Novels in the classroom:

Motivating students in pre-university level to read their novels with the reader approach

Inge Mutsaers
6219012
Educational Master Thesis

English Language and Culture: Education and Communication

First reader: Dr Paul Franssen
Second reader: Dr Erwin Mantingh

University of Utrecht

Abstract

Students are not motivated to read novels for EFL classes. This research project attempts to introduce the so-called reader approach in order to improve students´ motivation for reading novels and also improve students´ learning outcomes. A control group of pre-university level students received a traditional approach, where they only had to read their novel and then answer the questions of different levels of processing of a book test. A research group received the reader approach. They were asked to read the same novel as the control group, but received additional classes where they worked in literary circles to make assignments based on the reader approach. Results have shown that students of the research group performed better than the control group on the lower levels of processing. Additionally, students of the research group claimed to be more motivated than the students of the control group.

Table of contents

Preface

My ambitions have always been bigger than they should be. Most times, that does not pose a problem. However, the last few months I have been struggling teaching as many hours a week as I usually do. After all, a lot of my time went in writing my thesis and preparing for the classes with my research group. A special thanks therefore goes out to my superior, Winry ´t Lam. He saw when I needed to be relieved of my duties and offered to help me as much as he could. I have missed some activities the school organised and took time off when I needed it.

My students of V5B was the research group. They were helpful from day one. I explained what I needed to do in order to get my MA title, and not one student even doubted to give me their signature on the form of consent. Many regularly asked how my thesis was progressing.

Also, my direct colleagues from the English department have been helpful. The programme for period two was already made, but they all agreed that I should arrange the period in a way that would be ideal for me. They also regularly asked whether I needed help or they could do anything for me.

Finally, dr Paul Franssen was the most patient and helpful mentor I could possibly wish for. He helped me to put my thoughts on paper clearly and made sure I did not feel overwhelmed. We may have seen each other more regularly than would be normal for a student writing a master thesis, but he felt that it would be worth it to see me as much as I needed him.

Statement of Originality

I have read the UU guidelines on plagiarism and I declare that the text and the work presented in this document are original and that no sources other than those mentioned in the text and its references have been used in creating it.

1. Introduction

Teaching literature, and more specifically, reading novels with a group, at secondary schools is often done without any authentic interaction between students and their teacher, and novels are only discussed on a basic level. Plot, characters, themes and motives are the most frequently used terms when discussing a novel. However, this teaching style may not be the best level on which a teacher could operate to spark interest in the student. Students are not motivated to read novels, and they do not realize the importance of studying literature and reading novels. Not only is reading novels good for the students´ linguistic abilities, it also exposes them to complex characters and different historical contexts (Van, 2009). The curriculum concerning reading novels should therefore be adapted so that teachers focus more on what the students think of novels and their experiences and interpretations while reading it. Teachers could focus on the students´ interpretation and abilities to see connections throughout the story, rather than asking the students to read a book thoroughly and remembering every detail. This approach is called the reader approach. (Bloemert et al, 2016).

In this research project, there will be four types of approaches categorized for processing a novel. The first approach is the text approach. Assignments and tests based on this approach ask about plot, characters, themes and motives. Additionally, students should be able to apply literary terms to the texts and categorize texts into different types and genres. Students have to be able to see novels as a whole and connect scenes and events. Although this approach is popular in secondary schools, teachers should broaden their horizon to motivate students to read, rather than being stuck in this first approach. The problem with just using this approach is that students are being denied a choice. Not only do they not get to choose what book to read; they also cannot provide any input concerning the topic or event in a novel. Student who have an option to read what they

want, and what to do with the newly acquired information, are more motivated to read (Witte 2008). Prior to this project, it was discovered that there also is a minimal version of the text approach in use, which will be called the traditional approach. The traditional approach only focuses on the plot of the novel. Students are therefore expected to know the contents of the book by heart, including tiny details. The disadvantage of this approach is that students are not tested for their ability to comprehend novels, but remembering facts. The second approach is called the language approach. Here, literary texts and novels are used for linguistic purposes instead of literary purposes. This approach is not used for literature classes, but for linguistic classes. Thirdly, there is the historical approach. Students learn about cultural events in history and learn to place the plot of a novel in other historical timeframes, which often means a change in cultural importance of the novel. However important this approach is for the societal and cultural awareness for students in general, the goal of understanding literature is surpassed completely in this approach. Finally, there is the reader approach. Students are asked to give their own insights on scenes or characters, and give their own interpretation of events. Knowing the plot is a necessity, but students are motivated to give their own opinions and twists to the plot of novels.

Research has shown that using the reader approach stimulates students in forming their views towards literature. Students that feel like they are being heard and can give their opinions, are more motivated to work. Additionally, they tend to work better when they can work in groups and talk about a novel (Witte, 2008). Even though group work would be a fitting work form for some of the other approaches to teaching literature, this research project involves the combination of a motivating work form and a motivating approach for processing. The teacher has to give clear instructions on what is expected of the group, and when students adhere to their newly acquired sense of responsibility, their

motivation will go up. A motivated student works harder, which will lead to higher results (Teitler, 2013).

The main research question therefore is: Can the use of the reader approach in processing novels help to improve both students´ motivation, and their learning outcomes for 5VWO students?

Sub questions are:

1) Are students more motivated to read novels when they have been processing the novel using the reader approach, as opposed to the traditional approach?

2) Do students have a deeper understanding of the literature they have been exposed to when they have been processing a novel using the reader approach, compared to the traditional approach?

The hypothesis is that students who receive the traditional approach and students who receive a reader approach will perform equally well on their book test on the lower levels of processing. The second group, however, is expected to perform better on questions that require a higher level of processing. Also, students that receive the reader approach are expected to rate their own motivation higher than the group that has received a traditional approach.

In order to test this hypothesis, students in their fifth year of pre-university level (VWO) will all read the same novel. A control group will be instated that receives no processing help or lessons, they will only receive short discussions on the book´s plot according to the traditional approach. The research group receives two lessons to process the novels with a so-called literary circle, with assignments based on the reader approach. Forming a literary circle in class means that students form a small book club where they discuss the novel and make assignments on the novel in groups. One lesson will be taught after reading half of the novel, one lesson will be taught after reading the entire novel.

This study combines the factors of motivation and learning outcomes, and will attempt to answer whether the reader approach motivates students to read novels more than the control group, and whether a more motivated student will perform better on a literature test than students from the control group.

The project will be divided into three parts: The first part entails students reading a novel and forming their own ´literary circle´ in the appointed classes to process the book (so far). The reader approach – based assignments should motivate students to read the novel and think about the text and its meaning. They will get the chance to give their creative interpretation of some scenes and give their input on certain events in the plot. The second part of the project is the book test. The questions on this book test will encompass all thinking levels of Bloom´s taxonomy of processing and will be checked with a rubric. Bloom´s taxonomy was developed to systematically divide (test) questions into groups. In the lower levels, students are required to use easier cognitive levels of thinking, whereas in the higher levels, students have to address higher cognitive levels of thinking. In this book test, it will be analysed whether students that have processed this book with the reader approach, will also perform better on test questions that are designed to fit Bloom´s higher thinking levels. Also, most of these questions will be based on the reader approach. The third part of this research involves a questionnaire on motivation. Students will be asked whether they liked reading the novel better when they had time to process it with their literary circle, rather than only limited processing time using the traditional approach.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Motivation

One of the most important goals for teachers whose students are reading novels, is to keep the students motivated to read. Motivation in literature classes in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom has been a thoroughly researched area (Aggabao & Guiab, 2014; Ahmad & Aziz, 2009; Rashid et al, 2010; Turner & Patrick, 2004). However, how to approach unmotivated students and where the reason lies for their lack of motivation is debateable. Turner & Patrick (2004) argue that there are many factors involved in keeping students motivated. One difference between students is that some are naturally motivated, and some are not. A second factor is the teacher. A teacher who is considered to be good motivates students to persevere in difficult tasks whereas a teacher that is considered bad cannot motivate students to work. Ahmad & Aziz (2009) identify good literature teachers as being student centred; they have reading and teaching interest and are able to understand the students´ abilities and limitations. They are also known to create interest from the student in the subject under time constraint. A third factor is the work habits and customs students have. Some students prefer to work in groups or on computers, whereas others have the habit of doing everything on their own, with their books. Research projects on these three factors combined have led to at least this conclusion: participation in lessons facilitates learning, both overtly and covertly.

Turner & Patrick´s study (2004) only analysed 2 students with overt (observable) participation. Both these students had different needs and different reasons for studying. The first student in this research project learned for mastery goals. Students who learn for mastery goals only want to demonstrate their abilities, rather than learning for themselves. He therefore only wanted to show what he already knew, and learning something new felt like he was put under pressure. In contrast, the second student wanted to learn for performance goals.

