summary of Research Question Three Findings

The research question addressed three areas of school demographics—school size, minority level, and SES level—and the possible associations between the demographics and the text variables. For the demographic of school size, there were a few statistically significant associations to the text variables. First, a statistically significant association was found between school size and the prevalence of certain subgenres in the texts. The average-sized schools had significantly more science fiction/fantasy novels on the list than expected schools. The small-sized schools had significantly more graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy than expected. Second, a statistically significant association was found between school size and the years of publication. Smaller schools had fewer new books than expected on their top 10 lists, while

average-sized schools had more new books. Finally, school size and the information on the back of the book or book jacket was also a statistically significant association. Both the average-sized schools and the large schools had more books that had snippets from the actual text than were expected.

The minority levels of the schools were also determined with categories of low, average, and high minority levels. There was a statistically significant association between the schools' minority levels and the prevalence of certain races/ethnicities of the protagonists in the texts. For the LML group, there were significantly more Asian and fewer white protagonists than expected. The AML group had fewer Asian protagonists and more white protagonists than expected. The HML group also had fewer white protagonists than would be expected. The author's race/ethnicity and the schools' minority levels were also statistically significantly associated. The LML and HML groups had significantly more Asian and fewer white authors than would be expected. The AML group had the opposite with fewer Asian and more white authors than expected.

Other associations between the schools' minority levels and text variables were found. There was a statistically significant association between the schools' minority levels and the years of publication of the texts. The LML group had fewer new books than would be expected and more relatively older books—those that were 6 to 10 years after their first publication—than expected. The AML group had newer books than expected, with the exception of 2 texts that were published more than 25 years before the study. The HML group had a prevalence of older texts—those that were first published 6 to 15 years before the study—more than would be expected. The association between the schools' minority levels and the prevalence of texts that were considered Accelerated Reader texts was also statistically significant. The LML group had

fewer AR texts on their lists than would be expected. The AML group and, to some extent, the HML group had more AR books than would be expected.

A few associations between the schools' minority levels and text variables approached significance. The association between the schools' minority levels and the prevalence of the author's gender approached significance ($p=0.084$). For the LML and HML groups, there were more male authors and fewer female authors than expected, though not significantly so. The AML group had more males and fewer females than expected. A correlation that approached asymptotic significance was with the Lexile levels of the texts ($p=0.091$). Both the HML group and the LML group had higher Lexile levels than expected with the AML group having lower levels than expected. The association between the minority levels and the prevalence of award-winning texts also approached significance ($p=0.074$). Both the HML and LML groups had fewer award-winning texts, and the AML had more award-winning texts than might be expected.

One association between the schools' SES levels and a text variable was found to be statistically significant. The prevalence of certain years of publication of the texts and the SES levels were a statistically significant association. The LS group had older books on their lists than expected. The AS had newer books than expected with the HS group's texts having approximately the expected number of new and old texts.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 began with the three research questions that would be addressed that included the types of genre and subgenres/formats that were most represented, the texts composition and physical characteristics and external influences, and the relationships between school demographics and these features. Then, the process of the study was discussed from the initial review of the literature to the forms used in the study and the statistical analyses the data

underwent. The chapter continued with the findings of the first research question, which included a statistically significant difference in the prevalence of fiction over nonfiction texts and graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy and science fiction/fantasy novels over other subgenres.

The second research question's findings were discussed next. These included statistically significant differences for male authors over female authors and white authors over other races/ethnicities. Other statistically significant findings included characteristics of the protagonists. The study found that protagonists were often middle-school age or above, from one- or two-parent homes, and had a healthy personality. The themes of the texts were usually the importance of perseverance and the struggle of good versus evil. Physical features that were statistically significantly different were the prevalence in cover art of the depiction of a person or people and in the back-of-the-book or book jacket information the prominence of a summary. The study found that, overall, newer books were more often on the top 10 lists than older ones, that the books were often not award-winners but were a part of the AR program, and that the text or its author often had a social media page.

Finally, the third research question's findings were discussed. These findings included the statistically significant association between school size and subgenre, which showed a prevalence for science fiction/fantasy novels for small-sized and average-sized schools. Average-sized schools also had a prevalence of graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy texts. There were other statistically significant associations between school size and the back-of-book or book jacket information and the years of publication. Minority levels of the schools had a statistically significant associations with the protagonists' and authors' races/ethnicities, years of publication, and prevalence of AR texts. The SES levels of the schools had one statistically significant association with the years of publication of the texts on the top 10 lists.

Chapter 5 first provides a summary of the study. It then draws conclusions from the findings of the three research questions along with connections to the literature. Limitations found in the study are addressed with recommendations for future research. Implications of the study are offered, then. Last, Chapter 5 offers conclusions made from the study.

Chapter 5: Analysis and Synthesis

Adolescent reading achievement has been a point of concern for many. The performance of adolescents on the NAEP assessments has not equaled the continued rise and success as made by their elementary school counterparts (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013). This difference between scores is echoed in the responses to the NAEP questionnaire regarding time spent in voluntary reading, where over half of the 9-year-olds responded to reading for pleasure almost daily. Only one-quarter of the 13-year-olds assessed stated that they read for pleasure almost daily. The NAEP data, then, point to the benefits of voluntary reading. The importance of voluntary reading to students' reading success has been documented repeatedly (e.g.-- Krashen, 2013; Dambar, Samuelsson, & Taube, 2011; Stanovich, 1986). Factors that influence the desire to read voluntarily include knowing and providing texts that are of interest to students (Ivey & Broaddus, 2001). The understanding and the provision of interesting texts can provide students with an environment that supports their need for autonomy, relatedness, and competence, as posited by SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2002). In having interesting texts readily available in the library, students may feel that they have a choice in their reading materials. By providing libraries that take student interests into account when making book purchase choices, students may feel a positive relationship with their school. Students may also find texts that make them feel confident in their reading ability.

Providing texts of interest to students requires an understanding of texts that are popular with students. Student interests in texts may be informed by a variety of factors (e.g.-- Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006; Hopper, 2005; Kragler & Nolley, 1999), including composition and physical features, such as the protagonist's race or the cover art of the book, or an external influence, such as winning an award. These factors may depend on certain demographic aspects

of the schools (e.g.—Pribesh, Gavigan, & Dickinson, 2011). The purpose of this study was to examine the most frequently circulated texts by students in a district's middle school libraries and the relationships among the demographics of the schools and the students' preferences for certain text characteristics.

The first chapter addressed the purpose of the study, the theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory for the study, and the background of the study. Three research questions guided the study and were as follows:

1. Of books checked out from middle school libraries, which genres, subgenres, or formats are most prevalent?
2. Which common composition and physical characteristics, as well as external influences, do these texts share?
3. Is there a relationship among these factors and school demographics (i.e.—school size, minority status, poverty level)?

Chapter 2 of the study provided a review of the literature associated with the purpose and topic of the study. To answer the research questions, the researcher first reviewed the literature for research studies that addressed the same or similar questions. These studies were addressed and helped the researcher determine the factors that may contribute to students' interest in certain texts.

Chapter 3 provided the methodology of the study, detailing the selection of the school district, the procurement of the texts, the handling of the data, and the analyses that were conducted. The researcher set parameters for the possible school district to take part in the study. It was decided that a school district whose definition of "middle school" was the inclusion of 6th through 8th grades only, who had at least 10 middle schools in the school district, and who was

not going through restructuring would be included. The school district selected was one in the southeastern United States and housed 14 middle schools, of which 12 would, ultimately, be used in the study. Once the school district as participant was determined, the school district provided the researcher with the circulation data of the libraries for each of the 12 middle schools participating in the study. The researcher determined the top 10 texts from each school by choosing the texts that were the most circulated. Texts that were on a school's top 10 list but were part of a series of which others were on the list as well were narrowed to one selection to be on the list. Random selection of the rest of the most-circulated texts rounded out the top 10 lists. The texts were then analyzed to determine the genre, subgenre or format, several composition and physical features, as well as external influences, of each. All garnered information were documented on three forms: the Library Circulation Data form, the Book Characteristics Data Collection form, and the Fictional Text Analysis form. Each form was assessed for reliability by two other investigators completing the forms for 10% of the texts in the study. Krippendorff's alpha was used to determine reliability of the forms.

Chapter 4 provided the statistical analyses and the findings of the study. Data were analyzed using SPSS software with statistical tests including independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA tests, Kruskal-Wallis H-tests, Pearson's correlation, Spearman's rho, and chi-square tests for association. The researcher detailed the findings of each test, both those that were statistically significant and those that were not. Chapter 5 provides discussion of the findings made in Chapter 4 with connections drawn from the literature. Following, the chapter provides limitations found in the study and recommendations for future research. Implications of the study are discussed afterward with conclusions drawn from the study.

Summary of Key Findings and Connections to the Literature

Research Question One

Genres. The first research question asked what genres and subgenres/formats were most prevalent in the most-circulated texts lists. To answer this question, texts were categorized as fiction or nonfiction and then by the subgenre or format. For genre, fiction texts were significantly more prevalent than nonfiction texts, accounting for almost 86% of the 120 most-circulated texts. Only 19 texts on the lists were nonfiction. This finding is different from what Harrison (2012) found in her study of the reading practices and motivations for upper-high school males. Harrison found in her interviews that the male participants preferred nonfiction reading. Groenke et al's (2012) study also found a desire for "real stories" and nonfiction texts, such as cookbooks, in their interviews with their sixth-grade, African-American female participants. In addition, Hartlage-Striby (2001) found in an analysis of elementary school library circulation that boys preferred nonfiction more than girls, but that as age increased both sexes checked out more nonfiction. The current study contradicts this finding, as this study focuses on middle schools, the next level beyond Hartlage-Striby's elementary school students.

Subgenres. The subgenres/formats for each text were categorized and tallied. In all, there were 16 subgenres/formats as categories, which included nonfiction subgenres like drawing/decorative arts and military/engineering and fiction subgenres like graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy, horror, and science fiction/fantasy novels. Two subgenres were the most prevalent in the lists: graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy and science fiction/fantasy novels. Together, these subgenres claimed 82 of the 120 spots on the lists. Individually, the graphic novel-science fiction/fantasy subgenre had 40 texts, while the science fiction/fantasy novel subgenre had 42. Some studies have found that many students did not prefer science fiction and

fantasy, such as Gordon and Lu's (2008) study of low-achieving high school students. Comic books, a distant cousin to the graphic novel, have been popular, though, among middle schoolers for some time. McKenna (1986) found in his study of 576 low-ability junior-high students that the participants preferred comic books, weird but true tales, biographies of rock stars, and books about the supernatural. Worthy, Moorman, and Turner (1999), in their study of 6th grade students, found that students preferred comic books and magazines, as well as books about sports or scary themes. It would seem that graphic novels have taken on the popularity of the comic book. Since the most popular graphic novels also provided science fiction/fantasy stories, the popularity of the supernatural may also be continued in these books.

Series books were also prevalent among the books on the top 10 lists. Books were categorized as being part of a series when there were at least two other books connected in story line and characters to the books. As with Williams' (2008) study where series books were frequently chosen by the African-American participants, series books were more often found on the top 10 lists than stand-alone books. The preference for series books may stem from the feeling of competence while reading a book from a series since the writing style, language, characters, and even the story line may be familiar (Young & Ward, 2010). Series books also offer the reader a "hook" to continue reading. As readers finish the first book in a series, they may feel enticed to read the second, third, or fourth book. As the current study selected only one book from a series for the top 10 lists, series books may be even more popular than the data show.

Magazines also can be popular texts. Worthy et al. (1999) found that librarians often did not keep many magazines in the library, even though they were the desired reading material for many students, as they were likely to be damaged. The current study affirms this finding, as it

had no magazines listed in its 120 most-circulated texts because students were not allowed to check magazines out of the library. Because of this, one format that has shown to be popular among adolescents was not one whose popularity was tabulated.

Research Question Two

Author gender. The second research question asked what common composition and physical characteristics, as well as external influences, did the texts share. Several of these characteristics were shared among the texts. First, the authors of the fictional texts were more often male. Out of 103 texts, 66 were written by males and only 37 by female authors. This finding is relative of the study by Hopper (2005) where certain text preferences were linked based on the student's gender. Female students were found to prefer certain authors, while male students had their own authors that they preferred. Generally, this preference was more for the genre or topic the author wrote about and less about the gender of the author. Because science fiction/fantasy novels and science fiction/fantasy graphic novels were overwhelmingly the most popular texts, the author gender for these two subgenres may explain the reasoning for the disproportionate number of male authors in the study. Of the 40 graphic novels-science fiction/fantasy, 38 of the texts were written by male authors, and only 2 were written by female authors. Of the 42 science fiction/fantasy novels, 24 were written by female authors and 18 by male authors. Thus, Hopper's (2005) finding that author preference may be more related to the subgenre or topic the author writes rather than to the author himself or herself seems to be validated in the current study.

Author race/ethnicity. The authors of the fictional texts also tended to be white. Of the 103 fictional texts, 84 texts were written by white authors. Only 16 books were by Asian authors, 2 by African-American authors, and 1 kept the race/ethnicity of the author hidden. None of the

texts in the study were written by Hispanic authors. The prevalence of white authors does not seem to reflect the racial makeup of the district's student population. The lack of diversity among the authors seems to reflect less of a desire to relate to the author through race or ethnicity. This corroborates Williams' (2008) study of approximately 300 African-American children, ages 8 through 12, and their book selections made when choosing books. She found that students were less influenced by skin color than other factors when selecting a text. The race or ethnicity of the author does not seem to affect students' text preferences.

Protagonist race/ethnicity. As with the race/ethnicity of the author, the popular texts most often had white protagonists. Of the 101 fictional texts suited to this examination, 75 had white protagonists, 14 had nonhuman protagonists, and 10 of the protagonists were Asian. There was only one protagonist who was Native American and one whose race/ethnicity was unable to be determined. Remarkably, there were no African-American or Hispanic protagonists. In searching the library circulation records for the schools, there were texts available to students by African-American authors and with African-American protagonists. These offerings were more prevalent in the schools with higher percentages of minority students. However, the availability of these texts was still rare when compared to the considerable quantities of texts from white authors with white protagonists. The racial/ethnic makeup of the protagonists in the popular texts were not similar to the racial/ethnic makeup of the students in the district studied. This finding is in contrast to past research studies that found that student readers wanted a connection with the text. Richardson and Eccles's (2007) study of students in late adolescence found that African-American participants often used texts to identify possible selves through voluntary reading of influential people. Swartz and Hendricks (2000) interviewed 31 adolescent students who received special education services about the factors that influenced their selections of texts.

