

# What Works Clearinghouse



## Book Clubs

**Effectiveness<sup>1</sup>** No studies of book clubs that fall within the scope of the Adolescent Literacy review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards. The lack of studies meeting WWC evidence standards means that, at this time, the WWC is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of book clubs on adolescent learners.

**Program Description<sup>2</sup>** Book clubs provide a reading framework designed to supplement or organize regular classroom reading instruction for students in grades K–8. This review focuses on *Book Club* (Raphael & McMahon, 1994)<sup>3</sup> and *Literature Circles* (Daniels, 2002),<sup>4</sup> but it uses the general (lowercase) term *book clubs* to embrace both *Literature Circles* and *Book Club* activities, as well as small-group discussion activities that closely resemble either strategy but may leave out one or more key elements of these originally conceived instructional paradigms.<sup>5</sup> The book club framework aims to improve students' comprehension skills and ability to interpret and think critically about text. In book clubs, small

groups of students gather together to discuss a piece of literature in depth. The discussion is guided by students' responses to what they have read, which might include events and characters in the book, the author's skills, or personal experiences related to the story. Book clubs emphasize students' autonomy in selecting texts and topics for discussion and social interactions among students over solitary experiences with texts. Although both *Book Club* and *Literature Circles* were developed for use in regular classroom instruction during the day, they also may be used during after-school programs.

1. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III), as described in protocol Version 2.0.
2. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from publicly available sources: the research literature (Daniels, 2002; Raphael & McMahon, 1994) and the website (no longer active) of a distributor of components and materials for book clubs.
3. Raphael, T., & McMahon, S. (1994). Book club: An alternative framework for reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 48(2), 102–116.
4. Daniels, H. (2002). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups* (2nd ed.). Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
5. Other models of literature discussion groups are not included in this review, as no research is available on them (e.g., Routman, R. [1994]. *The Blue Pages: Resources for teachers: From "Invitations."* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann).

## Program Description

(continued)

The WWC identified 284 studies of book clubs for adolescent learners that were published or released between 1989 and 2009.

Eleven studies are within the scope of the Adolescent Literacy review protocol but do not meet WWC evidence standards.

- Eight studies do not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.
- Two studies have confounding factors, such as combining book clubs with other interventions, which makes it impossible to attribute the observed effect solely to book clubs.
- One single-case design study did not meet the minimum threshold of at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect.

Two hundred seventy-three studies fall outside the Adolescent Literacy review protocol:

- One hundred thirty-one studies have an ineligible study design.

- One hundred eighteen studies do not have a comparison group.
- Thirteen studies are meta-analyses or literature reviews.
- One hundred forty-two studies are outside the scope of the Adolescent Literacy review protocol for reasons other than study design.
  - Forty-nine studies do not measure the effectiveness of book clubs in a manner defined by the WWC.
  - Forty-two studies do not evaluate the impact of book clubs on student literacy outcomes.
  - Thirty-five studies feature a sample that does not include students in grades 4–12.
  - Fifteen studies feature a sample that is less than 50% general education students.
  - One study occurred outside the geographical area covered by the Adolescent Literacy review.

## References

Studies that fall outside the Adolescent Literacy protocol or do not meet evidence standards

Adams, B. (1998). *Using the book club approach to improve readers' engagement, enjoyment and comprehension* (Unpublished educational specialist's thesis). Georgia State University, Atlanta. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Alger, C. L. (2007). Engaging student teachers' hearts and minds in the struggle to address (il)literacy in content area classrooms. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(8), 620–630. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

Allen, J., Möller, K. J., & Stroup, D. (2003). "Is this some kind of soap opera?": A tale of two readers across four literature

discussion contexts. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19(5), 225–251. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

Allen, S. H. (1994). *Talking about literary texts: Research findings on literature discussion groups in the elementary classroom*. Columbus, OH: Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Alwood, C. S. (2000). *Exploring the role of the teacher in student-led literature circles* (Unpublished manuscript). Western Washington University, Bellingham. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

Anderson, K. M., & Salem State College. (2002). *Will literature circles improve students interest in reading?: An action research*

## References *(continued)*

- report. Salem, MA: Salem State College, Dept. of Education. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Anderson, T. (2001). *Literature circles: How can they help students achieve benchmark level in reading comprehension?* (Unpublished manuscript). Western Oregon University, Monmouth. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Andrews, S. V., & Wheeler, P. J. R. (1991, November). *Learning teams in the college classroom: The one-room schoolhouse revisited*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Oxford, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Baker, B. C. (2006). *Optimizing the effectiveness of literature circles: An after-school reading club intervention model* (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, Stanislaus. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Bales, J. (2008). *Supportive online learning environments for primary students: Literature circles in an educational MOO* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Charles Sturt University, New South Wales, Australia. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Bandermann, E. (1997). Engagement with text through social interaction (collaboration). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(06A), 176–1913. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Baumann, L. S. (1998). *The effects of using small group literature circles and teacher-led novel instruction on high school students' literary engagement and attitudes about reading* (Unpublished thesis). Otterbein College, Westerville, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Beach, R., DeLapp, P., Dillon, D., Galda, L., Lensmire, T., Liang, L., . . . Walker, C. (2003). Annotated bibliography of research in the teaching of English. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(2), 213–228. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (1999). Comprehension: The sine qua non of reading. *Teaching & Change*, 6(2), 197. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Berne, J. I. (2001). Connected teacher learning: An examination of a teacher learning network. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(07A), 215–2386. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Berwanger, N. (2002). *Differentiating a literature unit through brain research and literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, St. Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Bettis, P., & Roe, M. F. (2008). Reading girls: Living literate and powerful lives. *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, 32(1), 1–18. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Biedermann, M. R. (2000). *The effects of literature circles on fourth grade students' quality of discussion* (Unpublished master's thesis). Carthage College, Kenosha, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Blum, H. T., Lipsett, L. R., & Yocom, D. J. (2002). Literature circles: A tool for self-determination in one middle school inclusive classroom. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23(2),