Students who learn for a performance goal learn for self-improvement, even when it means the road to their goal is awkward (Woolfolk, 2013). She wanted to expand her knowledge as much as possible. The same teacher used a comparable teaching style for both students, yet his teaching style had a contrasting outcome on them. When the teacher encouraged the first student to think further, he felt pressured and uneasy. The teacher therefore left this student to his own devices, or simply gave him the information he needed to know. The danger of this approach in giving literature instructions is that it can easily lead to spoon feeding the information to the student (Rashid et al 2010). The second student felt empowered to find out more by herself.

It is fair to say that students need different approaches from a teacher to maintain their motivation for a task. Proving this statement, Aggabao & Guiab (2014) published their research concerning students of different fields of study to identify some of these differences. The students of biology, sociology, information technology (IT) and development & communication (DevCom) all received many different types of EFL literature instructions. They were then asked which of the instructions they thought was most useful, and which approach they thought was most effective. The DevCom students described film reviewing as very interesting and effective. Biology students found group discussion and role-playing to be very interesting and very effective. Sociology students labelled the teacher-student discussions as very effective and very interesting and included many more approaches as (very) interesting and (very) effective as well. IT students assessed all activities as interesting and effective. The students were asked to give their personal opinion. Rather than having factual evidence of an effective approach to give EFL literature instructions, the researchers worked with the students´ answers and therefore the outcomes might be untrustworthy. However, the results do imply that students in different fields of study, have a preference for different approaches. Individual differences may occur within the student groups per field of

study, yet the overall differences of preferences per field of study proves that there is indeed a difference in preference for students in different field of study collectively. Blatchford et al (2003) also stated that when students prefer to process literature using a certain approach and consider it to be effective themselves, they will be more motivated to work on the assignments given.

For a secondary school situation, this means that students should be taught literature using a method that appeals to them. Some approaches to teaching EFL literature can be considered ineffective for this group of students in general, whereas other approaches might be effective for only a part of the students. Studies mentioned in previous paragraphs show that student participation is critical for motivation, regardless of what kind of personalities the students have individually. This study therefore aims to find a general direction that proves to be more effective and motivating for teaching literature in EFL classes.

The only matter that still needs mentioning is the nature of the motivation students have. Hayamizu (1997) mentions four types of motivation in his research paper. The first type of motivation is external regulation. Students who work for school because they have external regulation work because they want to obtain a reward. This means a compliment, a good grade and finally a diploma. The second type of motivation is called introjected regulation. Here, students work because their own emotions tell them to do so. If they do not work for school, their consciousness tells them they are doing something inappropriate and the students then feel guilty or ashamed. The third type of motivation Hayamizu calls identified regulation. Students work because they see the importance of what they have to do for their development and for their future. Finally, there is the level which means students work purely for their own enjoyment. This level is called intrinsic motivation. The level of intrinsic situation would be ideal for every student. However, since students do not like

school, or at least not every subject, the preference goes to a motivated student. As long as the student remains motivated, it does not matter where the base lies for the motivation.

2.2 Literary Circles

Research has shown that talking about literature is both motivating for students and adds to their interest in their literary work (Blatchford et al 2003; Chambers, 1983; Cornelissen, 2016). Some schools therefore use a work form called *literary circle*. In literary circles, students work in groups to answer questions and give their own insights into a particular novel. They have the opportunity to talk about the novel extensively and on different levels of comprehension. The questions the groups receive are intended to engage students more with the novel and its plot, and assignments that relate the plot with their own insights. After all, without a set of guiding questions, students would be more likely to confuse scenes, have a one-sided vision of an event, and not comprehend a novel of the requisite level (Witte, 2008).

When teachers ask structured questions, which leave room for interpretation and creativity, students are encouraged to work with each other and learn from each other and each other´s views on the novel. The knowledge of peers is often close to their own and they can help each other throughout the process. Pairing students who are at different levels of development for this subject, means that all students can benefit from their interaction, either by asking questions, explaining or systematizing information. Together they will find the information necessary to complete their assignments and topics in the literary circle (Vygotsky, 1978). Additionally, Ahmad & Aziz (2009) state that students can be kept alert and motivated by changing work forms. Working in literary circles is unconventional, and therefore students are given the chance to be innovative and more creative than they have been thus far.

Students are invited to give their own interpretation of (parts of) a novel, and identify with subjects on a more personal level. When students receive a set of questions and

instructions, they also need to know the purpose of working in their own literary circle. It should also be clear how the assignments connect with the novel and the book test. If the teachers´ expectations are not clear to the students, the literary circles will be an unclear tool without purpose, and students´ motivation will diminish.

Blatchford et al (2003) pleads for more group work in the classroom. Working in groups is most effective when the teacher directs groups in group size, interaction type and learning tasks. Before sitting in their literary circle, students should therefore always be instructed about what it is they are going to do exactly. Popular policy is that the teacher has the same role in the process when students work individually as when they work in groups. However, this cannot work well with groups because the teacher should let students work together, rather than being the centre of attention during group work. Therefore, the teacher should take a step back and observe how students discuss results, rather than only giving information to the whole class. The teacher´s role is only guiding the groups that encounter problems in their discussion. Key is that teachers have faith in their students and their abilities to work in groups. This is a work form that encourages students to think outside of the box, and this research project attempts to analyse the effect on learning, motivation and development through this work form.

2.3 Four types of Teaching Literature

The Sint-Jans Lyceum (SJL) in Den Bosch is one of the schools where EFL literature classes are often being taught without any authentic transaction between the students and the teacher. The teacher does most of the talking and the students have to listen and read. Also, the novels are only discussed on a basic level, which includes plot, characters and occasionally themes and motives. However, this type of teaching style may not be the most fitting level on which a teacher should operate to spark interest in the student. Interest is important, since studying literature is indispensable for students´ development, as it exposes them to meaningful

content filled with descriptive language and complex characters (Van, 2009). To have

students realize this importance, teachers should cater to their needs. After having read many

different studies that attempt to divide literature instructions into categories, Bloemert et al

(2016) combine the options given in these previous studies and differentiate between four

types of literature instructions. The first is the text approach, and this type of instruction also

slightly overlaps with the level at which the students at the SJL are being taught. This level of

analysing a novel includes knowing the plot and also being able to make connections between

characters, themes and different scenes throughout the novel. The traditional approach, the

common approach when reading a novel at the SJL, demands no insight into context and

character development, as it only emphasizes the plot in itself. The second type is a historical

approach; this type of instruction asks students to place the book within a historical frame

that helps them understand the contents of the book. Also, this approach can be used to place

a novel in a different historical context than the one when it was written, so a comparison can

be made between the different historical contexts to place the novel. This approach can

therefore be used to emphasize the importance of various historical contexts in both EFL and

L1 classes to teach about culture. The third approach is the language approach. In both first

language (L1) and EFL classes, literary texts can be used as a tool to teach students about

language use and expand their vocabulary. The fourth type of instruction, which is at the

centre of this research project, is the reader approach. The reader is the focal point in this

approach, rather than the text itself or the writer. The reader is asked to give their personal

interpretation and opinions in this approach, and there is place for the reader´s creativity. The

student constructs their own version of reality when encountered with the novel. In other

words, each individual responds differently to a single novel. Therefore, multiple

interpretations of one situation can be correct.

      2.4 Six Levels of Processing

In order to properly test students´ knowledge and abilities, questions and assignments must be instated. Questions to test the students´ cognition on the subject can be divided into different levels of comprehension and processing. Bloom (1956) discusses six separate levels of processing, each more abstract than the preceding level(s). Bloom believes too many teachers make tests that only test students´ first level: knowledge. A test should be balanced and have questions for every level. Tests that contain mostly questions on the first level are in line with the text approach and even the traditional approach. This principle also goes for the SJL. The aim should be that every book test contains questions based on all levels of processing. The levels are:

1. Knowledge

2. Comprehension

3. Application

4. Analysis

5. Synthesis

6. Evaluation

The level of knowledge is a matter of remembering information. Typical assignments for this level include ´name the characters´, ´list events´, and ´label a scene as´. This level only focusses on the facts in the storyline of the book. The second level also concerns itself with the facts, but the students are asked to do something with that information, like comparing, describing in their own words or predicting an outcome. Application lets the students be more creative, and use the information they have learned in a new (yet comparable) situation. An example assignment for this level is to solve a new problem with the information they have already learned. Analysis asks the student to give their own insights into the facts. At this level, students can analyse, explain, and investigate. Synthesis means the students can use their newly acquired knowledge to create something new. They could be asked to invent,

imagine, create and compose new stories or scenes. Finally, the level of evaluation asks the students to be critical of what they have just learned. They are expected to give their opinion on the value or bias behind a source and explain why the source is good or bad (Bloom, 1956). Additionally, students can give their opinion on whether they find scenes morally acceptable.