They found that many of the participants stated that being able to see oneself as the character was one factor that they used to decide if they wanted to read a text. The desire to identify with a character can be an important factor in text selection, yet the current study's popular texts are not representative of the racial/ethnic diversity of the district. Although the offerings of books with minority protagonists may be becoming more plentiful (Harris, 1991), some librarians and educators may choose not to stock the books, seeing the books as not universally appealing. As Harris (1991) urged publishers to look to minority publications to market their books, changing the view of "minority" texts as specifically for one race or ethnicity to read could begin within the classroom or library. Rather than displaying texts with minority characters only during certain times of the year, such as "Black History Month," these texts could be touted yearlong. The lack of books on the top 10 lists with minority protagonists begs for more studies to determine how books can reflect the current racial and ethnic makeup of the readership.

Protagonist age. Another significant finding of the study was the prevalence of middle-school and above middle-school age protagonists. Of the 101 fictional texts with one protagonist, 43 were of middle-school age and 48 were above middle-school age. Only three were younger than middle-school age and seven had no age given. The students of the study showed a strong preference for texts where the protagonist was their age or older. Johnson, Peer, and Baldwin (1984) had a similar finding in their study of 4800 students in grades 4 through 10, who demonstrated a preference for protagonists of relatively the same age as themselves. The older the students were the older the protagonists they preferred. This interest in protagonists of an age relative to one's own is supported by SDT. The theory states that people desire to understand themselves (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Preferring protagonists that are of the same age as oneself may allow the reader to see himself or herself as the protagonist in the text.

Protagonist family structure. The study also demonstrated a preference for protagonists who came from one- or two-parent households. Of the 101 households in the fictional texts, 39 had protagonists from 1-parent households, 34 from 2-parent homes, and 9 had guardians as caregivers. Nineteen of the protagonists had no parents or none were mentioned in the text. This preference for one- or two-parent households may support the need for a connection with the text as evidenced by Swartz and Hendricks (2000). In their study, participants discussed the need for a connection with the characters in text selection, citing the ability to relate to protagonists who have similar experiences, such as having divorced parents. This desire to relate to the protagonist seems to reflect the results of the current study in the prevalence of protagonists from one- or two-parent households.

Protagonist personality. The protagonists of the texts in the study also exhibited an overwhelmingly “healthy” personality. The protagonists tended to be extroverted, emotionally stable, and agreeable. They acted conscientiously and were open to new experiences. Although some of the protagonists displayed characteristics of neurotic tendencies and introversion, the prevalence of positive personality characteristics supports studies that find that readers look for their own identity, or the identity they want to have, in the texts they select. Richardson and Eccles (2007) discussed the reflection of one’s identity or the self in the reading material of adolescents, while Swartz and Hendricks (2000) discussed the preference for characters with certain likeable personality traits. The desire to see oneself in the characters promotes the idea that one would like to see one’s best self reflected in the text.

The findings of the study regarding the type of protagonist most prevalent in the popular texts exhibit the desire of adolescents to find people like them in the texts they choose. As the findings indicate that the adolescents chose texts with protagonists who were close to their own

age, had likeable personalities, and were mostly from one- to two-parent households, it seems likely that students look for texts that reflect who they are or who they want to be. Hughes-Hassell and Lutz's (2006) study found similar results in their study of 245 middle school students' reasons for text selections. The study showed 41% of males and 73% of females chose a text because the characters within the text were people like them. However, in the current study, there were some characteristics of the district not reflected in the texts chosen. The dominance of white protagonists in the study's results are different from the racial/ethnic makeup of the district. If readers are looking for texts with protagonists that reflect their own or desired identity, why are the texts not more reflective of the racial/ethnic makeup of the district? It is possible that fewer options of interesting texts with protagonists of similar ethnic/racial makeup are available for minority students.

Theme. Four main themes were prevalent in the fictional texts studied with two of the themes occurring significantly more often in the texts. The themes of the importance of perseverance and the struggle of good versus evil were significantly prevalent among the popular texts. These themes demonstrate the interest adolescents have in what Samuels (1989) calls "problem" novels, where problems teens face daily are depicted through myriad subgenres of texts. Hopper (2005) also discussed the significance of the prevalence of issues-based texts. Hopper found that issues-based fiction dominated the teen sections in book stores and was often used to define adolescent literature. The themes in the current study's texts affirm the dominance of texts that address teens' real-life issues. Addressing specific themes in the texts, Chance (1999) found that the theme of becoming self-aware and responsible for one's own life was the most common thematic idea in texts chosen for the International Reading Association's Young Adult's Choices project. Beyard-Taylor and Sullivan (1980) found that the 576 7th-, 9th-, and

11th-grade participants in their study preferred stories with a positive, problem-solution style theme. Both the theme of responsibility and the preference for positive endings in a text are comparable with the current study's theme of perseverance and the struggle of good versus evil.

Lexile level. The current study found a negative correlation between Lexile level and prevalence of texts on the top 10 lists. More often, texts on the list had a relatively low Lexile level. This finding supports the SDT postulation that the feeling of competence is a vital aspect of motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Students in the district frequently chose texts that were in the lower range of Lexile levels, which would most likely allow them to feel that they could be successful in reading the text. Initially, this finding seems to support Carver's (1994) study of texts of varying readability and the occurrence of unknown words. Carver found that texts at a student's independent reading level—where 1% of the words in the text were unknown words for the student—were not likely to introduce new vocabulary to the reader, thereby not adding to a student's vocabulary. In the current study, although the Lexile level average was considered in the lower range of Lexile levels, there were still texts all along the Lexile level spectrum. Some of the texts selected often were found in the Lexile range associated with high school or above level texts. This wide range of levels provides the impression that the readers of the text were more concerned with their interest in the text rather than the readability of the text. This supposition reflects Kragler and Nolley's (1996) study of 4th grade students' text selection, where most of the participants chose texts without concern for or consideration of the level or fit of the book to their own reading abilities. Similarly, Gabriel et al. (2012) found that the magazines in their study had a broad range of readability levels. Students in their study were able to navigate among the articles in the magazines. Students in the study were able to find articles in the magazines that were both of interest to them and within their reading ability. The current

study found that many of the texts with a high Lexile level were episodic as well. These texts were generally informational and had pictures that accompanied the text. Students may have found these texts easy enough to navigate with the aid of text support through the pictures and possibly their own background knowledge of the topic. Text difficulty may be relative to the prior knowledge and interest the student has in the text's topic as well. Although a text's Lexile level may be well above the student's determined reading level, if the student has prior knowledge or experience with the topic, what would seem as challenging vocabulary may actually be words with which the student has had experience.

Cover art. The cover art of the popular texts tended primarily to depict a person or people. Out of the 120 texts, 87 had a person or people prominently displayed, rather than abstract designs, inanimate objects, landscapes, or nonhuman characters. Williams (2008) found similar results in her assessment of African-American students' text selections. In her study, the most popular texts had male characters or famous people portrayed in the cover art. The presence of a person or people in the cover art could demonstrate SDT's idea of relatedness, where identifying with the characters in the text—as visually found on the cover—provides a way for students to feel understood. The importance of cover art for students when selecting a text was found by Swartz and Hendricks (2000), who had over half of their participants picking out books primarily because of the cover art and/or pictures. Moss and Hendershot (2002) also found a significant portion of their participants who reported visual aspects of the texts were influential in book selection of nonfiction texts. As the current study shows, adolescents may prefer texts whose cover art offers them a way to identify with the text over other portrayals.

Back-of-book/book jacket information. Most of the texts in the study had a summary as the focal point on the back of the book or book jacket rather than a snippet from the actual text of

the book or a list of other titles in the series. Of the 120 texts, 113 had a brief summary of the text, with 6 having a snippet and only 1 having other titles listed prominently. The importance of the back-of-book or book jacket information when choosing a text was determined by Rinehart et al. (1998) in their study of 25 8th-grade students. The study determined that students found the back-of-book or book jacket summaries representative of the plot of the story. They believed their reaction to the summary was indicative to their reaction after reading the story. As significantly more of the popular texts had summaries rather than other information, this may indicate the students may have used these summaries to determine interest in the text or that there is a prevalence of young-adult texts using summaries as more of the focal point on the back of the book.

Publication year. Certain years of publication were more popular than others in the study. Almost all of the texts, 113 of the 120 texts, on the top 10 lists had been published within the past 10 years. Almost two-thirds of the texts had been published in the past five years. As the study indicates, the newness of a text may affect its popularity. Similarly, Gabriel et al. (2012) found that the magazines their participants received were generally read on the day they arrived, which indicated that the novelty of the text played an important role in the desire to read. The current study's finding that newer texts were more prevalent in the top 10 lists allows for a similar conclusion to be drawn.

Award-winning texts. Most of the texts in the current study were not award-winning texts. Of the 120 texts, only 32 texts had won a state, panel-chosen, and/or reader-chosen award. From this, it seems that the fact that a text won an award played little part in the selection of the text for reading. Ujiie and Krashen's (2006) study had similar findings in their re-analysis of the popular texts of Nilson, Peterson, and Searfoss's (1980) analysis. They found that few award-

winning texts in the library were also considered popular texts by the students. In the current study, of the texts that had won awards, there was not a significant difference among the prevalence of texts that had won state, panel-chosen, or reader-chosen awards. This finding corroborates the conclusion that the awards a text has or has not won does not seem to affect the popularity of the text.

YALSA's Teens Top Ten. As well as the lack of award-winning texts on the top 10 lists, few of the texts in the study had been chosen for YALSA's Teens Top 10 lists. Only 18 of the 120 texts had been on YALSA's lists. This is a surprising finding since Swartz and Hendricks (2000) found that half of their participants were influenced by friend recommendations for books when choosing a text. Because YALSA's lists contain texts nominated and chosen by teens, one might see the placement on the list as a recommendation by a peer. Yet, with few on the list, one might determine that recommendations for texts are only a factor in text selection when the student knows the person making the recommendation.

District novels list. The texts found on the school district's list of books approved for classroom use were seldom found among the top 10 lists of the current study. Only 5 of the 120 texts were on the middle-school-approved lists. Unfortunately, this finding may indicate an environmental factor not conducive to the tenets of SDT. As SDT requires an environment that promotes a relationship that is mutually caring (Ryan & Deci, 2002) between the student and school, having few popular texts approved for classroom use may demonstrate a lack of care for students' interests. Worthy et al. (1999) found in their study that the participating school libraries did not provide texts of interest for all students, such as those that academically-low students wanted to read. With the current study, students preferred newer texts, those published within the past 10 years. The middle-school, approved lists for the district had less than half of the books

with a publication date of 2004 or newer. Unfortunately, the texts approved for use in the classroom are not the ones the students are most likely to choose to read.

Accelerated Reader. The texts on the top 10 lists were, however, more likely to be found within the AR program. Of the 120 texts, 90 could be found within the AR system. Smith and Westberg (2011) found that students read differently for AR than they would for simple voluntary reading. The differences included reading faster and choosing different books based upon points awarded to earn more prizes from the program. Because the AR program offers tangible rewards for reading certain texts, this could undermine the intrinsic motivation a student would have for reading voluntarily, as SDT's micro-theory of Cognitive Evaluation Theory posits (Ryan & Deci, 2002). This would seem especially true if the texts that were most popular were also the texts that earned high numbers of points in the AR system. However, there was no correlation between the number of points a text earned and its prevalence on the top 10 lists.

Movies and television connections. Many of the texts in the study were not ones that had been made into or from movies or television shows. Only 44 of the 120 texts had been made into or from the media. This finding is markedly different from what Williams (2008) found in her study. For her participants, Williams found that many selected texts that had a media connection. Hopper (2005) also found what seemed like an influence of film and television on students' text selections, although few students cited this as an important influence in their book choices. Swartz and Hendricks (2000) also had approximately one-third of their participants selecting a text because of its tie to movies or television. The current study's findings seems to divert from past research in the influence film and television have on text selection.

Social media. Most of the texts did, however, have a social media page on Facebook or Twitter for either the text or its author. Of the 120 texts, only 17 did not have a Facebook or

Twitter page devoted to the text or its author. Because social media is relatively new, little research has been conducted to determine if this media influences text selection. Worthy et al. (1999) did find that knowledge about authors from another form of media may influence students' text selection. The prevalence of social media pages for the popular texts may either indicate its influence on student text selection or the popularity of social media within the literary society. Further research in this area is needed.

As indicated, several text factors had specific characteristics that were prevalent among the popular texts in the study. Authors and protagonists of the fictional texts tended to be white, and the authors tended to be male. The protagonist was usually of the same age or above as the reader. He or she tended to be from a one- or two-parent household and had a healthy, positive personality. The texts, in general, had themes of the importance of perseverance and the struggle of good versus evil. Although the prevalence of the text was negatively correlated to Lexile level, the levels were widespread. Cover art depicting a person or people and back-of-book or book jacket focusing on summaries were the norm in the study. The popular texts tended to be newer texts, published within the past 10 years. They were often not award-winners, not found on the YALSA's Teens Top 10 lists or the district's approved-novels list, but they were often found in the AR program. Most of the texts did not have a movie or television connection but they did have social media pages. Following, the school demographics were assessed to determine if they played any part in student text feature preferences.

Research Question Three

The third research question asked if there was a relationship among the factors presented and school demographics, specifically school size, minority level, and SES level. There were several significant differences when school demographics were considered. These included

subgenre/format, year of publication, and back-of-book or book jacket information for schools of differing sizes; protagonist and author race/ethnicity and year of publication for schools of differing levels of minority student percentages; and publication year for schools of differing SES levels.

School size and subgenre/format. There were varying preferences for text subgenres depending upon the size of the school. Small schools tended to prefer science fiction/fantasy novels, with 8 of the 20 texts being of this subgenre. This was significantly higher than would be expected. Average-sized schools had a preference for both science fiction/fantasy novels and graphic novels with the science fiction/fantasy novels making up about 32% of their texts and graphic novels with science fiction/fantasy stories making up about 38% of their texts. Both of these percentages were higher than would be expected, based on the overall data. The large-sized school had 7 of their 10 texts that were science fiction/fantasy novels or graphic novels. This was approximately the expectation for the group. Although much research has not been conducted that looked at the effect of school size on subgenre/format preference, Pitcher et al. (2007) found that school demographics had an effect on what was offered in school libraries. For the current study, the small school group had a higher average book-to-student ratio (19.157:1) than both the average-sized school group (12.29796:1) and the large-sized school (12.007:1). Yet, there were still preference differences. Perhaps, with the larger book-to-student ratio, students at the small schools had more science fiction/fantasy texts from which to pick.

School size and year of publication. The school size also seemed to correlate with the relative newness of texts on the lists. Small schools had fewer of the newer texts with nine of their texts published in 2009 to 2013, with 2011 being the newest texts on the list. Seven of their popular texts were published from 2004 to 2008 and four were before 2004. The average-sized

group tended to have newer texts on their lists, with 63 texts that were published in the years of 2009 to 2013, 20 in the years of 2004 to 2008, and only 7 published before 2004. The large school's popular texts were all published between 2008 and 2013. The data showed that, although the large school had a lower ratio of books to students, the popular texts were newer. Compared to the average and large-sized school groups, the small-schools group had a significantly older set of popular books. Pitcher et al. (2007)'s determination that demographics may have an effect on what is offered in the school libraries does seem supported by the current study.

School size and back-of-book/book jacket information. Although the majority of the 120 texts had summaries on the back of the book or book jackets, there was a difference in the prevalence of texts with a snippet or other titles in a series being on the list. Of its 10 popular texts, the large-sized school had 3 texts with snippets. This is significantly larger than would be expected, based on the data. The average-sized school group had 1 text listing other titles in the series and 2 snippets among their 90 texts. The small-sized group had only 1 text out of the 20 with a snippet, the other 19 having summaries. A possible explanation for these differences may be more about the book-to-student ratio than the preference for snippets. Because the large school had a ratio of 12.007 books per student, while the average group had 12.29796 and the small group had 19.157. It may be that with fewer texts per students from which to select a text, the back-of-the-book or book jacket information may not be as useful to students than it is to those who have more choices from which to pick.

Minority level and protagonist race/ethnicity. There was a difference among the schools of varying percentages of minority students and the prevalence of certain races/ethnicities. The group of schools with a high percentage of minority students had significantly fewer white

protagonists than would be expected. The average group had more white protagonists and fewer Asian protagonists than would be expected. The group that had the lowest percentage of minority students had fewer white protagonists and more Asian protagonists than expected. The findings indicate that the schools with a higher percentage of minority students and the school with a lower percentage of minority students both had a prevalence of texts with minority protagonists—specifically those who are Asian. As there were no Hispanic or African-American protagonists among any of the 120 texts, the prevalence of Asian protagonists for both the HML and LML groups may be even more telling. Other research studies have indicated an interest in texts with protagonists of the same race/ethnicity as the reader. Barry's (2013) study of urban eighth-grade students found that 29% of males and 38% of females would read more texts with characters with whom they could identify racially/ethnically. Hughes-Hassell and Lutz (2006) found that students demonstrated a preference for reading about people like themselves or people they wanted to be like. Interestingly, the LML group also had a significant number of Asian protagonists as well. It may be that the desire to learn about others also factors into text selection.

Minority level and author race/ethnicity. Like the association between minority level and protagonist race/ethnicity, there was an association between minority level and author race/ethnicity. Asian authors were more prevalent than expected with the HML and LML groups and less prevalent than expected with the AML group. White authors were less prevalent than expected with the HML and LML groups and more prevalent than expected with the AML group. Because the Asian protagonists were in texts written by Asian authors, this finding may reflect more of the interest in the protagonist than in the author.

Minority level and year of publication. There was a correlation between minority level and the prevalence of texts with certain years of publication. The HML group had texts that were

relatively older than the AML group and LML group. The HML group had only 80% of their texts published within the past 10 years. The AML group had 97% of their texts published between 2004 and 2013, and the LML group had 100% of their texts published within the past 10 years. These data indicate a higher number of newer texts among schools with fewer minority students. Pribesh, Gavigan, and Dickinson's (2011) study of school libraries found that schools in poorer areas had fewer texts added each year. This may explain the disparity between the percentage of newer popular texts of the HML group and the higher percentages of the AML and LML groups.

SES level and years of publication. As with the differences between minority level and the popular texts' years of publication, the SES levels of the schools had similar findings. The higher SES school had no real differences between the years of publication and the expected years. The average SES schools group had fewer texts than expected published 6 to 10 years ago, but more than expected published in the years of 1999 to 2003. The lower SES schools group had more texts that were published in 1999 to 2003 than expected and fewer texts that were published in 2009 to 2013. The lower SES group had the same schools in its group as were in the HML group. Because of this, the fewer number of newer popular texts are the same for both demographics.

Several text factors had differing characteristics dependent upon the demographics of the schools. Small schools in the study tended to prefer science fiction/fantasy novels, while average-sized schools preferred both science fiction/fantasy novels and graphic novels. School size also had a relationship with the texts' years of publication. Small schools had fewer new texts on the lists, while the average-sized and large schools had higher numbers of texts that had been published within the past five years. The large school and average-sized schools had more

texts that used snippets or other titles in the series as back-of-book or book jacket information than what was expected. Minority levels also had differences in text preferences. Schools with high percentages of minorities and schools with low percentages of minorities had fewer texts with white protagonists and more texts with Asian protagonists. Schools with an average percentage of minorities had more white and fewer Asian protagonists than expected. These findings were duplicated when assessing minority levels and author's race/ethnicity. The texts' years of publication and the minority levels of the schools had significant differences. The schools with higher percentages of minority students had texts that were older on the top 10 lists, while the schools with an average or low percentage of minority students had newer texts on their lists. This finding was also duplicated when comparing schools with varying SES levels.

Limitations of the Study

As the study progressed, limitations and delimitations were addressed. As stated in Chapter 1, the study was not a random sample. A district in the southeastern United States with schools that had varying percentages of minorities, SES levels, and school sizes was found among those that defined middle schools as grades 6th through 8th, had 10 or more middle schools within the district, and were not going through restructuring. The study was further delimited to include circulation data only from the public middle school libraries for the district, although students may find their pleasure reading materials from bookstores, public libraries, and other means. Finally, as the study progressed, the study was delimited by the lack of information in the circulation data to determine exactly who checked out each book. It could not be determined the gender, SES level, or racial/ethnic makeup of the student checking out each text. These limitations did not affect the generalizability of the data as each school was seen as a

participant rather than the students. Rather, the generalizability of the findings may be in the view of schools and school districts with similar demographics.

Recommendations

The importance of voluntary reading requires further study into ways to support the activity and to continue to find texts of interest to students. The current study endeavored to answer *what* middle-school students like to read; future research should address *why* students like particular texts. By finding out why students like particular texts, an educator may be able to suggest more texts that support that particular interest. As there is little current research that provides the answers to *why* for student preferences, this is an area in need of research. Second, gender differences in text preferences should continue to be studied, as few current studies look only at gender specifically rather than gender as well as minority status. Some studies have indicated a difference in nonfiction preference between male and female participants, where male students have preferred nonfiction more than females (e.g.—Topping, Samuels, & Paul, 2008). The current study demonstrated a preference overall for fiction. More research is needed to determine if nonfiction is still a preference for male students. In addition, more studies are needed to determine where students are getting their texts for pleasure reading. Few current studies indicate not only where students get their texts but if there is a difference among demographic information. Determining *where* texts are procured and *why* they are chosen provide educators and researchers valuable information that can be used to support engaged voluntary reading.

Conclusions and Implications

Several conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study. Middle school students do have specific preferences for texts they check out of their public middle school libraries. In

addressing the first research question, it can be concluded that the middle-school students preferred fictional texts over nonfiction texts. This preference for fictional texts may be problematic as schools may emphasize nonfiction texts more often in aligning with Common Core State Standards, national standards that emphasizes the need for rigorous texts. Students also had a preference for science fiction/fantasy novels. This conclusion is similar to other studies where some students preferred science fiction/fantasy texts (e.g.—Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1999), yet a new addition seems to be the considerable interest in graphic novels. The interest in fiction, specifically science fiction/fantasy, may also indicate escapism, especially as nonfiction, rigorous texts become a larger part of classroom reading. Students may find escape from overly-challenging, dry texts within the pages of a science fiction novel or a fantasy graphic novel.

In addressing Research Question 2, several conclusions can be made. The middle-school students tended to prefer texts to which they could relate. The fictional texts had protagonists that were primarily of the middle-schoolers' age or older and had positive, healthy personalities. They were generally from one- or two-parent households. It may be that these preferences allow the reader to identify with the protagonist. The themes of the importance of perseverance and the struggle of good versus evil found in the text may portray the same struggles of adolescence. These themes in the texts can provide students with the feeling of understanding of what one is going through, as SDT posits (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The cover art of the text also demonstrates the desire to identify with the text. The prevalence of depictions of a person or people focused in the cover art provides students a relative mirror into which they can find their own identity within the text.

The middle-school students tended to check out texts that were new and relatively easy to read. Most of the popular texts were published within 10 years, and a large portion were within 5 years of the study. This demonstrates the influence that novelty has on text selection. As Gabriel et al. (2012) suggested in their study of students with magazine subscriptions, the newness of a text to a student can be a powerful enticement to reading. The popular texts were easy to comprehend, based upon the low Lexile level on average. This validates the SDT presumption that motivation is supported by the feeling of competence in the activity. Although the average Lexile level of the texts was low, the Lexile levels for the texts produced a wide range. Students' confidence in their ability to read a text may also go beyond the complexity of sentence length and syllable count, two areas taken into account when determining a Lexile level. Some of the texts chosen had Lexile levels that were comparable to a 12th grade reading level. These texts may hold another factor that allows the student to feel confident in their ability to read the text, such as multiple pictures or a student's extensive background knowledge on the topic.

The students' reading preferences often were not seen as "quality" literature, as evidenced by the lack of awards won, placement on YALSA's Teens Top 10 lists, or the district's approved-novels list. It seems evident that what may seem like a "good" book to those selecting texts for awards or for use in the classroom may not reflect student interests. Even lists that take the reader's input into consideration, such as the Teens Top 10 lists, are not free from conjecture. The popular texts of this study were seldom found on the Teens Top 10 lists, begging the question who is making the recommendations and how far-reaching are these text suggestions?

The popular texts in this study demonstrate a change in the connection between popular texts and media. In the recent past, movie and television tie-ins were found to be influential in

text selections (e.g.—Hopper, 2005). Yet, the current study had few texts that were made into or from movies and television shows. Instead, social media pages were more prevalent among the texts and their authors. Whether these pages influenced student interest or are just a product of their time remains to be seen.

The data analyses of the study also offer conclusions drawn for Research Question Three. First, not all schools or readers are created equal. This is especially true when looking at the popular texts of schools with different demographics. Schools with higher percentages of minorities or lower SES had older texts on the list than schools with fewer minorities or higher SES. The prevalence of older texts demonstrates the differences between school libraries between those with money and those without (e.g.—Pitcher et al., 2007). The lack of access to new texts can disallow the influence of novelty. This can keep the schools from creating an optimal environment for intrinsic motivation.

Also lacking from the lists was diversity among the protagonists of the books and their authors. The majority of the authors and protagonists of the fictional texts in this study were white. Although there were a few Asian authors and protagonists, there were no Hispanics or African Americans. This is not reflective of the readership of these texts. If students desire to read about protagonists with whom they can relate, the lack of texts from and about people of color can be especially problematic. In the current study, both schools with high and low percentages of minority populations had higher-than-expected numbers of Asian authors and protagonists. The prevalence of Asian authors and protagonists may demonstrate the preference for graphic novels, since all of the Asian authors and protagonists were associated with graphic novels. This finding may also demonstrate the desire of minority students to read texts written by and about other minorities. It may reveal the desire of students in schools with few minority

students to read about people with backgrounds different from themselves. Thus, the uniformity of the protagonists and authors may offer a narrow view of humanity.

Based upon the aforementioned conclusions, the researcher provides several implications for educators/librarians and administrators/supervisors. Rather than looking solely to award lists, educators and librarians should utilize library records, along with student discussion, in establishing a classroom library or when making book recommendations. Library circulation records can give insight into what students want to read, which can help educators and librarians in making decisions of what to purchase for either the classroom or school library. The records can also give teachers and librarians ideas when asked for book suggestions by students. It can be difficult to make recommendations to students who claim they do not like to read. However, with the knowledge of what is popular among the student's peers, teachers and librarians may find it easier to make recommendations of "good" books.

Educators and librarians should not depend exclusively on the Accelerated Reader (AR) program to entice students to read. As the current study shows, although many books are in the AR program, students did not seem to select texts based on the number of points the book was assigned. Because of this, the AR program does not seem to influence students in reading texts. Rather, it may distract from texts that students actually want to read. Rather than forcing students to choose texts that are on the AR list, it would be beneficial for students to be allowed more choice in their text selections of reading material.

Educators and librarians should become more familiar with graphic novels. As these texts continue to gain in popularity, becoming familiar with the format gives teachers another type of text to use in the classroom. These texts can also be helpful in enticing the struggling or apathetic reader since the pictures can help them attend to the text more easily. Graphic novels still offer

practice in utilizing reading skills and strategies, such as making inferences, drawing conclusions, and questioning the text. Some classic literature have been turned into graphic novels recently, such as Gareth Hinds' 2010 graphic adaptation of Homer's *The Odyssey*, a text found on one of the current study's school's top 10 lists. Using the graphic novel version in conjunction with the written version can offer additional help to struggling readers or English Language Learners, besides adding to the interest of the story. Additionally, since 16 out of the 40 science fiction/fantasy graphic novels were written by Japanese authors, becoming familiar with authors from other countries may be advantageous.