The book test that was developed for this research project, and that both the experimental group and the control group make, consists entirely of questions based on these 6 levels of processing. Abduljabbar & Omar (2015) have developed an accessible model containing sample keywords typically used for questions of a certain level, and sample questions per level of processing. The questions used both in class and in the book test are thus based on this model.

Other processing models have been developed in an attempt to give a short and clear overview of the different possibilities of test questions. However, Kwakernaak (2013) mentions the two most widely adopted models in secondary schools today; the RTTI model (which translates to reproducing – applying 1 – applying 2 – insight) and the OBIT model (which translates to remembering – understanding – integrating – applying). Neither encompass the wide variety of possibilities in test questions as well as Bloom´s taxonomy does. Also, Bloom´s taxonomy has been mentioned by Woolfolk et al (2013) as being a clear guideline to use when creating test questions, and for mapping the division in cognitive processes. Based on these premises, Bloom´s six- level processing seemed the obvious choice to make for a basis in this research.

2.5 End terms

In the Netherlands, by law, there are 3 general goals the students have to obtain in order to receive a pre-university education (VWO) diploma. These terms are the same for all three of the foreign language subjects most frequently taught at secondary schools (French, German,

and English). These are the translated end terms:

Term 7: The candidate can argumentatively discuss his reading experiences of at least 3 novels.

Term 8: The candidate can recognise and distinguish between different types of literary texts, and apply literary terms in interpretations of literary texts.

Term 9: The candidate can give an overview of the movements in literary history and place the works read in a historical perspective.

Witte (2005) divides students´ literary competence into six different levels. The lowest three levels mostly emphasize the students´ reading experiences; students are acquiring the ability to identify with the characters in a novel and are looking for recognizable characters and events. At the higher levels, students are asked to analyse. To reach a higher level of literary competence, students need to be stimulated to explore and gain more literary experience. Teachers need to challenge students and present multiple assignments. Additionally, the teacher must adapt the assignments for the students to their level. Only then will the students´ development be stimulated. Learning activities that do not comply with these conditions, lead to demotivated students and frustration. The ultimate wish for secondary schools is to have students reach the highest level of literary competence. In order to have as many students as possible reach the highest level of literary competence as they each personally can, they have to be motivated. The reader approach will do just that.

2.6 Conditions for realising reader-based literature education

To be able to realise a reform of the literature education towards a more reader based approach, a few terms and conditions apply. Firstly, students need to know what they are going to do and why. They should be informed that literature instructions can have different

layers, and on what level they are going to work. Witte (2008) emphasizes the importance of this elaboration towards the student and explains that the lack of this first stage, or the obscurity of what students are supposed to be doing, leads to many of the problems students have in their literary development.

A second issue that needs to be addressed is the build up in proficiency levels. For EFL classrooms, the levels are built up from level A1 until C2. Most secondary school students are only expected to reach B2 or maybe C1 in certain skills. In the first 3 years of pre university education, the proficiency levels are low as well. In the fourth form, reading proficiency levels are expected to go up quickly, and the transition between these two stages is not smooth for the students. The transitions between forms should be communicated more transparently towards the students, and years of secondary school should adjust literary programmes to suit students' abilities. The assignments that students use in their literary circle should fit their respective level and should stimulate them to do their best. Assignments that are on level B1, whilst the students are mostly at level B2, lead to boredom and demotivation (Kwakernaak, 2015).

Thirdly, the role of the teacher, especially in group work, should be reformed. Blatchford et al (2003) emphasize the general distrust teachers have towards students, and do not believe the students can guide their own process. Also, teachers fear the loss of control in the classroom and believe students cannot achieve the desired results when learning from classmates. The teacher needs to adopt the tradition of scaffolding rather than giving a lecture about literature. Finally, enthusiasm is key for motivating students. Ahmad & Aziz (2009) mention the combination of creative assignments and an enthusiastic teacher as key features of motivating students for literature.

3. Methodology
3.1 Participants

This study focusses on two groups of English learners. Both groups consist of students in a 5VWO class. 30 students are in the class of teacher A, who is also the researcher. The second group consists of a class of 29 students. These students are in the class of teacher B. These students are all around the same age (16 or 17 years old) and both classes are evenly divided concerning gender. None of the students has read the novel before, and all of these students have Dutch as their first language (L1). Teacher A's class is the experiment group. These students will receive reader approach-based instructions and assignments, and will work in literary circles. Teacher B's class is the control group. These students have to read the book by themselves and receive information on the book in the traditional approach only.

3.2 Materials

Since this study had to be done within a limited time period, the options and possibilities for this research thesis were limited as well. The Sint-Jans Lyceum school in Den Bosch works with class sets, which means that every student must read the same novel. In period two, logistically the most convenient time frame to conduct this research, the 5VWO classes read *Day of the Triffids* by John Windham. Students have around 6 weeks to finish their novel.

   Day of the Triffids was written in 1951 and is still considered a classic today. Written in times of the cold war, this story portrays a post-apocalyptic society where most people have been blinded by a meteor shower. An aggressive species of plants originated in Russia then starts taking over the world, eliminating everyone that crosses their path.

   The materials that will be used in class, and the test questions, are all based on Bloom´s taxonomy of processing. Every processing level has some specific types of exercises that fit the respective level. Students are asked to form a group and discuss their novel as their own literary circle. While discussing the novel, they make in-class assignments after three

weeks, and again after six weeks. These assignments leave room for the students´

interpretation and creativity. Creative 'hands on' assignments include creating a flyer

(application), a timeline (knowledge), or a drawing (comprehension). Writing assignments

include: ´Write a letter to the government to warn them about the Triffids´ (synthesis), ´what

would you do differently?´ (evaluation), and ´rewrite the ending of the novel´(application).

Due to practical restrictions, this research project does not have assignments on the novel for

every single level of processing, but it does leave room for students to choose which direction

they would prefer to work in. The in-class assignments are based on these levels and demand

a higher level of abstract thinking with every step up the ladder of processing; these

assignments are more demanding for the students than assignments based on Bloom's first

few levels of processing, and are more subjective in nature, which is also the reason why

these are not all test questions: they are time consuming and a challenge to grade. The actual

test questions will not encompass every level of Bloom's taxonomy, but the in-class

assignments will. The questions on the test are based roughly on the levels of processing, and

therefore can scale which students are better in making assignments at which levels. A copy

of both the in class assignments and the book test is included in the appendix.

     The researcher selects a variety of students to form a focus group and asks them

questions based on the motivational questionnaire in appendix X. These selected students are

chosen because they differ in gender, average grade in English class, and whether they are re-

taking their 5th form this year. This variety of students should lead to a complete view of

diverse students. The questions are about their motivation to read their novel and their

motivation to learn for this literature test. The questions are in Dutch to guarantee a complete

understanding of the questions. The answers to the questions could be categorized in 4 types

of motivation: external regulation (learn to obtain a reward), introjected regulation (an inner

voice of reason or consciousness), identified regulation (a sense of duty to your own

development) and intrinsic motivation (learning because you want to). This questionnaire is based on the self-regulating questionnaires developed by Ryan and Connell (1989). The original questionnaire they have created was longer than the one that will be used in this research project. The final paragraph in the original questionnaire involved questions on working for school in general, which seemed redundant to this research. By applying some small alterations (e.g. 'classes' in general becomes 'novel') this questionnaire became what it is now. (see appendix)

3.3 Procedure

The control group will receive *Day of the Triffids*, and they will be asked to read half of the novel within 3 weeks of having received their copy of the novel at their school´s library. After these three weeks, the students will discuss the contents of the book so far. Teacher B leads this group discussion, following the customs of the traditional approach. These discussions do not encompass the entire class of 50 minutes, and students are asked to continue their daily routines after the discussion. After six weeks, the students are asked to do the same thing, this time after having read the entire book. The students receive a book test with questions based on Bloom´s taxonomy, and are asked to fill in the questionnaire about their motivation.

The experiment group of teacher A will go through a similar process. They are asked to read half of the book in three weeks. In class, students receive reader-centred assignments in their literary circles to process the content of the novel. They work in groups formed by the teacher to discuss the book and make assignments given by the teacher. Some assignments concern creative writing based on a chosen fragment of the text, and one assignment in particular asks for the student to draw a scene from the novel involving the Triffids as accurately as possible. Students have to make 3 assignments of their own choosing. However, to make sure students will not only choose drawing exercises, or just writing assignments,

they are asked to choose at least one assignment from each category. These assignments fill an entire class of 50 minutes. The students receive the same book test as the control group, with questions based on Bloom´s taxonomy. After three weeks and after six weeks, the students that have been asked to be in the focus group are asked about their motivation for reading their novels.