Students should not be held to a certain level of texts when selecting texts to read. Too often, students are told that they must select a text that is on their reading level or at a certain Lexile level. As the study has shown, students prefer texts that allow them to feel confident in their reading. This should be encouraged. When left to their own devices, students tend to pick texts on a variety of levels, not just those that are seen as easy to read. Giving students more power in text selection can increase interest and the feeling of autonomy to promote intrinsic motivation. Teachers may choose to document which texts a student chooses to determine if, in fact, the student is reading on a variety of levels. When a student continually picks "easy" texts, the teacher can then steer the student to more challenging yet interesting texts that he or she has found using the library circulation data. Teachers may offer a limited choice of more challenging, interesting texts. Doing so would still provide an environment conducive to feelings of autonomy, yet also introduce students to books that may be interesting and appropriately challenging for them.

Enticing students to read may take some ingenuity on the part of the educator and librarian. Connecting students to texts can be aided through social media. The popularity of

social media pages, such as Facebook or Twitter, can provide students with information about a text. Allowing students to navigate through their favorite author's or book's social media page and to add a message to the page allows students to engage in an authentic activity related to the text. As the popularity of such sites continues to increase, more texts and authors will be found with social media pages.

The cover art of books has also been influential in text selection. Displaying texts with the cover art showing may help entice students to read. Books that are new to the library or are considered "good" books by many of the students can be prominently displayed with the cover art facing out to draw the would-be reader in to pick up the book and read the back-of-book summary. By displaying the cover art, students may consider reading the text more seriously than just seeing a title on the spine of the book.

It is important for libraries, both classroom and school, to have a variety of texts that portray diverse protagonists. Having a diverse collection of interesting texts that depict people of various races, ethnicities, and backgrounds allows more students to identify with a text. Having a library that is full of texts with African-American and Hispanic protagonists, as well as others, that are from different walks of life offers to readers a plethora of means to identify with a text. It also allows students who may have limited knowledge about other cultures to experience the similarities and differences of humanity. Reading about others who are different from oneself may help a student to become more open-minded and aware of life outside of his or her own neighborhood.

Implications for administrators and supervisors have also come from the current study. First, districts should consider students' interests when selecting texts for approved use in the classrooms. The list of approved texts should not only contain texts that are considered quality

literature by literacy experts but also texts that students will want to read. By considering student interest when choosing texts that are appropriate for classroom use, administrators and supervisors can promote an environment that supports student autonomy and promotes intrinsic motivation. SDT states that a basic need of people is to feel connected, a sense of belonging and being cared for (Ryan & Deci, 2002). By attending to student interests in texts selected for classroom use, students may feel that the district cares about their interests and opinions.

Finally, school libraries should constantly offer new texts. As novelty can influence students in their desire to read, having a library that is stocked with new texts is vital for promoting voluntary reading. As the current study shows, new texts are not always available in poorer schools. Rotating some library books among schools in a district may be an option to ensure that all students have access to new texts and to keep the cost of purchasing new books down.

Middle school students have strong preferences when it comes to their voluntary reading material. To engage students in voluntary reading, it is important to listen to the student as they share their interests. One way to do so is to look at the library records to identify books of interest to students. Making new, interesting texts that allow all students, regardless of race/ethnicity or SES, to connect with texts is vital to their education and their desire to read voluntarily.

References

- Abrahamson, R.F., & Carter, B. (1992). What we know about nonfiction and young adult readers and what we need to do about it. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 8(1), 41-54.
- Allington, R.L. (2009). If they don't read much...30 years later. In E.H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Reading more, reading better* (p. 30-54). Washington, D.C.: Guilford Press.
- Allington, R.L. (1984). Content coverage and contextual reading in reading groups. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 16(2), 85-96.
- Allington, R.L., McGill-Franzen, A., Camilli, G., Williams, L., Graff, J., Zeig, J., ...Nowack, R. (2010). Addressing summer reading setback among economically disadvantaged elementary students. *Reading Psychology*, 31, 411-427.
- Arnone, M.P., Reynolds, R., & Marshall, T. (2009). The effect of early adolescents' psychological needs satisfaction upon their perceived competence in informational skills and intrinsic motivation for research. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 15(2), 115-134.
- Association for the Library Service to Children (2014). *The John Newbery Medal*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/alsc/awardsgrants/bookmedia/newberymedal/aboutnewbery/>
- Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(4), 152-177.
- Bang-Jensen, V. (2010). A children's choice program: Insights into book selection, social relationships, and reader identity. *Language Arts*, 87(3), 169-176.
- Barry, A.L. (2013). Reading preferences and perceptions of urban eighth graders. *Reading Horizons*, 52(4), 353-374.
- Beach, J. D. (2015). Do Children Read the Children's Literature Adults Recommend? A Comparison of Adults' and Children's Annual "Best" Lists in the United States 1975–2005. *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, 21(1), 17-41.

- Beyard-Taylor, K.C., & Sullivan, H.J. (1980). Adolescent reading preferences for type of theme and sex of character. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16(1), 104-120.
- Braten, I., Lie, A., Andreassen, R., & Olaussen, B.S. (1999). Leisure time reading and orthographic processes in word recognition among Norwegian third- and fourth-grade students. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 11, 65-88.
- Brenner, D., & Heibert, E.H. (2010). If I follow the teachers' editions, isn't that enough? Analyzing reading volume in six core reading programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(3), 347-363.
- Brooks, C.F., & Young, S. (2011). Are choice-making opportunities needed in the classroom? Using self-determination theory to consider student motivation and learner empowerment. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 23(1), 48-59.
- Carroll, P.S. (1997). Today's teens, their problems, and their literature: Revisiting G. Robert Carlsen's "Books and the Teenage Reader" thirty years later. *The English Journal*, 86(3), 25-34.
- Carver, R.P. (1994). Percentage of unknown vocabulary words in text as a function of the relative difficulty of the text: Implications for instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 26, 413-437.
- Carver, R.P., & Leibert, R. E. (1995). The effect on reading library books at different levels of difficulty upon gain in reading ability. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(1), 26-48.
- Cavazos-Kottke, S. (2006). Five readers browsing: The reading interests of talented middle school boys. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 50(2), 132-147.

- Chance, R. (1999). A portrait of popularity: An analysis of characteristics of novels from Young Adults' Choices for 1997. *The Alan Review*, 27(1), 65-68.
- Cho, K.S., & Choi, D.S. (2008). Are read-alouds and free-reading "natural partners?" An experimental study. *Knowledge Quest*, 36(5), 69-73.
- Cline, R.K.J., & Kretke, G.I. (1980). An evaluation of long-term SSR in the junior high school. *Journal of Reading*, 23(6), 503-506.
- Cunningham, A.E., & Stanovich, K.E. (1990). Assessing print exposure and orthographic processing skill in children: A quick measure of reading experience. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 733-740.
- Dambar, U., Samuelsson, S., & Taube, K. (2011). Differences between overachieving and underachieving classes in reading: Teacher, classroom, and student characteristics. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 12(4), 339-366.
- DeNaeghel, I., Van Keer, H., Vansteenkiste, M., & Rosseel, Y. (2012). The relation between elementary students' recreational and academic reading motivation, reading frequency, engagement, and comprehension: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1006-1021.
- Di Loreto, C., & Tse, L. (1999). Seeing is believing: Disparity of books in two Los Angeles area public libraries. *Public Library Quarterly*, 17(3), 31-36.
- Dunn, O.J. (1964). Multiple comparisons using rank sums. *Technometrics*, 6, 241-252.
- Edmunds, K.M., & Bauserman, K.L. (2006). What teachers can learn about reading motivation through conversations with children. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(5), 414-424.
- Fisher, D., Grant, M. & Ross, D. (2010). Building background knowledge: Improving student achievement through wide reading. *The Science Teacher*, 77(1), 23-26.

- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2012). Motivating boys to read: Inquiry, modeling, and choice matter. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(7), 587-596.
- Gabriel, R., Allington, R., & Billen, M. (2012). Middle schoolers and magazines: What teachers can learn from students' leisure reading habits. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas*, 85(5), 186-191.
- Gardner, D. (2004). Vocabulary input through extensive reading: A comparison of words found in children's narrative and expository reading materials. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(1), 1-37.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London: Continuum.
- Gordon, C. & Lu, Y. (2008). "I hate to read or do I?": Low achievers and their reading. *School Library Media Research*, 11, 1-15.
- Greaney, V. (1980). Factors related to amount and type of leisure-time reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 15(3), 337-357.
- Greaney, V., & Hegarty, M. (1987). Correlates of leisure time reading. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 10(1), 3-20.
- Green, R.A. (2011). *Case study research: A program evaluation guide for librarians*. Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited.
- Groce, R. D., & Groce, E.C. (2005). Deconstructing the *Accelerated Reader Program*. *Reading Horizons*, 46(1), 17-30.
- Groenke, S.L., Bennett, A., & Hill, S. (2012). Not "if" but "why" and "how:" What already-Motivated black female readers can teach us about adolescent literacy instruction. In R. Bowden & E. Ortlieb (Eds.), *Educational research & innovations: 2012 CEDER yearbook* (pp. 77-100). Corpus Christi: Consortium for Educational Development, Evaluation, and Research.

- Guthrie, J.T., Schafer, W.D., & Huang, C. (2001). Benefits of opportunity to read and balanced instruction on the NAEP. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94(3), 145-162.
- Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K.C., Taboada, A., Davis, M.H., ... & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(3), 403-423.
- Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S.C. Christensom, A.L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 601-634). New York: Springer.
- Harris, V.J. (1991). Multicultural curriculum: African American children's literature. *Young Children*, 46(2), 37-44.
- Harrison, B. (2012). Reading for pleasure among Year 13 boys: What are the possibilities and problems? *Kairaranga*, 13(2), 41-48.
- Hartlage-Striby, K. (2001). Girls choose fiction; boys choose non-fiction. *Kentucky Libraries*, 65(4), 36-40.
- Hayes, A.F., & Krippendorff, K. (2007). Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 1(1), 77-89.
- Hedrick, W.B., & Cunningham, J.W. (2002). Investigating the effect of wide reading on listening comprehension of written language. *Reading Psychology*, 23, 107-126.
- Heron, A.H. (2003). A study of agency: Multiple constitutions of choice and decision making in an inquiry-based summer school program for struggling readers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(7), 568-579.
- Hopper, R. (2005). What are teenagers reading? Adolescent fiction reading habits and reading choices. *Literacy*, 39(3), 113-120.

- Huang, S. (2012). A mixed method study of the effectiveness of the accelerated reading program
On middle school students' reading achievement and motivation. *Reading Horizons*,
51(3), 229-246.
- Huck, S.W. (2012). *Reading statistics and research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Hughes-Hassell, S., & Lutz, C. (2006). What do you want to tell us about reading? A survey of
the habits and attitudes of urban middle school students toward leisure reading. *Young
Adult Library Services*, 4(2), 39-45.
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). "Just plain reading:" A survey of what makes students want
to read in middle school classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(4), 350-377.
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2000). Tailoring the fit: Reading instruction and middle school
readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(1), 68-78.
- Ivey, G. & Johnston, P.H. (2013). Engagement with young adult literature: Outcomes and
processes. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 48(3), 255-275.
- Johnson, D.M., Peer, G.G., & Baldwin, R.S. (1984). Protagonist preferences among juvenile
and adolescent readers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 77(3), 147-150.
- Kamil, M. (2008). About recreational reading and achievement: How to get recreational reading
to increase reading achievement. *Fifty-seventh yearbook of the National Reading
Conference* (pp. 31-40). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.
- Kim, J.S., & Guryan, J. (2010). The efficacy of a voluntary summer book reading intervention
for low-income Latino children from language minority families. *Journal of Educational
Psychology*, 102(1), 20-31.
- Kragler, S., & Nolley, C. (1999). Student choices: Book selection strategies of fourth graders.
Reading Horizons, 36, 354-365.

- Krashen, S. (2013). Access to books and time to read versus the Common Core State Standards and tests. *English Journal*, 103(2), 21-29.
- Krashen, S. (2002). What do we know about libraries and reading achievement? *The Book Report*, 20(4), 38.
- Krashen, S., Lee, S., & McQuillan, J. (2012). Is the library important? Multivariate studies at the national and international level. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 8(1), 26-38.
- Kuhn, M.R., Schwanenflugel, P.J., Morris, R.D., Morrow, L.M., Woo, D.G., Meisinger, E.B., ... Stahl, S.A. (2006). Teaching children to become fluent and automatic readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(4), 357-387.
- Ladd, P.R. (2011). The popularity of picture books with television tie-in contents in the public library. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, 1(1), 25-37.
- Lance, K.C. (1994). The impact of school library media centers on academic achievement. In C. Kuhlthau (Ed.), *School library media annual* (Vol. 12, pp. 183-197). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Lenters, K. (2006). Resistance, struggle, and the adolescent reader. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(2), 136-146.
- Lindsay, J.J. (2013). Interventions that increase children's access to print material and improve their reading proficiencies. In R.L. Allington & A. McGill-Franzen (Eds.), *Summer reading: Closing the rich/poor reading achievement gap* (pp. 20-38). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Mallette, M.H., Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (2004). The influence of *Accelerated Reader* on the affective literacy orientations of intermediate grade students. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*(1), 73-84.
- McCrae, R.R., & John, O.P. (1990). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality, 60*(2), 175-215.
- McKenna, M.C. (1986). Reading interests of remedial secondary school students. *Journal of Reading, 29*(4), 346-351.
- McKenna, M.C., Conradi, K., Lawrence, C., Jang, B.G., & Meyer, J.P. (2012). Reading attitudes of middle school students: Results of a U.S. survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(3), 283-306.
- McKenna, M.C., Kear, D.J., & Ellsworth, R.A. (1995). Children's attitudes toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly, 934-956*.
- McKool, S.S. (2007). Factors that influence the decision to read: An investigation of fifth grade students' out-of-school reading habits. *Reading Improvement, 44*(3), 111-131.
- McQuillan, J., & Au, J. (2001). The effect of print access on reading frequency. *Reading Psychology, 22*(3), 225-248.
- Mol, S.E., & Bus, A.G. (2011). To read or not to read: A meta-analysis of print exposure from infancy to early adulthood. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(2), 267-296.
- Moss, B., & Hendershot, J. (2002). Exploring sixth graders' selection of non-fiction trade books. *The Reading Teacher, 56*(1), 6-17.
- Nagy, W.L., Anderson, R.C., & Herman, P.A. (1987). Learning word meanings from context during normal reading. *American Educational Research Journal, 24*(2), 237-270.

- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2013). *National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP)*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1996). Trends in school district demographics, 1986-1987 to 1990-1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Clearinghouse.
- Neuman, S.B. (1986). The home environment and fifth-grade students' leisure reading. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(3), 334-343.
- Niemiec, C.P., & Ryan, R.M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 133-144.
- Parr, J.M., & Maguiness, C. (2005). Removing the *silent* from SSR: Voluntary reading as social practice. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 98-107.
- Pierce, J.B. (2003). Picking the flowers in the "fair garden:" The circulation, non-circulation, and disappearance of young adult nonfiction materials. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 9(2), 62-72.
- Pitcher, S.M., Albright, L.K., DeLaney, C.J., Walker, N.T., Seunarinisingh, K., Mogge, S., ... & Dunston, P.J. (2007). Assessing adolescents' motivation to read. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(5), 378-396.
- Pribesh, S., Gavigan, K., & Dickinson, G. (2011). The access gap: Poverty and characteristics of school library media centers. *The Library Quarterly*, 81(2), 143-160.

- Ramos, F., & Krashen, S. (1998). Rapid research report: The impact of one trip to the public library: Making books available may be the best incentive for reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 51(7), 614-615.
- Reutzel, D.R., Fawson, P.C., & Smith, J.A. (2008). Reconsidering silent sustained reading: An exploratory study of scaffolded silent reading. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102(1), 37-50.
- Reutzel, D.R., & Gali, K. (1998). The art of children's book selection: A labyrinth unexplored. *Reading Psychology*, 19(1), 3-50.
- Richardson, P.W., & Eccles, J.S. (2007). Rewards of reading: Toward the development of possible selves and identities. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 46, 341-356.
- Rinehart, S.D., Gerlach, J.M., Wisell, D.L., & Welker, W.A. (1998). Would I like to read this book? Eighth graders' use of book cover clues to help choose recreational reading. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 37(4), 263-280.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. *Handbook of self-determination theory*. Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.
- Samuels, B.G. (1989). Young adults' choices: Why do students "really like" particular books? *Journal of Reading*, 32(8), 714-719.
- Serafini, F., & Blasingame, J. (2012). The changing face of the novel. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(2), 145-148.

- Shapiro, J., & Whitney, P. (1997). Factors involved in the leisure reading of upper elementary school students. *Reading Psychology, 18*(4), 343-370.
- Smith, A.F., & Westberg, K.L. (2011). Student attitudes toward *Accelerated Reader*: “Thanks for asking!” *Current Issues in Education, 14*(2), 1-8.
- Smith, M., & Wilhelm, J.D. (2002). *Reading don’t fix no Chevys*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*(4), 360-407.
- Strommen, L.T., & Mates, B.F. (2004). Learning to love reading: Interviews with older children and teens. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy 48*(3), 188-200.
- Swanborn, M.S.L., & de Glopper, K. (1999). Incidental word learning while reading: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 69*(3), 261-285.
- Swartz, M.K., & Hendricks, C.G. (2000). Factors that influence the book selection process of students with special needs. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult literacy, 43*(7), 608-618.
- The Lexile Framework for Reading. (2014). What is a Lexile measure? Retrieved from <https://lexile.com/about-lexile-overview/>
- Trochim, W.M. (2006). The research methods knowledge base, 2nd ed. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>
- Ujiie, J., & Krashen, S. (2006). Is acclaimed children’s literature popular among children? A secondary analysis of Nilson, Peterson, & Searfoss. *Knowledge Quest, 34*(1), 39-40.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Niemiec, C.P., & Soenens, B. (2010). The development of the five mini-theories of self-determination theory: An historical overview, emerging trends, and future direction. *The Decade Ahead: Theoretical Perspectives on Motivation and Achievement Advances in Motivation and Achievement, 16A*, 105-165.

- Whitehead, N. (2004). The effects of increased access to books on student reading using the public library. *Reading Improvement*, 41(3), 165-178.
- Williams, L.M. (2008). Book selection of economically disadvantaged black elementary students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102(1), 51-63.
- Worthy, J. (1996). Removing barriers to voluntary reading for reluctant readers: The role of school and classroom libraries. *Language Arts*, 73(7), 483-492.
- Worthy, J., & McKool, S.S. (1996). Students who say they hate to read: The importance of opportunity, choice, and access. In D.J. Leu & C.K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice: 45th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 245-254). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Worthy, J., Moorman, M., & Turner, M. (1999). What Johnny likes to read is hard to find in school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(1), 12-27.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research design and methods*. (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Yin, R.K. (1981). The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 58-65.
- Young, T.A., & Ward, B.A. (2010). Companion and series books: Invitations to many happy returns. *Reading Horizons*, 50(1), 67-79.

Appendices

Appendix A

Library Circulation Data Form

School Assigned Letter:_____ Total Number of Students in School:_____

Total Number of Books in School Library:_____ Library Hours:_____

Number of Books Allowed out at a Time:_____ Time frame for Checkout:_____

[illegible]

Appendix B

Book Characteristics Data Collection: Investigator Number ____

1. Title of Book:_____

Author:_____

2. Letter Identification of the School(s) for which this is a frequently circulated text._____

3. Genre (Fiction/Nonfiction)

a.School Library	b.County Library	c.New York City Library

4. Subgenre/Format

a.County Library	b.New York City Library	c.Goodreads.com

5. Awards Earned

a.Book Cover/Interior	b.County Library	c.Goodreads.com

6. Latest Year of Publication as Listed on Book:_____

7. Was this book on the Young Adult Library Services Association's Teens Top 10 List for its earliest publication year?_____

8. What is the Lexile Level for this book?_____

9. Are there any special attributes to this book that may be of interest to students, not previously mentioned? If so, please identify them here._____

10. Is the book available for student assessment/awarding of points on the *Accelerated Reader Program*? _____ If yes, how many points are awarded for the book? _____

Appendix C

Fictional Text Analysis

Investigator Number: ____

Directions: For each fictional text, provide the title of the text and author.

Title of Text: _____

Author Name: _____

1. Cover Art: Look at the front cover of the text. Which term best describes the most prominent feature on the front cover: person(s), other species, inanimate objects, abstract design? _____
2. Back of Book/Book Jacket: Look at the back of the book and/or inside the book jacket. Which best describes the writing found in this or these location(s): a snippet from the actual text or a general summary of the book? If neither is accurate, describe the writing found. _____
3. Author Characteristics: Find the author blurb usually located in the back of the text. What is the author's gender and race/ethnicity, using the blurb and/or pictures provided? Provide how you determined these two characteristics.
Gender (male/female): _____ Evidence: _____
Race/ethnicity: _____ Evidence: _____
4. Protagonist: For each of the following characteristics, determine the best descriptor for the protagonist (the main character or "hero") of the text. Then, provide evidence from the text that supports this choice.
Protagonist Name: _____
Gender of Protagonist (male/female): _____
Evidence: _____

Race/Ethnicity(African-American, White, Asian, Hispanic, Other, Not Given): _____

Evidence:_____

Socio-Economic Status (Low, Middle, High):_____

Evidence:_____

Age of Protagonist:_____Evidence:_____

Family Structure of the Protagonist's Home (two parents, single parent, no parent,
guardian other than parent):_____

Evidence:_____

Personality Traits: Five pairs of personality traits have been identified below, with the
definition for each trait in the parentheses following the word. For each of the five pairs,
mark with an "X" the descriptor that best describes the protagonist and provide a reason
for your selection.

Pair 1: Extroverted (outgoing):_____ Introverted (reserved, shy):_____

Reason:_____

Pair 2: Agreeable (pleasing):_____ Disagreeable (not pleasing):_____

Reason:_____

Pair 3: Conscientious (guided by a sense of right and wrong):_____

Unconscientious (not guided by a sense of right and wrong):_____

Reason:_____

Pair 4: Emotionally stable (calm, unworried): _____

Neurotic (anxious, tense):_____

Reason:_____

Pair 5: Open to experience (curious, imaginative):_____

Closed to experience (conventional, traditional):_____

Reason:_____

5. Theme: What theme(s) is developed in the text? Provide the theme and evidence that supports this choice.

Theme(s):_____

Evidence:_____

6. a. Was this book made into a movie? _____

b. a television series?_____

c. Provide the web address where you found this information._____

d. Was this book made FROM a movie?_____

e. A television series?_____

f. Provide the web address where you found this information._____

7. Was this book on the district's approved novels list?_____

8. Does this book have a Facebook or Twitter account? a. Facebook:___ b. Twitter: _____

c. What search words did you use to find the account?

9. Does the author have a Facebook or Twitter account? a. Facebook: ____ b. Twitter: ____
c. What search words did you use to find the account?
-

Appendix D

Book Characteristics Data Collection Sheet Instructions

For each book that is to be analyzed, complete the “Book Characteristics Data Collection Sheet.”

The directions listed below match by number to each part of the analysis sheet. If you have any questions about completing the sheet, please contact Kim McCuiston, (865)919-4015.

1. Write the complete title of the book and the author’s first and last name.
2. Look for the book title/author on each of the school library circulation lists. Write the school letter for each school (found at the top of the spreadsheet) that lists this book as a frequently checked out book.
3.
 - a. For genre, look at the school library circulation lists. Write the genre (fiction/nonfiction) that is used to categorize this book using the call number assigned to the text.
 - b. Using the Yahoo! search engine, go to XXXXX County’s public library site. If the county library carries the book, write the genre (fiction/nonfiction) they use to categorize the book. If they do not carry the book, write “NA” for “not applicable.”
 - c. Using the Yahoo! search engine, go to the New York City Library website www.nypl.org. If the New York City library carries the book, write the genre (fiction/nonfiction) they use to categorize the book. If they do not carry the book, write “NA” for “not applicable.”
4.
 - a. For subgenre/format, sing the Yahoo! search engine, go to XXXXX County’s public library site. If the county library carries the book, write the subgenre/format they use to categorize the book. If they do not carry the book, write “NA” for “not applicable.”

- b. Using the Yahoo! search engine, go to the New York City Library website www.nypl.org . If the New York City library carries the book, write the subgenre/format they use to categorize the book. If they do not carry the book, write “NA” for “not applicable.”
- c. Using the Yahoo! search engine, go to the Goodreads website www.goodreads.com. Type in the title for the book. If the book is found on the site, check the “Related Shelves” list. Write the category of shelves for this book that has the highest frequency of placement.
5. For awards earned, do the following:
- a. Look at the book’s cover, first few pages, and back cover for any awards this book has won. List these on the chart. If the book shows no awards won, write “NA.”
- b. Go to XXXXX County’s public library website. If the library has a copy of the book, check the library information for the awards this book has won. List these on the chart. If the public library shows no awards won, write “NA.”
- c. Go to the Goodreads website www.goodreads.com. Type in the title of the book. When you find the book, find the list of literary awards given for this book. List them. If the website shows no awards won, write “NA.”
6. Look at the copyright date for the book inside the book’s cover (or in the first few pages). Write the latest date that the book was published.
7. On the YALSA site www.ala.org/yalsa/teenstopten, click on the year of publication for the book. Write “yes” if it is on the list and “no” if it is not on the list.
8. To determine the reading level of the text, type in the text title on the Lexile Framework for Reading website <https://www.lexile.com/>. If the text is found in the database, write down the

Lexile level provided by the website. If the text is not found in the database, type in the first 1000 words of the text into a Word document. Upload this document to the Lexile Analyzer found on the same website. Do this again for another 1000 words in the middle of the text and again for the first 1000 words in the last chapter of the text. Average the three Lexile scores together to get the Lexile level for this text and write the average in the blank provided.

9. If the book has any attributes that you think might be of interest to students but has not been addressed already, please write the attribute here. Please describe the attribute as specifically as possible.

10. Go to the website www.arbookfind.com/default.aspx. Type in the name of the book. Look for the book to see if there is a listing for it in the *Accelerated Reader* Program. Write “yes” if you find it available in the program, “no” if it is not found. If it is found, please write the points given for successful completion of the assessment for the book.