To monitor whether students in the experiment group are more motivated and perform better, a control group is instated that receives the traditional approach. Both groups take the same book test. The book test has questions that differ in levels of difficulty and in levels of processing (Bloom 1956). Bloom´s taxonomy of the types of questions used (either in class or in the book test) provides clarity on the thinking levels a student addresses to be able to answer the questions.

After these classes, the researcher checks the tests using a rubric. Grading the test while taking into account the division of the questions into groups of Bloom's taxonomy gives an overview of which students outperform others in the higher levels of processing. By assigning two different approaches to two different groups of students, an attempt is made to label one of the two approaches as being more effective, and more motivating.

3.4 Analysis

The book test will be checked using a rubric. Most of the answers will be checked as either correct or incorrect. For the questions on higher levels, the rubric will state that an answer should at least entail certain factors to be assessed as correct, partially correct or incorrect. There will be an overview of which student performed well on which questions, as to compare the results of the experimental and control group. The results will be put in tables showing the actual points and the percentages of the total available points every student has earned for their answer per question. The average percentage of earned points per question will be held side by side for the research group and the control group, to see which group

outperformed the other group on which questions. A difference of higher than 5 percent would be considered statistically significant (Stokking, 2016).

The motivation interviews are performed after three and six weeks. By writing down the key points students make in their answers, the answers can be coded and compared to the answers given by the other students. With these outcomes, it can be concluded which students are more motivated to learn, and in what way they are (external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic motivation). Again, a comparison will be made between the outcomes of the students of the control group and the experiment group.

4. Results

4.1 The book test results

The questions in the book test were divided into 5 groups: Remembering, understanding, applying, analysing and evaluating. There were no test questions based on the level of creating. Table 1 shows the percentages of the average number of correct responses per group. Since some questions were answered partially correctly, the percentages in this table are the numbers of earned points of the total number of points available. (i.e. if 20 out of 30 students answer a question correctly, they would have earned 20 out of 30 points. The percentage would then be 67%).

Table 1: Percentage of correct answers per question

		Research group	Control group	Difference
Remember	Q 1	98,5 %	74 %	24,5%
	Q 2	63,6 %	65 %	-1,7%
	Q 3	55%	53 %	2%
Understand	Q 4	42 %	41,5 %	0,5%
	Q 5	67 %	60 %	7%
Apply	Q 6	62 %	67 %	-5%
Analyse	Q 7	93 %	89,5 %	3,5%
	Q 8	97 %	95 %	3%
Evaluate	Q 9	50 %	48,5 %	1,5%

4.1.1 Remembering

98,5% of the available points were earned for question 1 in the research group. The complete table (see appendix A) shows that only 1 student received no points for the given answer and

only 4 students received half points for their answers to this question. The control group

received fewer points for this question and earned 74 % of the available points. Out of 29, 11

students received half points for their answers and 2 students received no points.

The answers to question 2 were scored worse than those from question 1 by both

groups. The control group answered this question a little better than the research group by

1,4%. The research group received 63,6% of the total available points and the control group

received 65% of the total points. Both groups contained only 2 students who earned the

maximum score for their answers to this question.

Question 3 led to disappointing results in both groups. In the research group, some

students received the maximum score for their answers, yet many students received only half

the points or no points at all. The results were a little bit worse in the control group;

compared to the 55% of correct answers in the research group, the control group scored 53%.

4.1.2 Understanding

Students scored equally on question 4. The difference is only half a percent for the research

group and the control group, with 42% and 41,5% respectively.

Question 5 led to a wider gap between the two groups. The research group received

67% of the total score for this question. 9 students were awarded no point for their answers,

and 2 students received half points for their answers. The control group received 60% of the

total score and 5 students received half points, whereas 9 students received no points.

4.1.3 Applying

The control group answered this question correctly more often than the research group. Out

of 29 participating students in the research group, only 7 received the maximum score for

question 6. 11 students of the control group received the maximum score for their answers. In

both groups, many students received half of the available points.

4.1.4 Analysing

Both questions 7 and 8 were answered well by both groups. Students of the research group earned 93% of the available points for question 7, as only 4 students received half points for their answers. In the control group, 6 students received half points which led to a total score of 89,5%.

The difference in score for question 8 was minimal. In the research group, students received 97% of available points, where the control group earned 95% of the total score. In the first group, 2 students received half points, and in the second group only 1 student received no points and 1 student received half points.

4.1.5 Evaluating

In the final category, the differences were minimal once again. Both groups received about half of the total points. The research group did a little better and scored exactly 50%. The control group came close with 48,5%.

4.2 Motivation

This section will summarize the conversations that took place with the students of the focus group, in order to get an idea of their motivation to read and study for this English literature test. The questions and the students´ answers can be found (coded) in the appendix.

4.2.1 Focus group: the research group

Student 1: Male, doing 5th form for the second time, average grade is not sufficient.

After three weeks of reading he has not read the book as far as he was asked to do. He was not motivated to do so. He thought that he would be fine if he started reading a few days before the test. The answers to his first interview were very negative: he did not care about

getting in trouble for not doing homework, he did not like any assignment and he did not like working in class. He also did not consider himself to be a team player and did not want to work in groups.

In the second interview, I talked to a whole new person. He was much more positive and felt motivated to work. He stated that he felt better about himself when working on his literature assignments and was happy to work in groups, so that he could show other people what he knew. One striking difference is how he wants to be viewed by others: working in groups has motivated him to work together, find a solution to a problem and he wanted to get the attention of the teacher when working and doing his best. The only aspects he still did not respond to positively were the questions based on identified regulation; He did not see the importance of working hard for the future. He only looked as far as his upcoming literature test.

Student 2: Female, first time in 5th form, average grade is a passing grade

She was a positive student in the first interview. She saw the importance of working hard and thought about the future. She emphasized that she did not enjoy working for literature classes, but she did it anyway. The reason for this is that she found it difficult. She also wanted the positive attention of her group and liked to be complimented for her hard work. The importance of literature classes specifically was not on her mind, but she did feel that it is her duty to work hard on anything that she had to do for school.

The second interview led to many of the same answers as the first. She still did not like making homework for literature classes. However, one difference is that she mentioned that she could be embarrassed when she was the only person in her group/literary circle who did not do her homework. She wanted to participate in the group discussions and did not want to fall behind. She scored low on the factor of intrinsic motivation: she did not enjoy working for literature classes, or for school in general.

Student 3: Male, doing 5th form for the second time, average grade is a passing grade

He was careful in his first interview. He understood the importance of making homework, and he knew why students have to do literature homework and assignments. He even realised that reading books is important for his development. However, he was only motivated by external factors. He wanted the teacher to see his hard work, and he wanted to pass the fifth form so he could get his diploma. He did not want to study for his own development and he did not feel like he should be ashamed of not having finished his homework or not knowing something. He did not enjoy literature classes whatsoever, but still attempted to make the best of it.

In his second interview, he still did not like making literature homework or reading. However, he was more positive about the other factors. Working in groups motivated him to find an answer together and the importance of the teacher was marginalised. Besides scoring low on intrinsic motivation, he scored high on introjected regulation and identified regulation. He therefore wanted to work because he knew he should, and because he knew it would be the best thing for him personally.

4.2.2 Focus group: the control group

Student 1: Female, doing 5th form for the second time, average grade is not sufficient.

This student was happy to work with me for our interview, yet she gave answers during our first interview that did not line up with the view teacher B had about this student. She wanted the teacher to know how smart she was, yet did not find homework too important. Working on literature assignments and reading novels are considered boring and a waste of time, but she does make a final spurt (every time so far) a few days before the book test. She wanted to do better and work harder, but somehow did not consider that as an achievable goal.

After the book test, this student felt the heat of not knowing many of the questions and

feared a failing grade. She had a wake-up call a few days before this interview and decided to work harder to improve her performance. Therefore, she was far more positive about many things. The role of the teacher was still crucial for this student, she relied on the teacher to motivate her to do her work. Also, identified regulation became a greater part of her motivation. She was told that working hard meant not only that she can get a diploma; working hard would be good for her development, and working hard would mean that she could start doing her dream job more quickly, which was about helping people.

Student 2: Female, first time in 5th form, average grade is a passing grade

During the first interview, she was timid and gave all the ´correct´ answers. She was happy to work for school, and saw the importance of doing her literature homework. The only factor she did not consider to be important, was the teacher. She believed students can motivate themselves and that group work is a convenient tool for learning for your own enrichment.

        The second time I spoke to this student, she was more negative about certain things. She did not believe literature homework was fun, and she did not like to work in the classroom. However, she still believed literature was important for students´ development and to obtain a reward. The role of the teacher also became more important according to her, since they are the ones handing out these rewards. Whereas she scored high on all levels of motivation in our first talk, she scored low on intrinsic motivation in our second interview.