Appendix E

Annotated Lists of Top 10 Books

Table A.1

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Checkouts, Genres, Subgenres

School	Book Title	Author	Average Checkouts	Fiction/ Nonfiction	Subgenres
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel	11	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
A	<i>Big Nate Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce	11	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Humor
A	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	10	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan	10	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	9.5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening	9	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Humor
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	9	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
A	<i>Nightschool Vol. 1</i>	Chmakova	8	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
A	<i>Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland</i>	Patterson	7.5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
A	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	5.5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Mightiest Superheroes</i>	Cowsill	26	Nonfiction	Drawing/Decorative Arts
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee	16	Nonfiction	Drawing/Decorative Arts
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	14	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye	13.67	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	12	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson	12	Nonfiction	Recreation/Performing Arts
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	10	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel	9.5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	6.33	Fiction	Realistic Humor
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz	4.75	Fiction	Spy

Table A.1 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Average Checkouts	Fiction/ Nonfiction	Subgenres
C	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	21	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
C	<i>The Battle of the Labyrinth</i>	Riordan	13	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
C	<i>Matched #1</i>	Condie	11.5	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
C	<i>Smile</i>	Telegmeier	11	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Humor
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's	11	Nonfiction	Encyclopedia/Book of Facts
C	<i>The Angel Experiment #1</i>	Patterson	10.5	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
C	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner	9	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
C	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	8.67	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	8.5	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
C	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan	6	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection)</i>	Cass	28	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson	26	Nonfiction	Zoologic/Animals
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe	24	Nonfiction	Zoologic/Animals
D	<i>The Scorch Trials</i>	Dashner	22	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	21	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
D	<i>Only the Good Spy Young</i>	Carter	19	Fiction	Spy
D	<i>Daniel X (2010) Demons and Druids</i>	Pattersosn	19	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
D	<i>City of Bones</i>	Clare	18	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
D	<i>Toto! The Wonderful Adventures 3</i>	Osada	16	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
D	<i>Found (The Missing #1)</i>	Haddix	13	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
E	<i>Big Nate Out Loud</i>	Peirce	17	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Humor
E	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	14	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
E	<i>Million-Dollar Throw</i>	Lupica	14	Fiction	Realistic Sports
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	13	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy

Table A.1 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Average Checkouts	Fiction/ Nonfiction	Subgenres
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	12	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	12	Nonfiction	Military Engineering
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	9.5	Fiction	Realistic/Romance
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	9.33	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	7.33	Fiction	Realistic Humor
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	7	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	17	Nonfiction	Military Engineering
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	16.5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	16	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	15	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	14	Nonfiction	Manufacture/Hardware
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	13.8	Nonfiction	Encyclopedia/Book of Facts
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millennium World 2</i>	Takahashi	13	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	9.67	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
F	<i>Dragon Ball Z: Vol. 18</i>	Toriyama	9	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	8.5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro	16	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	16	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	16	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	12	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	12	Fiction	Realistic Humor
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	11	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	11	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	11	Nonfiction	Recreation/Performing Arts

Table A.1 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Average Checkouts	Fiction/ Nonfiction	Subgenres
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	8.25	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	7.67	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	24	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	18	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	15	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	15	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	14	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	12	Fiction	Realistic Humor
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	11	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	10.8	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	9.67	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	8.143	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	40	Fiction	Historical Fiction
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	17	Fiction	Historical Fiction
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	12	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	8.25	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Verne/Miller	8	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	7	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	7	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	6.67	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	5.67	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
J	<i>School's Out--Forever</i>	Patterson	5.5	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	20	Fiction	Realistic Humor
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	12	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy

Table A.1 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Average Checkouts	Fiction/ Nonfiction	Subgenres
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	12	Fiction	Realistic Humor
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for Kids	12	Nonfiction	Encyclopedia/Book of Facts
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	10	Fiction	Horror
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	9.67	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	9	Nonfiction	Drawing/Decorative Arts
K	<i>Bone (2005) Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	7.95	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	6.416	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	5	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	8	Fiction	Realistic/Romance
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	7	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	7	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	6	Fiction	Horror
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	6	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Talented Pop Star</i>	Russell	6	Fiction	Realistic Humor
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	6	Nonfiction	Encyclopedia/Book of Facts
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness	6	Nonfiction	Encyclopedia/Book of Facts
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	6	Nonfiction	Drawing/Decorative Arts

Table A.1 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Average Checkouts	Fiction/ Nonfiction	Subgenres
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	5	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
M	<i>Legendz (2005) Vol. 1</i>	Hirai	9.25	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	9	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	9	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	6.75	Fiction	Graphic Novel/Science Fiction
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	5.5	Fiction	Science Fiction/Fantasy

Table A.2

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Series, Author Gender and Race, Protagonist Gender

School	Book Title	Author	Series?	Author Gender	Author Race	Protagonist Gender
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel	No	Male	White	Male
A	<i>Big Nate Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce	Yes	Male	White	Male
A	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Male	Asian	Female
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male+Female
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening	No	Male	White	NA
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes	Female	White	Female
A	<i>Nightschool Vol. 1</i>	Chmakova	Yes	Female	White	Female
A	<i>Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland</i>	Patterson	Yes	Male	White	Male+Female
A	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes	Male	White	Male
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes</i>	Cowsill	No	Male	White	NA
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee	No	Male	White	NA
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Male	Asian	Female
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye	Yes	Male	White	Male
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes	Male	white	Male
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson	No	Female	NA	NA
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes	Female	White	Female
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel	No	Male	White	Male
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	Yes	Male	White	Male
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz	Yes	Male	White	Male

Table A.2 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Series?	Author Gender	Author Race	Protagonist Gender
C	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
C	<i>The Battle of the Labyrinth</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
C	<i>Matched #1</i>	Condie	Yes	Female	White	Female
C	<i>Smile</i>	Telegmeier	Yes	Female	White	Female
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's	Yes	NA	NA	NA
C	<i>The Angel Experiment #1</i>	Patterson	Yes	Male	White	Female
C	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner	Yes	Male	White	Male
C	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Yes	Female	White	Male
C	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male+Female
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection)</i>	Cass	Yes	Female	White	Female
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson	Yes	Female	NA	NA
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe	No	NA	NA	NA
D	<i>The Scorch Trials</i>	Dashner	Yes	Male	White	Male
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
D	<i>Only the Good Spy Young</i>	Carter	Yes	Female	White	Female
D	<i>Daniel X (2010) Demons and Druids</i>	Pattersosn	Yes	Male	White	Male
D	<i>City of Bones</i>	Clare	Yes	Female	White	Female
D	<i>Toto! The Wonderful Adventures 3</i>	Osada	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
D	<i>Found (The Missing #1)</i>	Haddix	Yes	Female	White	Male
E	<i>Big Nate Out Loud</i>	Peirce	Yes	Female	White	Male
E	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
E	<i>Million-Dollar Throw</i>	Lupica	No	Male	White	Male
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	Yes	Female	White	Female
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	Yes	Female	White	Female

Table A.2 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Series?	Author Gender	Author Race	Protagonist Gender
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	No	Male	White	NA
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	Yes	Female	White	Female
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	Yes	Male	White	Male
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	No	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	No	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	Yes	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millennium World 2</i>	Takahashi	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
F	<i>Dragon Ball Z: Vol. 18</i>	Toriyama	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	Yes	Male	White	Male+Female
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	No	Female	White	Female
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Female
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	Yes	Female	White	Male
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	No	NA	NA	NA
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	Yes	Female	White	Male
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female

Table A.2 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Series?	Author Gender	Author Race	Protagonist Gender
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	Yes	Female	White	Female
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	No	Male	White	Female
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	Yes	Male	White	Male
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Yes	Male	White	Male
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Male	Asian	Female
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	No	Female	White	Male
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	No	Female	White	Female
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	Yes	Male	Not Given	Male
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Verne/Miller	No	Male	White	Male
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	Yes	Female	White	Female
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes	Male	White	Male
J	<i>School's Out--Forever</i>	Patterson	Yes	Female	White	Female
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	Yes	Female	African American	Female
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Yes	Female	White	Male
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	Yes	Male	White	Male
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for Kids	No	NA	NA	NA

Table A.2 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Series?	Author Gender	Author Race	Protagonist Gender
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	Yes	Male	White	NA
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Male	Asian	Female
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	Yes	Male	White	NA
K	<i>Bone (2005) Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Yes	Male	White	Male
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	Yes	Male	White	Male
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	Yes	Male	White	Male
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	Yes	Female	White	Female
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	Yes	Male	White	Male
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	Yes	Male	White	Male
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	Yes	Male	White	Male
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Talented Popstar</i>	Russell	Yes	Female	African American	Female
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	Yes	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness	Yes	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	Yes	Male	White	NA
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo	No	Male	White	NA
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee	Yes	Male	White	Female
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin	Yes	Male	White	Male
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass	Yes	Female	White	Female
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes	Female	White	Female
M	<i>Legendz (2005) Vol. 1</i>	Hirai	Yes	Female	Asian	Male
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	Yes	Female	White	Male
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	Yes	Male	White	Male

Table A.2 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Series?	Author Gender	Author Race	Protagonist Gender
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	Yes	Male	Asian	Male
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Female	White	Female

Table A.3

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Protagonist Race, Age, Family Structure, Extroversion, Agreeableness

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist -Race	Protagonist -Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel	White	13	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Big Nate Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce	White	11	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	White	12	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan	White	13	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	White	14	No Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	White	16	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Nightschool Vol. 1</i>	Chmakova	White	13	1-Guardian	Yes	No
A	<i>Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland</i>	Patterson	White	15	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Nonhuman	Not Given	No Parent	Yes	Yes
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes</i>	Cowsill	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	White	12	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye	Nonhuman	15	No Parent	Yes	No
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Nonhuman	Not Given	No Parent	Yes	Yes
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	White	16	2-Parent	Yes	Yes

Table A.3 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist-Race	Protagonist-Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel	White	9	1-Parent	No	Yes
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	White	13	2-Parent	Yes	No
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz	White	14	No Parent	Yes	Yes
C	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	White	14	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
C	<i>The Battle of the Labyrinth</i>	Riordan	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
C	<i>Matched #1</i>	Condie	White	17	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
C	<i>Smile</i>	Telegmeier	White	12	2-Parent	No	Yes
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
C	<i>The Angel Experiment #1</i>	Patterson	White	14	No Parent	Yes	Yes
C	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner	White	15	No Parent	Yes	Yes
C	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	White	16	1-Parent	Yes	No
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Nonhuman	8	2-Parent	No	Yes
C	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan	White	14	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection)</i>	Cass	White	17	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D	<i>The Scorch Trials</i>	Dashner	White	16	No Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	White	14	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Only the Good Spy Young</i>	Carter	White	18	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Daniel X (2010) Demons and Druids</i>	Pattersosn	Nonhuman	15	No Parent	Yes	No

Table A.3 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist- Race	Protagonist- Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
D	City of Bones	Clare	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Toto! The Wonderful Adventures 3</i>	Osada	Asian	13	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Found (The Missing #1)</i>	Haddix	White	13	1-Guard	Yes	Yes
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	White	11	2-Parent	No	Yes
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	White	17	1-Parent	No	Yes
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	White	17	2-Parent	No	Yes
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	White	17	1-Parent	No	No
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	White	13	2-Parent	Yes	No
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	White	14	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	Asian	16	2-Parent	No	Yes
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	Asian	17	1-Parent	Yes	No
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	Asian	15	2-Parent	Yes	No
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millennium World 2</i>	Takahashi	Asian	15	2-Parent	No	Yes
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
F	<i>Dragon Ball Z: Vol. 18</i>	Toriyama	Nonhuman	737	1-Guard	Yes	No

Table A.3 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist-Race	Protagonist-Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	White	14	No Parent	Yes	Yes
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	White	14	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	White	15	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	White	13	2-Parent	Yes	No
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	White	15	2-Parent	No	Yes
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	Nonhuman	13	1-Guardian	No	Yes
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	White	17	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	Asian	16	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	Nonhuman	17	1-Parent	No	Yes
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	White	13	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	White	14	None	Yes	Yes
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	White	12	2-Parent	Yes	No
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	White	13	None	Yes	Yes

Table A.3 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist-Race	Protagonist-Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Nonhuman	Not Given	None	Yes	Yes
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	White	12	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	Native American	11	1-Guardian	Yes	Yes
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	White	10	No Parent	Yes	Yes
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	White	15	1-Guardian	No	Yes
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	White	16	1-Parent	Yes	No
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Verne/Miller	White	30	1-Guardian	Yes	Yes
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	White	16	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	White	15	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	White	16	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Nonhuman	Not Given	No Parent	Yes	Yes
J	<i>School's Out--Forever</i>	Patterson	White	14	No Parent	Yes	Yes
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	White	14	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Nonhuman	Not Given	Not Given	No	Yes
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	White	13	2-Parent	Yes	No
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for kids	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	White	12	1-Parent	Yes	Yes

Table A.3 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist -Race	Protagonist -Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	White	12	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	Nonhuman	12	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	White	17	2-Parent	No	Yes
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	White	15	1-Guardian	Yes	Yes
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	Asian	16	2-Parent	No	Yes
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	Not Given	13	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	Nonhuman	Not Given	No Parent	Yes	Yes
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Talented Pop Star</i>	Russell	White	14	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	White	17	1-Parent	No	No
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee	White	14	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin	White	18	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass	White	12	2-Parent	No	Yes
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	White	16	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
M	<i>Legendz (2005) Vol. 1</i>	Hirai	Asian	9	1-Guardian	No	Yes

Table A.3 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist-Race	Protagonist-Age	Protagonist Family Structure	Protagonist Extroversion	Protagonist Agreeable
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	White	16	1-Parent	Yes	Yes
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	White	18	2-Parent	Yes	Yes
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	Asian	14	2-Parent	No	Yes
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	White	17	1-Parent	No	No

Table A.4

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Protagonist Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience, Emotional Stability, SES

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist Conscientious	Protagonist Open to Experience	Protagonist Emotionally Stable	Protagonist-SES
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
A	<i>Big Nate Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce	No	Yes	Yes	Middle
A	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening	NA	NA	NA	NA
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
A	<i>Nightschool Vol. 1</i>	Chmakova	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
A	<i>Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland</i>	Patterson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
A	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes</i>	Cowsill	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye	No	Yes	No	Middle
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	No	Yes	No	Middle
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper

Table A.4 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist Conscientious	Protagonist Open to Experience	Protagonist Emotionally Stable	Protagonist- SES
C	Maximum Ride #4 The Manga	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
C	The Battle of the Labyrinth	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
C	Matched #1	Condie	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
C	Smile	Telegmeier	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
C	Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected	Ripley's	NA	NA	NA	NA
C	The Angel Experiment #1	Patterson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
C	The Maze Runner	Dashner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
C	The Hunger Games	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
C	Firestar's Quest (Warriors)	Hunter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
C	The Red Pyramid	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
D	The Elite (The Selection)	Cass	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
D	Weird Creatures	Carson	NA	NA	NA	NA
D	Wild Creatures	Grambe	NA	NA	NA	NA
D	The Scorch Trials	Dashner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
D	Maximum Ride #4 The Manga	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
D	Only the Good Spy Young	Carter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
D	Daniel X (2010) Demons and Druids	Pattersosn	No	Yes	No	Middle
D	City of Bones	Clare	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
D	Toto! The Wonderful Adventures 3	Osada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
D	Found (The Missing #1)	Haddix	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
E	Big Nate Out Loud	Peirce	No	Yes	Yes	Middle
E	The Lost Hero	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
E	Million-Dollar Throw	Lupica	Yes	Yes	No	Poor

Table A.4 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist Conscientious	Protagonist Open to Experience	Protagonist Emotionally Stable	Protagonist- SES
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	NA	NA	NA	NA
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	No	Yes	No	Middle
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	No	Yes	No	Upper
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millennium World 2</i>	Takahashi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
F	<i>Dragon Ball Z: Vol. 18</i>	Toriyama	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle

Table A.4 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist Conscientious	Protagonist Open to Experience	Protagonist Emotionally Stable	Protagonist- SES
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	NA	NA	NA	NA
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	No	Yes	No	Middle
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Miller	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle

Table A.4 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist Conscientious	Protagonist Open to Experience	Protagonist Emotionally Stable	Protagonist- SES
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not- So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	Yes	Yes	No	Middle
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	No	Yes	No	Middle
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for Kids	NA	NA	NA	NA
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	NA	NA	NA	NA
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	NA	NA	NA	NA
K	<i>Bone (2005) Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	Yes	Yes	No	Middle
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not- So-Talented Pop Star</i>	Russell	Yes	Yes	No	Middle
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table A.4 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Protagonist Conscientious	Protagonist Open to Experience	Protagonist Emotionally Stable	Protagoni st-SES
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	NA	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	NA	NA	NA	NA
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo	NA	NA	NA	NA
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
M	<i>Legendz (2005) Vol. 1</i>	Hirai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	Yes	Yes	Yes	Middle
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upper
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	No	Yes	Yes	Middle
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor

Table A.5

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Theme, Lexile Level, Cover Art, and Back-of-Book Information

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back-of-Book Information
A	Ghostopolis	Tennapel	Perseverance	300	Person	Summary
A	Big Nate Goes for Broke	Peirce	Perseverance	450	Person	Summary
A	Amulet: The Stonekeeper	Kibuishi	Importance of Relationships	340	Person	Summary
A	The Serpent's Shadow	Riordan	Good vs. Evil	690	Person	Summary
A	Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1	Lee	Perseverance	323	Person	Summary
A	Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'	Groening	NA	440	Person	Summary
A	Divergent	Roth	Belief in Self	700	Landscape	Summary
A	Nightschool Vol. 1	Chmakova	Perseverance	270	Person	Summary
A	Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland	Patterson	Good vs. Evil	573	Abstract	Summary
A	Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns	Smith	Good vs. Evil	340	Person	Summary
B	The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes	Cowsill	NA	1140	Person	Summary
B	Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics	Lee	NA	1196	Person	Summary
B	Amulet: The Stonekeeper	Kibuishi	Importance of Relationships	340	Person	Summary
B	Daniel X: The Manga	Kye	Good vs. Evil	400	Person	Summary
B	Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns	Smith	Good vs. Evil	340	Person	Summary
B	Big Game Hunting	Peterson	NA	1063	Non-Human Creature	Other Titles in Series
B	Divergent	Roth	Belief in Self	700	Landscape	Summary
B	Cardboard	Tennapel	Importance of Relationships	300	Person	Summary

Table A.5 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back of Book Information
B	Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever	Kinney	Perseverance	1060	Person	Summary
C	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	Perseverance	390	Person	Summary
C	<i>The Battle of the Labyrinth</i>	Riordan	Importance of Relationships	590	Person	Summary
C	<i>Matched #1</i>	Condie	Importance of Relationships	680	Person	Summary
C	<i>Smile</i>	Telegmeier	Belief in Self	410	Inanimate Object	Summary
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's	NA	1220	Person	Summary
C	<i>The Angel Experiment #1</i>	Patterson	Perseverance	700	Person	Summary
C	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner	Perseverance	770	Landscape	Summary
C	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Perseverance	810	Inanimate Object	Summary
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Importance of Relationships	830	Non-Human Creature	Summary
C	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan	Good vs. Evil	650	Person	Summary
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection)</i>	Cass	Importance of Relationships	680	Person	Summary
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson	NA	980	Non-Human Creature	Snippet
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe	NA	1093	Non-Human Creature	Snippet
D	<i>The Scorch Trials</i>	Dashner	Good vs. Evil	720	Landscape	Summary
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	Perseverance	390	Person	Summary
D	<i>Only the Good Spy Young</i>	Carter	Perseverance	780	Person	Summary
D	<i>Daniel X (2010) Demons and Druids</i>	Patterson	Perseverance	790	Person	Snippet

Table A.5 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back of Book Information
D	<i>City of Bones</i>	Clare	Good vs. Evil	740	Person	Summary
D	<i>Found (The Missing #1)</i>	Haddix	Good vs. Evil	750	People	Summary
E	<i>Big Nate Out Loud</i>	Peirce	Belief in Self	370	Person	Summary
E	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	660	Person	Summary
E	<i>Million-Dollar Throw</i>	Lupica	Perseverance	960	Person	Summary
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	Importance of Relationships	650	Person	Summary
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	Good vs. Evil	800	Person	Summary
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	NA	1573	Inanimate Object	Summary
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	Belief in Self	820	Abstract	Summary
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Perseverance	820	Person	Summary
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	Importance of Relationships	1060	Person	Summary
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	Good vs. Evil	630	Non-Human Creature	Summary
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	NA	1363	Inanimate Object	Summary
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	Perseverance	590	Person	Summary
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	Perseverance	333	Person	Summary
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	Good vs. Evil	413	Person	Summary
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	NA	1450	Inanimate Object	Summary
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	NA	1330	Abstract	Summary
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millennium World 2</i>	Takahashi	Belief in Self	577	Person	Summary

Table A.5 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back of Book Information
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	660	Person	Summary
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	Perseverance	280	Person	Summary
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro	Perseverance	300	Person	Summary
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	Perseverance	323	Person	Summary
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	660	Person	Summary
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	Good vs. Evil	400	Person	Summary
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	Perseverance	770	Person	Summary
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	690	Person	Summary
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	Perseverance	830	Person	Summary
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	NA	1276	Person	Summary
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	Perseverance	780	Person	Summary
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	Good vs. Evil	800	Non-Human Creature	Summary
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	Perseverance	790	Person	Summary
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	660	Person	Summary
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	Importance of Relationships	720	People	Summary
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	Importance of Relationships	950	Person	Summary
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Perseverance	323	Person	Summary
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	Importance of Relationships	1010	Person	Summary
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	Good vs. Evil	480	Person	Summary

Table A.5 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back of Book Information
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Good vs. Evil	360	Non-Human Creature	Summary
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Perseverance	820	Person	Summary
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	Perseverance	400	Person	Summary
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	Importance of Relationships	940	Person	Summary
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	Importance of Relationships	540	Person	Summary
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	Perseverance	700	Abstract	Snippet
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Perseverance	810	Inanimate Object	Summary
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Miller	Perseverance	490	Person	Summary
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	Good vs. Evil	640	Person	Summary
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	660	Person	Summary
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	Good vs. Evil	710	Landscape	Summary
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Good vs. Evil	340	Person	Summary
J	<i>School's Out--Forever</i>	Patterson	Perseverance	660	Person	Summary
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	Belief in Self	840	Person	Summary
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Importance of Relationships	810	Non-Human Creature	Summary
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	Perseverance	1060	Person	Summary
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for Kids	NA	1146	Non-Human Creature	Summary
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	NA	640	Landscape	Snippet
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Importance of Relationships	340	Person	Summary

Table A.5 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back of Book Information
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	NA	NA	Non-Human Creature	Summary
K	<i>Bone (2005) Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Good vs. Evil	360	Non-Human Creature	Summary
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	Perseverance	470	Person	Summary
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	Perseverance	570	Person	Summary
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	Belief in Self	770	Person	Summary
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	Good vs. Evil	413	Person	Summary
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	Perseverance	533	Person	Summary
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	Good vs. Evil	423	Person	Summary
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	Good vs. Evil	430	Non-Human Creature	Summary
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Talented Pop Star</i>	Russell	Belief in Self	770	Person	Summary
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	NA	1336	Inanimate Object	Snippet
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness	NA	1380	Abstract	Summary
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	NA	NA	Non-Human Creature	Summary
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Perseverance	820	Person	Summary
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo	NA	1443	Landscape	Summary
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee	Perseverance	323	Person	Summary
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin	Good vs. Evil	687	Person	Summary
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass	Importance of Relationships	750	Person	Summary

Table A.5 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Theme	Lexile Level	Cover Art	Back of Book Information
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Belief in Self	700	Landscape	Summary
M	<i>Legendz (2005) Vol. 1</i>	Hirai	Perseverance	353	Person	Summary
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	Perseverance	760	Person	Summary
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	Perseverance	840	Person	Summary
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	Perseverance	346	Person	Summary
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Perseverance	820	Person	Summary

Table A.6

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—Publication Year, Award-Winning, Awards Earned, Teens Top 10, District Novels List

School	Book Title	Author	Publication Year	Award-Winning?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel	2010	Yes	YALSA Great Graphic for Teens	No	No
A	<i>Big Nate Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce	2012	Yes	Jr. Lib Guild	No	No
A	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	2008	No	NA	No	No
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan	2012	No	NA	No	No
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	2009	No	NA	No	No
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening	2010	No	NA	No	No
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	2012	Yes	Goodreads Choice	Yes	No
A	<i>Nightschool Vol. 1</i>	Chmakova	2009	No	NA	No	No
A	<i>Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland</i>	Patterson	2011	No	NA	No	No
A	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	2009	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes</i>	Cowsill	2010	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee	2010	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	2008	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye	2012	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	2009	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson	2011	No	NA	No	No

Table A.6 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Publication .Year	Award-Winning?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	2012	Yes	Goodreads Choice	Yes	No
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel	2011	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	2010	No	NA	No	No
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz	2006	Yes	State Awards	No	No
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's	2006	No	NA	No	No
C	<i>The Angel Experiment #1</i>	Patterson	2005	Yes	YALSA Teens Top 10	Yes	Yes
C	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner	2009	Yes	State Awards	No	No
C	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	2008	Yes	School Lib, Journal, ALA, etc.	Yes	Yes
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	2007	No	NA	No	No
C	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan	2010	Yes	School Lib. Journal Book of Year	No	No
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection)</i>	Cass	2013	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson	2010	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe	2010	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>The Scorch Trials</i>	Dashner	2011	Yes	Voya Perfect Ten	No	No
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	2009	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>Only the Good Spy Young</i>	Carter	2012	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>Daniell X (2010) Demons and Druids</i>	Pattersosn	2011	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>City of Bones</i>	Clare	2008	Yes	State Awards	Yes	Yes
D	<i>Toto! The Wonderful Adventures 3</i>	Osada	2008	No	NA	No	No
D	<i>Found (The Missing #1)</i>	Haddix	2008	Yes	State Awards	No	No

Table A.6 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Publication .Year	Award- Winning?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
E	<i>Big Nate Out Loud</i>	Peirce	2011	No	NA	No	No
E	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	2010	No	NA	No	No
E	<i>Million-Dollar Throw</i>	Lupica	2009	Yes	State Awards	No	No
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	2009	Yes	State Awards	No	No
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	2009	No	NA	No	No
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	1982	No	NA	No	No
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	2005	No	NA	No	No
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	2009	Yes	Booklist, Children's Choice, etc	Yes	No
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	2012	No	NA	No	No
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	2007	Yes	Coop Childr. Book Center	No	No
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	2007	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	2005	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	2009	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	2005	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	2004	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	2012	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millennium World 2</i>	Takahashi	2006	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	2010	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>Dragon Ball Z: Vol. 18</i>	Toriyama	2004	No	NA	No	No
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	2009	No	NA	No	No

Table A.6 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Publication .Year	Award-Winning?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro	2012	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	2010	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	2010	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	2012	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	2011	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	2012	Yes	Goodreads Choice	No	No
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	2012	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	2008	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	2008	No	NA	No	No
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	2010	Yes	Pub. Weekly, Goodreads, Voya	Yes	No
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	2007	No	NA	No	No
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	2010	No	NA	No	No
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	2012	No	NA	No	No
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	2011	No	NA	No	No
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	2009	No	NA	No	No
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	2009	Yes	Goodreads Choice	No	No
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	2004	No	NA	No	No
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	2005	Yes	State Awards	No	No
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	2009	Yes	Booklist, Children's Goodreads	Yes	No
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	2011	No	NA	No	No

Table A.6 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Publication .Year	Award-Winning?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	2013	No	NA	No	No
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	2010	No	NA	No	No
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	2011	No	NA	Yes	No
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	2008	Yes	School Lib Journal, ALA Notable Etc.	Yes	Yes
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Miller	2008	No	NA	No	No
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	2011	Yes	State Awards	No	No
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	2010	No	NA	No	No
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	2012	Yes	Goodreads Choice	Yes	No
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	2009	No	NA	No	No
J	<i>School's Out--Forever</i>	Patterson	2007	No	NA	Yes	No
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	2010	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	2004	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	2009	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for Kids	2010	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	2010	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	2008	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	1984	No	NA	No	No
K	<i>Bone (2005) Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	2005	Yes	State Awards	No	No

Table A.6 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Publication Year	Award Winning ?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	2009	Yes	School Lib Journ, YA Readers, ALA	No	Yes
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	2011	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	2005	Yes	Panel Awards	Yes	No
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	2002	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	1999	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	2000	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	2008	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Talented Pop Star</i>	Russell	2011	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	2011	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness	2010	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	2003	No	NA	No	No
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	2009	Yes	Booklist, Children's Choice, Goodreads	Yes	No
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo	1997	No	NA	No	No
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee	2010	No	NA	No	No
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin	2009	No	NA	No	No
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass	2010	No	NA	No	No

Table A.6 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	Publication .Year	Award-Winning?	Awards Earned	Teens Top Ten	District Novels List
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	2012	Yes	Goodreads Choice	Yes	No
M	<i>Legendz Vol.1</i>	Hirai	2005	No	NA	No	No
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	2010	No	NA	Yes	No
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	2010	No	NA	No	No
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	2007	No	NA	No	No
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	2009	Yes	Booklist, Children's Choice, Goodreads	Yes	No

Table A.7

Annotated List of Top 10 Books—On AR, AR Points, Made into Movies/TV, from Movies/TV, Social Media Page

School	Book Title	Author	On AR/Points	Made into Movies/TV	Made from Movies/TV	Social Media Page
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel	Yes/1	No	No	No
A	<i>Big Nate Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce	Yes/2	No	No	Yes
A	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan	Yes/15	No	No	Yes
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening	No	No	Yes	Yes
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes
A	<i>Nightschool Vol. 1</i>	Chmakova	Yes/1	No	No	No
A	<i>Witch & Wizard the Manga Battle for Shadowland</i>	Patterson	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
A	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes</i>	Cowsill	No	Yes	No	Yes
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee	No	Yes	No	Yes
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson	Yes/1	No	No	No
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel	Yes/1	Yes	No	Yes
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	Yes/3	No	No	Yes
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz	Yes/7	Yes	No	Yes