Student 3: Male, first time in 5th form, average grade is a passing grade

This student was fairly neutral in his first interview. He wanted to work for school, but not too much. He wanted to impress the teacher, yet not desperately. Also, he liked working on literature assignments, but not too much. He believed that working in groups would be a good tool to have students interact about the book, but also stated that he would be tempted to chat with his peers about other things as well, as opposed to only about the book. Also, he could

not guarantee that he and his peers would be speaking English if he was asked to be so throughout the assignments.

In the second interview, this student remained neutral. His attitude towards the teacher had improved slightly. He wanted to show the teacher that he had read the entire novel and could sum up most of the events that happen in the novel. Once, he did mention that if he had the chance, he would demonstrate his knowledge with the other students. However, being from the control group, this student did not work in groups and had no opportunity to share his knowledge in class. This student scores highest in external regulation. He worked hard, but only if it is for a concrete goal.

5. Discussion

In the first two sections of this chapter, the results will be discussed and the findings from the graphs of the previous chapter will be interpreted. In the third section, I will answer the main research question and the sub questions, using the information from the first paragraph.

5.1 Interpretation of the book test results

The questions on the book test were divided according to Bloom´s taxonomy of processing. On the level of remembering, students of the research group scored higher than the students of the control group. The reader-based assignments the students received in their literary circles were developed to make sure students would have to dig into the plot of the book. By having them work in groups to answer these questions about the plot on the level of remembering, students were forced to know more about the plot. The literary circles could be labelled as effective for the first level of processing, with a significant difference of 24,5 percent for one of the questions.

There were only minor differences between the two groups in the second level of processing. The difference in percentage may be small, but the control group was outperformed by the research group. The level of understanding was also represented in the assignments of the literary circle, and therefore could carefully be considered as being effective with a significant difference of 7 percent between the two groups.

The book test only contained one question on the third level: applying. Students from the control group received more points for their answers to this question than the research group. This question, or anything like it, was not discussed in the literary circles and answers on the books test were often incomplete. Therefore, it cannot be decided whether a reader approach is helpful for students in answering questions on the level of applying.

On the level of analysis, the students of the research group received more points than the students of the control group. Many questions in the literary circles were based on this

level. Students were therefore trained to not only know the plot of the book, but also to think further than the information the book has given them. They were trained to provide their own input and ideas to complete the novel or create other versions of the novel. However, the differences between the two groups was too small to be called significant, and therefore the reader approach cannot be labelled as effective for the level of analysis.

The final level of Bloom´s taxonomy is called ´evaluating´. There was only one test question based on this level of processing. Students of the control group scored 1,5% lower than the research group, so the difference is only minimal. Taking these results into consideration, it cannot be confidently stated that the reader approach can be considered effective for the level of evaluation.

5.2 Motivation

Students of the research group were more positive about literature classes in their second interview then they were in their first interview. Although they did not consider school and working for literature classes fun, they did see the importance of working hard and learning from each other. Working in groups motivated students to work harder and they wanted to find the solutions to the problems posed in their assignments. The types of assignments were considered to be a good preparation for the book test, and forced the students to dig deeper into their novel. Even though each of the interviewed students scored higher on a different level of motivation, it can be stated that the reader approach is considered by the students as an effective approach to prepare students for their book test.

The students of the control group reacted very differently to the posed questions. The first student was more motivated to work during the second interview. The second student was negative in the first interview and even more negative in the second interview. The third student was rather neutral in his answers, yet appreciated the teacher and wanted to share his knowledge. These mixed responses cannot be said to follow the same trend, as their attitudes

stayed the same or even worsened. After having spoken to the students in the focus group, it can be stated that the traditional approach is less motivating for students who read a novel than the reader approach.

5.3 Research question

The aim of this research project was to investigate whether students can be motivated to read novels for EFL classes, and whether a certain approach can do not only that, but also increase students´ learning outcomes. The main research question was: Can the use of the reader approach in processing novels help to improve both students´ motivation, and their learning outcomes for 5VWO students? Sub-questions were: 1) Are students more motivated to read novels when they have been processing the novel using the reader approach, as opposed to the traditional approach? 2) Do students have a deeper understanding of the literature they have been exposed to when they have been processing a novel using the reader approach, compared to the traditional approach? The hypothesis was that students would be more motivated when they process a novel using the reader approach, rather than the traditional approach. Students who have used the reader approach were also expected to outperform the student that have received the traditional approach. The hypothesis for the first sub question would then be that students are more motivated to read their novels and participate in the book- processing classes then the students of the control group would be. Finally, the hypothesis for the second sub question was that students would outperform students on the questions in the book test that concerned a higher level of processing.

To find out the answers to the research questions, I divided the students into two groups. One group received the so-called traditional approach, whereas the research group received the reader approach when processing a novel. The book test was developed to cover Bloom´s levels of processing, to see which group of students outperformed the other group on which levels. Also, some students formed a focus group and were asked to answer

questions about their motivation for reading novels for EFL classes.

Results showed that students from the research group outperformed the students of the control group on the first and second level of processing: remembering and understanding. On the other levels of processing, the differences were too small to confidently call one approach more or less effective. The interviews on motivation showed that students from the research group were more motivated to read a novel for EFL classes than students from the control group.

Contrary to what was expected students of the control group and the research group performed equally well on the book test questions of other levels than the level of remembering. Students using the reader approach were believed to outperform the traditional approach on the higher levels, and would do equally well on the first level. The exact opposite had happened. This could be explained through the nature of the assignments students of the research group were given during the book processing classes. These assignments forced students to look up information in their novel, before they could give their opinions and interpretations. The factual information and their knowledge of the plot was activated and correctly applied in the book test. The students of the control group did not have the chance to work together on assignments like these and many facts were forgotten on the test. The reason why both groups of students performed equally well on the questions of the higher levels of processing could be because they knew the general plot of the novel, and were asked to apply that general knowledge to a new assignment. Challenging as these assignments were, all students had an fair chance of succeeding in the higher levels of processing.

Working in groups to find a solution for a problem and working on assignments is considered as motivating by the students. The answer to my main research question is that the

reader approach improves students' motivation, and it adds to the improvement of learning

outcomes in 5VWO when reading a novel.

6   Conclusion

In this chapter I will firstly discuss the major conclusions that can be drawn from this thesis project. Secondly, I will consider its strengths and limitations. This entails how this research project could have reached its potential had it been longer and the data collection more extensive. Furthermore, I will discuss some suggestions for expanding this research and build from it.

6.1 Major conclusions

The purpose of this thesis was to analyze the possibility of improving motivation and learning outcomes for 5VWO students reading a novel. The analysis of the book test results lead to the conclusion that the reader approach has a minimal influence on students´ learning outcomes. The research group outperformed the control group only on some levels of Bloom´s taxonomy of processing, surprisingly enough more on the lower levels of Bloom's taxonomy than on the higher levels.

 Some students formed a focus group and were asked several questions about their motivation to work for EFL literature classes and their motivation to read novels. The results suggest that students who work in literary circles and make assignments that are reader-oriented, rather than text-oriented, are more motivated to work and to find out specifics of their novel.

6.2 Thesis Strengths and Limitations

The novel used for this project was *Day of the Triffids.* However, this novel was written in 1953 and students find it old-fashioned. This could be considered as something negative, yet I believe that finding a way to motivate students for a book they are not enthusiastic about in the first place, is the real challenge. When students can pick which novel they would want to read for a book test, their motivation might have been different from the first day.

 A negative aspect for teachers is that these types of assignments and books tests are time consuming, and sometimes too subjective to grade. Rather than giving the customary simple multiple choice tests, students are asked to answer questions elaborately. Their answers to these questions can be considered as complete or incomplete by different teachers. In order to prevent this from happening, multiple

teachers should grade the tests of one class, or one teacher should grade all of them.

 Students are more motivated to work for a project when they know it will benefit them. Students that participated in this research were more than happy to share their test results with the researcher, since that would mean that the program for book testing could change in a way that is beneficial for them. The downside of this is that students could have exaggerated their level of motivation in the interviews. However, I made an attempt to find different types of student, and truly believe their responses were genuine in the interviews.

6.3 Future research

To find out what exact aspects were motivating and contributed to students´ learning outcome, every aspect of this research should be investigated individually. This means that students should work with every approach used for reading literature: the text approach, the historical approach, the linguistic approach, the traditional approach, and the reader approach. After processing a book with exclusively one of these approaches, they should make a book test. Also, they should preferably all read the same novel.

 Some schools already work with literary circles. These schools could invest time in making novels more attractive through interesting assignments. After all, the reader approach and questions based on this approach are more attractive to students than questions based on the text approach.

 Finally, this research project could be done with students from all forms, and from all types of secondary education (MAVO, HAVO, VWO).

 Now, the only thing that needs investigating further is whether teachers are prepared to work with this approach. Book tests of older books have been used for many years now, and at the SJL they are all based on the traditional approach. These tests are easy to grade. Persuading teachers to work harder for a simple book test might be the real challenge then. However, literary circles as a preparation for a book test should get the attention they deserve from teachers at the SJL.

Bibliography

Abduljabbar, D.A., & Omar, N. (2015). Exam questions classification based on Bloom´s taxonomy cognitive level using classifiers combination. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information   Technology*, 78(3), 447.

Aggabao, R.G., & Guiab, M.R. (2014). Learning Activities in Studying Literature. *Researchers World, 5*(3), 48.

Ahmad, F., & Aziz, J. (2009) Students´ perception of the teachers´ teaching of literature communicating and understanding through the eyes of the audience. *European Journal of social sciences, 7*(3), 17-26.

Blatchford, P. Kutnick, P. Baines, E. & Galton, M. (2003). Toward a social pedagogy of classroom group work. *International Journal of Educational Research, 39*(1-2), 153-172.

Bloemert, J., Jansen, E., van de Grift, W. (2016). Exploring EFL literature approaches in Dutch secondary education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 29*(2), 169-188.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Vol 1: Cognitive domain.* New York: McKay, 20-24.

Chambers, A. (1983) *Introducing books to children*. Horn Book.

Cornelissen, G. (2016). *Maar als je erover nadenkt...: Een jaar literatuuronderwijs in groepen 7 en 9 van de basisschool* (Vol. 27). Eburon Uitgeverij BV.

Hayamizu, T. (1997). Between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Examination of reasons for academic study based on the theory of internalization. *Japanese psychological research*, 39(2), 98-108.

Kwakernaak, E. (2013). RTTI, OBIT, Bloom en het vreemdetalenonderwijs. *Levende talen magazine, 100*(5), 10-16.

Kwakernaak, E. (2015). *Didactiek van het vreemdetalenonderwijs*. Bussum: Uitgeverij Coutinho.

Rashid, R. A., Vethamani, M. E., & Rahman, S. B. A. (2010). Approaches Employed by Teachers in Teaching Literature to Less Proficient Students in Form 1 and Form 2. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 87-99.

Stokking, K. (2016). *Bouwstenen voor onderzoek in onderwijs en opleiding*. Garant-Uitgevers nv.

Turner, J.C., & Patrick, H. (2004). Motivational influences on student participation in classroom learning activities. *Teacher College Record, 106*(9), 1759-1785.

Van, T. T. M. (2009). The relevance of literary analysis to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 47, No. 3, p. 2). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington DC 20037.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980) *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.

Witte, T.C.H. (2005) Literaire ontwikkeling in het studiehuis. *Ontwikkelingsstadia in het leren van kunst, literatuur en muziek*. Cultuur en Educatie 14, Cultuurnetwerk Nederlands, Utrecht.

Witte, T.C.H. (2008). *Het oog van de meester: Een onderzoek naar de literaire ontwikkeling van havo- en vwo- leerlingen in de tweede fase van het voortgezet onderwijs* (Vol. 12). Eburon Uitgeverij BV.

Woolfolk, A., Hughes, M. Walkup, V. (2013). *Psychology in Education.* Harlow: Pearson.

Appendix A: Book test questions

---- Remembering/knowledge ----

1. Match the names of the characters with the correct statement

1. Bill	1 +	a. Starts his/her own religious group
2. Josella	2 +	b. Was blinded by a triffid but recovered
3. Miss Durant	3 +	c. Started a fire to smoke out the sighted
4. Coker	4 +	d. The youngest character in the book
5. David	5 +	e. Famous for a writing a book

2. Describe the way a triffid looks in approximately 50 words.

3. How did Bill know where to go when he had lost Josella, to go and find her?

---- Understanding/ comprehension ----

4. Compare the views the people from the university had with the views Coker had, concerning blind people and seeing people.

5. Explain why Bill would not just leave the blind people when he had the chance

---- Applying ----

6. Could something like this happen in our lifetime? Explain

---- Analysis ----

7.Had Josella never met Bill, what would have happened to her?

8. Besides food and water, what would Bill definitely need in order to survive in this society?

---- Evaluation ----
9. What is Coker's initial approach? Do you think Coker´s approach is a good or a bad thing?

Appendix B: Book test matrix

Test matrix

Subject: English Type of test: Booktest
Form: 5 VWO
Number of questions: 9
Grade counts how many times: 1

Question	Type of questions						
	Reproduction	*Production*					
	Remembering	Understanding	Applying	Analysing	Evaluating	Creating	
1.	X						12,5%
2.	X						18,75%
3.	X						6,25%
4.		x					12,5%
5.		x					6,25%
6.			x				12,5%
7.				x			12,5%
8.				x			6,25%
9.					x		12,5%
Total	37,5%	18,75%	12,5%	18,75%	12,5%	0%	100%

Appendix C: Book test rubric

---- Remembering/knowledge ----

1. Match the names of the characters with the correct statement (2 p)

1. Bill	1 + B	a. Starts his/her own religious group
2. Josella	2 + E	b. Was blinded by a triffid but recovered
3. Miss Durant	3 + A	c. Started a fire to smoke out the sighted
4. Coker	4 + C	d. The youngest character in the book
5. David	5 + D	e. Famous for a writing a book

Half a point deduction per mistake

2. Describe the way a triffid looks in approximately 50 words. (3 p)
   3 feet / roots with which they walk
   Long stem
   Cup
   Stinger coming out of the cup
   Can become 2.4 meters high
   Sticks they use to clatter to call other triffids
   they give pink oil

Half a point per correct characteristic

3. How did Bill know where to go when he had lost Josella, to go and find her? (2 p)

She told him earlier that she always went to an idyllic farm – that´s where they would meet up – 2 points

She wrote an address on the wall in the university – 1 point

---- Understanding/ comprehension ----

4. Compare the views the people from the university had with the views Coker had, concerning blind people and seeing people. (2 p)

University: blind women only, they can produce seeing children – seeing men – 1 point
Coker: One seeing person can take care of multiple blind people – 1 point

5. Explain why Bill would not just leave the blind people when he had the chance (1 p)

He could not leave these harmless, helpless people behind – felt guilty

---- Applying ----

6. Could something like this happen in our lifetime? Explain. (2 p)

Yes, because plants are everywhere – they are a symbol for something else
No, because we´re smarter now – technology is more advanced

---- Analysis ----

7.Had Josella never met Bill, what would have happened to her? (2 p)

Josella was rescued from a blind man who tied her down so she could take care of him. She would be a slave and maltreated, or dead.

8. Besides food and water, what would Bill definitely need in order to survive in this society? (1 p)

1. A gun/weapon
2. A group of people
3. Fuel – half point

---- Evaluation ----
9. What is Coker's initial approach? Do you think Coker´s approach is a good or a bad thing? (2 p)

He wanted people to have an even chance. – 1 point
A good thing, because
A bad thing, because - 1 point

Appendix D: In class assignments

After three weeks:

Names:

Discuss the story – What happens per chapter?

What do we know about the characters?

1. Make a timeline of events so far

2. Draw a triffid as accurately as possible

3. Develop a set of instructions to kill as many triffids as possible in one go.

4. Can you explain what must have happened to the group led by a drunk man?

5. Develop a means of communication that you can use without triffids knowing about your presence.

6. You live in the 50´s, you know what is going to happen, write a letter to your government to warn them and ask to take action.

After six weeks:

Remembering/knowledge

1. Make a timeline

Understanding/ comprehension

2. What do you think could have happened after this book?
3. Retell the story in your own words

Applying

4. What factors would you change to help this book get to a happy ending for Bill quicker? Write your (short) version of the story.
5. If you were Bill, would you find an instruction to killing triffids as effectively as possible helpful? Explain.

Analysis

6. How would you sell your weapon against triffids? Create an add or describe what your commercial would look like.
7. Write Bills biography, make it a fluent story.
8. List the advantages and disadvantages to every approach the different groups of people have.

Synthesis/creating

9. If you had access to all resources and skills, how would you deal with the triffids?
10. What could the triffids be a symbol for in today's world?