Table A.7 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	On AR/Points	Made into Movies/TV	Made from Movies/TV	Social Media Page
C	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
C	<i>The Battle of the Labyrinth</i>	Riordan	Yes/12	Yes	No	Yes
C	<i>Matched #1</i>	Condie	Yes/13	No	No	Yes
C	<i>Smile</i>	Telegmeier	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's	No	Yes	No	Yes
C	<i>The Angel Experiment #1</i>	Patterson	Yes/11	No	No	Yes
C	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner	Yes/15	No	No	Yes
C	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Yes/15	Yes	No	Yes
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Yes/19	No	No	Yes
C	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan	Yes/18	No	No	Yes
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection)</i>	Cass	Yes/11	No	No	Yes
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson	No	No	No	No
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe	No	No	No	No
D	<i>The Scorch Trials</i>	Dashner	Yes/15	No	No	Yes
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
D	<i>Only the Good Spy Young</i>	Carter	Yes/8	No	No	Yes
D	<i>Daniel X (2010) Demons and Druids</i>	Pattersosn	Yes/6	No	No	Yes
D	<i>City of Bones</i>	Clare	Yes/20	Yes	No	Yes
D	<i>Toto! The Wonderful Adventures 3</i>	Osada	No	No	No	No
D	<i>Found (The Missing #1)</i>	Haddix	Yes/9	No	No	Yes
E	<i>Big Nate Out Loud</i>	Peirce	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
E	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes/19	No	No	Yes
E	<i>Million-Dollar Throw</i>	Lupica	Yes/8	No	No	Yes
E	<i>11 Birthdays</i>	Mass	Yes/7	No	No	Yes

Table A.7 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	On AR/Points	Made into Movies/TV	Made from Movies/TV	Social Media Page
E	<i>Being Nikki</i>	Cabot	Yes/12	No	No	Yes
E	<i>Observer's Directory of Military Aircraft</i>	Green	No	No	No	No
E	<i>Ready or Not</i>	Cabot	Yes/8	No	No	Yes
E	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes
E	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney	Yes/3	Yes	No	Yes
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan	Yes/10	Yes	No	Yes
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing	No	No	No	Yes
F	<i>Naruto # 8</i>	Kishimoto	No	Yes	No	Yes
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman	No	No	No	Yes
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo	No	No	No	Yes
F	<i>The Great Book of Guns</i>	McNab	No	No	No	No
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness	No	Yes	No	Yes
F	<i>Yu-Gi-Oh! Millenium World 2</i>	Takahashi	No	Yes	No	Yes
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes/19	No	No	Yes
F	<i>Dragon Ball Z: Vol. 18</i>	Toriyama	No	Yes	No	Yes
F	<i>Maximum Ride #2: The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro	No	No	No	Yes
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes/19	No	No	Yes
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol. 2</i>	Patterson	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
G	<i>Notes from an Accidental Band Geek</i>	Dionne	Yes/9	No	No	Yes
G	<i>The Mark of Athena</i>	Riordan	Yes/20	No	No	Yes
G	<i>Second Chance</i>	Brewer	Yes/9	No	No	Yes
G	<i>NFL Record and Fact Book 2008</i>	NFL	No	Yes	No	No
G	<i>Eighth Grade Bites</i>	Brewer	Yes/7	No	No	Yes

Table A.7 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	On AR/Points	Made into Movies/TV	Made from Movies/TV	Social Media Page
G	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins	Yes/15	Yes	No	Yes
I	<i>Naruto 16</i>	Kishimoto	No	Yes	No	Yes
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes/19	No	No	Yes
I	<i>Finale (The Hush, Hush Saga)</i>	Fitzpatrick	Yes/15	No	No	Yes
I	<i>The Orphan of Awkward Falls</i>	Graves	Yes/11	No	No	No
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney	Yes/3	Yes	No	Yes
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo	No	Yes	No	Yes
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes
I	<i>Amulet (2011) The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper	Yes/12	No	No	Yes
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff	Yes/4	No	No	No
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore	Yes/14	Yes	No	Yes
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins	Yes/15	Yes	No	Yes
J	<i>Journey to the Center of the Earth</i>	Miller	Yes/0.5	Yes	No	Yes
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan	Yes/17	Yes	No	Yes
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan	Yes/19	No	No	Yes
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
J	<i>School's Out--Forever</i>	Patterson	Yes/11	No	No	Yes
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell	Yes/4	No	No	Yes
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter	Yes/11	No	No	No
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney	Yes/3	Yes	No	Yes

Table A.7 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	On AR/Points	Made into Movies/T V	Made from Movies/TV	Social Media Page
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	Time for Kids	No	No	No	Yes
K	<i>Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark</i>	Schwartz	Yes/1	Yes	No	No
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
K	<i>Draw 50 Horses</i>	Ames	No	No	No	No
K	<i>Bone (2005) Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan	Yes/13	Yes	No	Yes
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan	Yes/6	Yes	No	Yes
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson	Yes/9	No	No	Y
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis	Yes/1	Yes	No	Yes
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto	No	Yes	No	Yes
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine	Yes/3	No	No	Yes
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
L	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Talented Pop Star</i>	Russell	Yes/4	No	No	Yes
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs	No	Yes	No	Yes
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness	No	Yes	No	Yes
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames	No	No	No	No
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo	No	No	No	No
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee	Yes/1	No	No	Yes
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin	No	Yes	No	Yes
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass	Yes/9	No	No	Yes
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes

Table A.7 Continued

School	Book Title	Author	On AR/Points	Made into Movies/TV	Made from Movies/TV	Social Media Page
M	<i>Legendz (2005) Vol. 1</i>	Hirai	No	No	No	No
M	<i>City of Glass</i>	Clare	Yes/23	Yes	No	Yes
M	<i>The Odyssey: A Graphic Novel</i>	Hinds	Yes/3	Yes	No	Yes
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura	No	Yes	No	Yes
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins	Yes/16	Yes	No	Yes

Appendix F

Table of Original Top 10 Lists without Removal of Duplicate Texts or Series

Table A.8

List of Top 10 Books by School without Removal of Duplicate Books or Books from Same Series

School	Book Title	Author
A	<i>Big Nates Goes for Broke</i>	Peirce
A	<i>Bone: Crown of Horns</i>	Smith
A	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel
A	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth
A	<i>Ghostopolis</i>	Tennapel
A	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee
A	<i>Simpsons Comics Get Some Fancy Book Learnin'</i>	Groening
A	<i>Tales from a Not-So-Graceful Ice Princess</i>	Russell
A	<i>The Red Pyramid</i>	Riordan
A	<i>The Serpent's Shadow</i>	Riordan
B	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi
B	<i>Big Game Hunting</i>	Peterson
B	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith
B	<i>Cardboard</i>	Tennapel
B	<i>Daniel X: The Manga</i>	Kye
B	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney
B	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth
B	<i>Stan Lee's How to Draw Comics</i>	Lee
B	<i>Stormbreaker</i>	Horowitz
B	<i>The Avengers: The Ultimate Guide to Earth's Superheroes</i>	Cowsill
C	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: The Third Wheel</i>	Kinney
C	<i>Firestar's Quest (Warriors)</i>	Hunter
C	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth
C	<i>Matched #1</i>	Condie
C	<i>Maximum Ride #2 The Manga</i>	Lee
C	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee
C	<i>Maximum Ride #5 The Manga</i>	Lee
C	<i>Maximum Ride #6 The Manga</i>	Lee
C	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Ripley's
C	<i>The Battle of the Labyrinth</i>	Riordan
D	<i>City of Bones</i>	Clare
D	<i>Daniell X: Demons and Druids</i>	Pattersosn

Table A.8 Continued

School	Book Title	Author
D	<i>Matched#1</i>	Condie
D	<i>Maximum Ride #4 The Manga</i>	Lee
D	<i>Mockingjay</i>	Collins
D	<i>The Elite (The Selection series)</i>	Cass
D	<i>The Maze Runner</i>	Dashner
D	<i>The Selection</i>	Cass
D	<i>Weird Creatures</i>	Carson
D	<i>Wild Creatures</i>	Grambe
E	<i>Big Nate from the Top</i>	Peirce
E	<i>Big Nate on a Roll</i>	Peirce
E	<i>Big Nate Out Loud</i>	Peirce
E	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth
E	<i>Million-Dollar Throw</i>	Lupica
E	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins
E	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan
E	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan
E	<i>The Throne of Fire</i>	Riordan
E	<i>The Titan's Curse</i>	Riordan
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 1: Strawberry and the Soul Reapers</i>	Kubo
F	<i>Bleach Vol. 8 The Blade</i>	Kubo
F	<i>East Blue 1-2-3</i>	Caselman
F	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2013</i>	Guinness
F	<i>Gun: A Visual History</i>	DK Publishing
F	<i>Naruto # 28: Homecoming</i>	Kishimoto
F	<i>Naruto # 8: Life-and-Death Battles</i>	Kishimoto
F	<i>Naruto #31: Final Battle</i>	Kishimoto
F	<i>Naruto #7: Orochimaru's Curse</i>	Kishimoto
F	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan
G	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth
G	<i>Maximum Ride #1: The Manga</i>	Lee
G	<i>Maximum Ride #3: The Manga</i>	Lee
G	<i>Psyren 1: Urban Legend</i>	Iwashiro
G	<i>Psyren 2: Shonen Jump</i>	Iwashiro
G	<i>Psyren 3: Dragon</i>	Iwashiro
G	<i>Psyren 4: Melzez's Door</i>	Iwashiro
G	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan
G	<i>The Third Wheel (Diary of a Wimpy Kid)</i>	Kinney

Table A.8 Continued

School	Book Title	Author
G	<i>Witch & Wizard: The Manga Vol.2</i>	Patterson
I	<i>Amulet: The Last Council</i>	Kibuishi
I	<i>Beet: The Vandel Buster Vol. 1</i>	Sanjo
I	<i>Big Nate on a Roll</i>	Peirce
I	<i>Bone #1: Out from Boneville</i>	Smith
I	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins
I	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Dog Days</i>	Kinney
I	<i>Maximum Ride: The Manga Vol. 1</i>	Lee
I	<i>Naruto #11: Impassioned Efforts</i>	Kishimoto
I	<i>Naruto 16: Eulogy</i>	Kishimoto
I	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan
J	<i>Bone: Volume 9 Crown of Horns</i>	Smith
J	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins
J	<i>Ghost Hawk</i>	Cooper
J	<i>Gingersnap</i>	Giff
J	<i>I Am Number Four</i>	Lore
J	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth
J	<i>The Demigod Files</i>	Riordan
J	<i>The Hunger Games</i>	Collins
J	<i>The Lost Hero</i>	Riordan
J	<i>The Son of Neptune</i>	Riordan
K	<i>Amulet: The Stonekeeper</i>	Kibuishi
K	<i>Bone: Vol 1 Out from Boneville</i>	Smith
K	<i>Cirque du Freak: Tunnels of Blood</i>	Shan
K	<i>Diary of a Wimpy Kid: Cabin Fever</i>	Kinney
K	<i>Dork Diaries: Tales from a Not-So-Popular Party Girl</i>	Russell
K	<i>Fire and Ice (Warriors)</i>	Hunter
K	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2012</i>	Glenday
K	<i>That's Awesome: The World's Most Amazing Facts</i>	TIME for kids
K	<i>The Lightning Thief</i>	Riordan
K	<i>The Sea of Monsters</i>	Riordan
L	<i>13 Little Blue Envelopes</i>	Johnson
L	<i>Bone #8: Treasure Hunters</i>	Smith
L	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins
L	<i>Draw 50 Baby Animals</i>	Ames
L	<i>Guinness Book of World Records 2011</i>	Guinness

Table A.8 Continued

School	Book Title	Author
L	<i>Locker 13 (Nightmare Room #2)</i>	Stine
L	<i>Naruto #7</i>	Kishimoto
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Expect the Unexpected</i>	Tibballs
L	<i>Ripley's Believe It or Not: Strikingly True</i>	Tibballs
L	<i>Ultimate Spider-Man Volume 2: Learning Curve</i>	Bendis
M	<i>Catching Fire</i>	Collins
M	<i>Divergent</i>	Roth
M	<i>Dragon Drive Vol. 1</i>	Sakura
M	<i>Finally</i>	Mass
M	<i>Insurgent</i>	Roth
M	<i>Legendz Vol. 1 (2005)</i>	Hirai
M	<i>Life in Ancient Rome</i>	Nardo
M	<i>Maximum Ride Manga, Vol. #3</i>	Lee
M	<i>Maximum Ride Vol. 2: The Manga</i>	Lee
M	<i>Thor: Featuring Dr. Strange, Ant Man, and</i>	Tobin

Vita

Kimberly McCuiston was born in Knoxville, Tennessee, to parents Ralph Flanders and Elizabeth Flanders. She is the elder sister of Amy. Kimberly attended schools in Knox County throughout her elementary and secondary school years. She attended Pellissippi State Community College and graduated with an Associate's degree in Elementary Education. During this time, Kimberly enjoyed her English courses and changed her major to English with Licensure when she enrolled at Maryville College in 1997. Kimberly graduated Maryville College in 1999 and accepted an 8th grade teaching position at Bearden Middle School in Knox County. In 2006, Kimberly transferred to Karns Middle School to teach 7th grade reading/language arts. Three years later, Kimberly returned to college to pursue a Masters degree in Curriculum and Instruction from Tusculum College while continuing to teach full time. She graduated from Tusculum College in December 2010. Shortly after graduation from Tusculum, Kimberly applied to the Ph.D. program at The University of Tennessee. In August 2011, Kimberly began her coursework at UT in pursuit of a doctorate in Teacher Education with a concentration in Literacy Studies. She currently teaches at Karns Middle School as a reading interventionist.