Evaluation

11. Would this be a tv show, what would be the age-restrictions/ other priorities and ratings?
12. Make a flyer that you would make to warn the people triffids are coming

Appendix E: Test results per student per question

V5B – Research group										Total	Grade
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
Max score	2	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	16	10
No.											
1	2	2	1	0	0,5	1	2	1	1	10,5	5,7
2	2	1	1	1,5	1	2	2	1	2	13,5	7,9
3	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	11	5,9
4	2	2	1	1,5	0	1	2	1	0	10,5	5,7
5	2	0,5	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	9,5	5,2
6	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	11	5,9
7	2	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	9	5
8	2	1,5	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	11,5	6,3
9	1	1,5	0,5	1	1	2	2	1	2	12	6,7
10	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	4,1
11	2	1,5	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	11,5	6,3
12	2	2,5	0	0	0	1	1	0,5	0	7	4,1
13	2	3	0,5	0	1	1	2	1	0	10,5	5,7
14	1	1	0,5	1,5	0,5	1	2	1	0	8,5	4,8
15	2	2,5	0	1	0,5	1	2	1	1	11	5,9
16	2	2,5	0	1,5	1	2	2	1	1	13	7,5
17	2	2	1	1,5	1	1	2	1	0	11,5	6,3
18	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	10	5,5
19	2	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	11	5,9
20	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	8	4,6
21	2	2	0,5	0	0	1	2	1	2	10,5	5,7
22	2	3	1	0	1	2	2	0,5	2	13,5	7,9
23	2	2,5	0,5	1	0	1	2	1	1	11	5,9
24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
25	2	2	1	1,5	1	2	2	1	2	14,5	8,8
26	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	10	5,5
27	2	2	0,5	2	1	1	2	1	2	13,5	7,9
28	2	2	0,5	1,5	0	1	2	1	1	11	5,9
29	2	1,5	0,5	1	0	1	2	1	0	9	5
30	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	13	7,5
Average	1,79	1,91	0,55	0,84	0,67	1,24	1,86	0,97	1		

V5E – Control group										Total	Grade
Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
Max score	2	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	16	10
No.											
1	1	1	1	1	0,5	1	1	1	2	9,5	5,2
2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	13	7,5
3	2	2	1	1,5	1	2	2	1	2	14,5	8,8
4	1	2	1	1,5	0,5	0	1	1	0	8	4,6
5	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	6	3,7
6	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	11	5,9
7	2	2	1	0	0,5	2	2	1	0	10,5	5,7
8	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	0,5	2	10,5	5,7
9	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	10	5,5
10	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	9	5
11	2	1,5	1	1,5	1	1	2	1	1	12	6,7
12	2	2,5	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	9,5	5,2
13	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	9	5
14	1	1,5	0,5	1	0	1	2	1	1	9	5
15	1	2,5	0	0,5	0,5	1	1	1	1	8,5	4,8
16	2	2	0,5	1	0,5	1	2	1	1	11	5,9
17	2	2,5	0	1,5	1	1	2	1	0	10,5	5,7
18	2	2	0	1,5	1	1	2	1	0	10,5	5,7
19	1	1,5	1	0	1	1	2	1	2	10,5	5,7
20	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	9	5
21	2	2	0,5	1	0	2	2	1	1	11,5	6,3
22	2	2	0,5	0	0	2	2	0	2	10,5	5,7
23	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	10	5,5
24	2	2	1	1,5	0	2	2	1	2	13,5	7,9
25	2	1	0,5	1	1	1	2	1	0	9,5	5,2
26	2	3	0,5	2	1	1	2	1	1	13,5	7,9
27	2	2	0,5	1	0	1	2	1	1	10,5	5,7
28	1	2,5	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	12,5	7,1
29	2	2	0	1,5	0	1	1	1	1	9,5	5,2
Average	1,48	1,95	0,53	0,83	0,60	1,34	1,79	0,95	0,97		

Appendix F: Motivation questions

Questionnaire based on the Self-Regulating Questionnaires – Academic (SRQ-A) by Ryan and Connell (1989)

Naam: _____   Leeftijd: _____

Klas: _____   Jongen/ Meisje

A.   Waarom maak je je literatuur huiswerk?

	Helemaal niet waar	Niet waar	Waar	Helemaal waar
1.Omdat ik wil dat de docent denkt dat ik een goede leerling ben	1	2	3	4
2.Omdat ik problemen krijg op school als ik het niet doe	1	2	3	4
3.Omdat het leuk is	1	2	3	4
4.Omdat het mij anders een slecht gevoel over mijzelf geeft	1	2	3	4
5.Omdat ik het boek graag wil begrijpen	1	2	3	4
6.Omdat ik dat hoor te doen	1	2	3	4
7.Omdat ik het leuk vind om huiswerk te maken	1	2	3	4
8.Omdat het belangrijk is om mijn huiswerk te maken	1	2	3	4

B.   Waarom werk je in de klas aan literatuuropdrachten?

	Helemaal niet waar	Niet waar	Waar	Helemaal waar
9.Zodat de docent niet boos op mij wordt.	1	2	3	4
10.Omdat ik wil dat de docent mij een goede leerling vindt.	1	2	3	4
11.Omdat ik nieuwe dingen wil leren	1	2	3	4
12.Omdat ik mij schaam als ik mijn opdrachten niet af krijg	1	2	3	4
13.Omdat het leuk is	1	2	3	4
14.Omdat het de regels zijn	1	2	3	4
15.Omdat ik het leuk vindt om te werken in de klas	1	2	3	4
16.Omdat het belangrijk is om te werken in de klas	1	2	3	4
17. Omdat ik goede cijfers wil halen voor een goede toekomst	1	2	3	4
18. Omdat ik goede cijfers wil halen voor een diploma	1	2	3	4

C.   Waarom probeer je antwoord te geven als je in groepjes werkt?

	Helemaal niet waar	Niet waar	Waar	Helemaal waar
19.Omdat ik wil dat andere leerlingen mij slim vinden	1	2	3	4
20.Omdat ik me schaam als ik het niet eens probeer	1	2	3	4
21.Omdat ik dat hoor te doen	1	2	3	4
22.Om erachter te komen of ik het goed of fout heb	1	2	3	4
23.Omdat het leuk is om uitdagende vragen te beantwoorden	1	2	3	4
24.Omdat het voor mij belangrijk is om moeilijke vragen te kunnen beantwoorden	1	2	3	4
25.Omdat ik wil dat de docent het opmerkt	1	2	3	4

External regulation: 2,6,9,14,18,19,25 → obtain a reward
Introjected regulation: 1,4,10,12,20,24 → voice of reason, consciousness, feeling of shame or guilt
Identified Regulation: 5,8,11,16, 17,21,22→ sense of duty, beneficial for own development
Intrinsic Motivation: 3,7,13,15,23 → purely for your own enjoyment

Appendix G: Coded answers to motivation questions

Q: Lees je altijd de boeken die je voor school moet lezen?

Student 1a: Nee
Student 1b: Ja
Student 1c: Deels
Student 2a: Soms
Student 2b: Deels
Student 2c: Ja

Q: Lees je graag voor school?

Student 1a: Nee
Student 1b: Nee
Student 1c: Nee
Student 2a: Nee
Student 2b: Ja
Student 2c: Niet echt

Q: Voel je je verantwoordelijk voor het maken van je literatuur huiswerk?

Student 1a: Een beetje, om de toets te kunnen maken
Student 1b: Ja, om de toets te kunnen maken
Student 1c: Ja, zodat ik de vragen in de les kan beantwoorden en de toets kan maken
Student 2a: Nee
Student 2b: Ja, huiswerk is goed voor je
Student 2c: Ja, maar ik doe het niet altijd

Q: Werk je in de klas altijd aan de literatuur opdrachten?

Student 1a: Ik beantwoord meestal wel alle vragen
Student 1b: Ja, ik doe altijd wat ik moet doen
Student 1c: Ja
Student 2a: Meestal
Student 2b: Ja
Student 2c: Ja, meestal

Q: Wat vind je het leukst/ stomst aan literatuuropdrachten in de les?

Student 1a: Literatuur is moeilijk, opdrachten ook.
Student 1b: Je leert het boek er beter door begrijpen
Student 1c: Het boek kan saai zijn, de opdrachten dan ook
Student 2a: Literatuur is moeilijk en saai, dus vragen erover maken is niet leuk.
Student 2b: Literatuur is goed voor je ontwikkeling, dus opdrachten maken ook.
Student 2c: Literatuur is leuker dan grammatica etc, maar vaak ook moeilijker

Q: Vind je dat de docent een grote rol moet spelen als je aan literatuur opdrachten werkt?

Student 1a: Die moet wel komen kijken of het goed gaat.
Student 1b: Ja, soms is het te moeilijk om zelf uit te komen
Student 1c: Nee, in groepjes is leuker zonder dat de docent komt kijken
Student 2a: Alleen met vragen nakijken
Student 2b: Nee
Student 2c: Een beetje

Werk je graag in groepjes voor literatuur opdrachten? Waarom wel/niet?

Student 1a: Ja, Samenwerken met mijn vrienden, weer eens wat anders dan uit boeken werken. Hoef je ook minder te doen, werk verdelen
Student 1b: Ja, elkaar helpen en aanmoedigen

Student 1c: Ja, het is leuker dan opdrachten uit een boek in stilte maken
Student 2a: Ja, want dan kun je meer kletsen
Student 2b: Ja, leuker dan alleen werken
Student 2c: Zou ik wel leuker vinden

Na de boektoets:

Q: Lees je altijd de boeken die je voor school moet lezen?

Student 1a: Niet altijd, maar ik doe mijn best
Student 1b: Ja
Student 1c: Ja, of in ieder geval het grootste deel
Student 2a: Meestal
Student 2b: Soms
Student 2c: Meestal

Q: Lees je graag voor school?

Student 1a: Nee, ik doe liever andere dingen
Student 1b: Niet echt, maar het is goed voor me
Student 1c: Mwa, meestal zijn de verhalen niet zo erg
Student 2a: Mwa, maar meestal niet
Student 2b: Nee
Student 2c: Mwa

Q: Voel je je verantwoordelijk voor het maken van je literatuur huiswerk?

Student 1a: Ja, om de toets te kunnen maken
Student 1b: Ja, voor de toets en het is ook nuttig voor volgend jaar en de vervolgopleiding
Student 1c: Ja, ik wil goede cijfers
Student 2a: Ja, want ik wil goede cijfers en mijn diploma
Student 2b: Meestal wel
Student 2c: Meestal wel

Q: Werk je in de klas altijd aan de literatuur opdrachten?

Student 1a: Ik beantwoord alle vragen en kijk of ik alles goed heb
Student 1b: Ja
Student 1c: Ja
Student 2a: Meestal
Student 2b: Meestal
Student 2c: Ja, vooral als we samen moeten doen

Q: Wat vind je het leukst/ stomst aan literatuuropdrachten in de les?

Student 1a: Samenwerken met mijn vrienden, hen kunnen helpen. Literatuur is moeilijk, opdrachten ook.
Student 1b: Ik vind de boeken vaak moeilijk, dus het helpt wel om het te begrijpen, maar soms zijn de vragen dan ook te moeilijk
Student 1c: Het helpt wel met het verhaal begrijpen, maar als het een saai verhaal is zijn de opdrachten ook niet leuk
Student 2a: Het literatuur gedeelte
Student 2b: Literatuur is moeilijk, de opdrachten ook. Vaak vragen ze dingen die je echt veel tijd kosten om op te zoeken
Student 2c: Samen werken is leuk, maar literatuur is moeilijk

Q: Vind je dat de docent een grote rol moet spelen als je aan literatuur opdrachten werkt?

Student 1a: Die moet wel komen kijken of het goed gaat. Kun je vragen aan stellen en helpen met de teksten/het boek
Student 1b: Ja, maar niet te veel. Nu is het vaak een ´hoorcollege´, de docent moet af en toe helpen

Student 1c: Ja, maar niet te veel

Student 2a: Ja
Student 2b: De docent moet wel helpen
Student 2c: de docent moet wel kunnen en willen helpen

Werk je graag in groepjes voor literatuur opdrachten? Waarom wel/niet?

Student 1a: Ja, is veel gezelliger en je kan ook van elkaar leren
Student 1b: Ja, ik vind vaak veel moeilijk wat een vriendin makkelijk vindt
Student 1c: Ja, het is leuker werken en je helpt elkaar
Student 2a: Zou ik graag doen om meer te leren
Student 2b: Zou wel leuker zijn dan nu
Student 2c: Het zou wel leuker zijn, dan kun je anderen ook helpen en kun je makkelijker vragen stellen als je iets niet snapt

Appendix H: Lesson plans

LESSONPLAN FRIDAY 8 NOVEMBER

Name: Inge Mutsaers Level class: VWO Form? 5th Which period? 6th	
Begin situation	Students have read novels for English class before.
Learning goals	Students can explain what is expected of them the coming period. Students can explain what the first few pages/ the first chapter of the novel is about.

Time (min)	Learning activity	Work form	Materials	Teaching activity
10	Learn what is expected next period	Individually, listen to teacher	Period planner	Explain what the class needs to do this period
10	Listen to teacher explain about thesis	Individually, listen to techer	-	Explain what is expected of the class for my thesis
5	Sign informed consent	individually	Informed consent paper pen	Hand out informed consent papers
10	Get novel from school library	Whole group	School pass, novel	Walk students to library
15	Read novel	individually	Novel	Make sure all students are reading

LESSONPLAN WEDNESDAY 4 DECEMBER

Name: Inge Mutsaers Level class: VWO Form? 5th Which period? 4th	
Begin situation	Students have read half of their novel for English class.
Learning goals	Students can discuss the first half of their book on all levels of processing.

Time (min)	Learning activity	Work form	Materials	Teaching activity
10	Listen to explanation	Individually, listen to teacher	-	Explain why students work in groups and what kind of questions they have to answer
35	Make assignments on all levels of processing	Literary circles	Handouts with assignments, pens and paper, novel	Walk around to help students who need a push in the right direction
5	Round up, put everything in binder with name on it	Literary circles	Handouts and made assignments	Receive everybody´s work

LESSONPLAN FRIDAY 13 DECEMBER

Name: Inge Mutsaers Level class: VWO Form? 5th Which period? 6th	
Begin situation	Students have read their novel for English class.
Learning goals	Students can discuss their novels on all levels of processing.

Time (min)	Learning activity	Work form	Materials	Teaching activity
5	Listen to explanation	Individually, listen to teacher	-	Explain what students have to do
40	Make assignments on all levels of processing	Literary circles	Handouts with assignments, pens and paper, novel	Walk around to help students who need a push in the right direction
5	Round up, put everything in binder with name on it	Literary circles	Handouts and made assignments	Receive everybody´s work

Appendix I: Form of consent

8 november 2019

Om mijn studie af te kunnen ronden, moet ik nog een masterscriptie schrijven. Mijn masterscriptie betreft het lezen van een roman (wat voor 5VWO leerlingen verplicht is in periode 2). Daarbij krijgen de leerlingen in het kader van mijn onderzoek, uitgebreidere lessen over hun roman. Daarop volgt een boektoets en een interview over hun motivatie om te lezen.

Leerlingen moeten toestemming geven voor mij om hun testresultaten en de antwoorden op hun motivatie interviews te mogen gebruiken. Deze toestemming is vrijwillig, en bovendien wordt geen enkele leerling bij naam genoemd. Het enige wat van de leerling te zien zal zijn is bijvoorbeeld 'Leerling 1, jongen'. Wanneer een leerling geen toestemming geeft, komen deze resultaten niet terug in het onderzoek.

Toestemming betekent een completer beeld van mijn onderzoeksresultaten, en betekent wellicht dat we literatuur lessen over de boeken die de leerling moet lezen beter kunnen afstemmen op de wensen van de leerling. Wanneer een leerling wel toestemming geeft, maar zich later toch bedenkt, kan hij of zij dit bekend maken bij de docent, waarna de gegevens uit het eindproduct zullen worden gelaten.

Wanneer het onderzoek af en gepubliceerd is, kunnen de leerlingen (en verder iedereen met interesse) het onderzoek nalezen op de website die ik ze zal geven wanneer interesse wordt getoond. Er zal ook een kopie op school aanwezig zijn.

Bij vragen of opmerkingen, neem contact op met de onderzoeker/ docent Engels:

Inge Mutsaers
i.mutsaers@sjl.nl
0615442389

Form of consent

Toestemmingsformulier voor literatuur onderzoek

1. Deelnemen aan het onderzoek	Ja	Nee
- Ik heb de uitleg van het onderzoek, uitgedeeld op 9 november 2019, gelezen, ik heb de kans gehad om vragen te stellen en antwoord gehad.		
- Ik ga er vrijwillig mee akkoord om deelnemer te zijn aan dit onderzoek en begrijp dat ik kan weigeren of me terugtrekken wanneer ik dat wil, zonder reden te geven.		
- Ik snap dat als ik meedoe aan dit onderzoek, ik een boektoets maak (T502) en ik een meerkeuze enquête invul over mijn motivatie om te lezen.		
2. Welke informatie wordt gebruikt in het onderzoek	Ja	Nee
- Ik begrijp dat mijn antwoorden worden gebruikt voor de masterscriptie van Inge Mutsaers aan de universiteit van Utrecht		
- Ik begrijp dat mijn naam niet wordt gebruikt in dit onderzoek, ik krijg een willekeurig leerling nummer en alleen mijn geslacht wordt genoemd in het onderzoek.		
- Ik geef toestemming voor de onderzoeker om geanonimiseerde citaten te gebruiken uit mijn toets of uit de lessen		
3. Verzamelde gegevens in de toekomst	Ja	Nee
- Ik geef er toestemming voor dat de gepubliceerde gegevens gebruikt kunnen worden door andere onderzoekers zodat zij hun onderzoek kunnen uitbreiden of ervan kunnen leren.		

Handtekeningen

_____   _____   _____

Naam deelnemer   Handtekening deelnemer   Datum

Ik heb de leerlingen correct ingelicht over het deelnemerschap en zo goed mogelijk uitgelegd wat toestemming betekent voor hen en het onderzoek.

_____   _____   _____

Naam onderzoeker   Handtekening   Datum