## References *(continued)*

- 99–108. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Bourdon, C. (2006). Learning in circles. *American Libraries*, 37(9), 53. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Bowron, R. K. (2001). How teachers' use of literature circles reflects a transactional view of reading. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(06A), 75–2056. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Boyd, F. B. (1997). The cross-aged literacy program: Preparing struggling adolescents for book club discussions. In S. I. McMahon & T. Raphael (Eds.), *The book club connection: Literacy learning and classroom talk* (pp. 162–183). New York: Teachers College Press. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Brock, C. H., & Raphael, T. E. (2003). Guiding three middle school students in learning written academic discourse. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103(5), 481–502. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Brock, C. H., & Raphael, T. E. (2005). *Windows to language, literacy, and culture: Insights from an English language learner*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Broughton, M. A. (2002). The performance and construction of subjectivities of early adolescent girls in book club discussion groups. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(1), 1–38. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Brown, B. A. (2002). *Literature circles in action in the middle school classroom* (Unpublished manuscript). Georgia College and State University, Milledgeville. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Browne, S. (2003). Upper elementary grade children respond to culturally relevant historical fiction in a community-based literary club. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(05A), 136–1567. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Buck, C. C. (2008). *Young readers respond to international children's literature* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Buzard, B., Jarosz, D., Lato, K., & Zimmermann, L. (2001). *Motivating the reluctant reader* (Unpublished master's thesis). Saint Xavier University & Skylight Professional Development, Chicago, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Byrd, D. E. (2002). An examination of how adult developmental reading students socially construct meaning while engaged in literature circles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(10A), 166–3631. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Cameron, K. M. (2003). *Motivating high school students to read through the use of adolescent literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Toledo, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Camp, C. J. (2006). The effects of literature circles vs. sustained silent reading (SSR) among eleventh grade English students.

## References *(continued)*

- Masters Abstracts International*, 46(03), 41–1219. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Campbell, H. M. (2003). *A comparison of student reading comprehension: Literature circles and basal readers* (Unpublished master's thesis). Shenandoah University, Winchester, VA. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit assigned to one or both conditions.
- Carlsen, N. (1999). *The effect of student-led literature discussion groups on reader response* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Dayton, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Carrison, C., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2005). From silence to a whisper to active participation: Using literature circles with ELL students. *Reading Horizons*, 46, 93–113. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Carstensen, C. C., California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, & College of Education & Integrative Studies. (2008). *Application of literature circles in high school special education classes*. Pomona, CA: California State Polytechnic University. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Caspi, L. L. (1994). The effect of strong women characters in literature and the role of literature discussion groups on the participation of sixth-grade students in literature discussion groups and on their sex stereotype and occupational attitudes. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54(8-A), 2964. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Cervantes, C. K. (2003). *“Literature circles” and “scaffolded reading experience” strategies compared for English language learner comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, San Marcos. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Chase, M. E. (2000). Bridging the expanse: A case study of literature discussion with a cross-age, cross-ability group of elementary students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(04A), 258–1340. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Chilcoat, C. L. (2003). Literature circles guided by comprehension strategies. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(05A), 228–1580. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Chou, L. (1999). Extending spoken and written English abilities through literature discussion groups among secondary students in Taiwan (English as a foreign language, China, eleventh-grade). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(08A), 184–2855. The study is ineligible for review because it does not take place in the geographic area specified in the protocol.
- Church, C. C. (2005). *The effects of peer mentoring through literature circles on female Hispanic students: An action research study* (Unpublished manuscript). Valdosta State University, GA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Cincotti, M. (2009). *Improving reading motivation through the use of literature circles* (Unpublished thesis). Gwynedd-Mercy College, Gwynedd Valley, PA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Clark, K. F. (2009). The nature and influence of comprehension strategy use during peer-led literature discussions: An analysis of intermediate grade students' practice. *Literacy*

## References *(continued)*

- Research and Instruction*, 48(2), 95–119. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Clarke, L. W. (2005). Conversations beyond the text: The influence of gender and social class on literature circle discussions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(11A), 247–3967. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Additional source:**
- Clarke, L. W. (2006). Power through voicing others: Girls' positioning of boys in literature circle discussions. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(1), 53–79.
- Coke, P. K. (2008). Uniting the disparate: Connecting best practices and educational mandates. *English Journal*, 97(5), 28–33. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Compton, C. L. (2001). *Integrating literature discussion groups with sustained silent reading to increase fifth grade reading comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boise State University, ID. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit assigned to one or both conditions.
- Cordero, M. (2008). Integrating reading, writing, and talk in the Spanish for native speakers classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(06A), 235–2113. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Cotten, C. K. (2000). Meaning and community in an eleventh-grade English class: The role of talk in developing lifelong readers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(03A), 475–918. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Cox, C., & Boyd-Batstone, P. (2008). *Engaging English learners: Exploring literature, developing literacy, and differentiating instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Daniels, H. (2002). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups* (2nd ed.). Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Daniels, H. (2005). Are literature circles on your IEP? *Voices from the Middle*, 12(4), 54–55. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Dashiell, P. M. (1995). The liberating potential of modern high fantasy: A case study of the exploration of self among adolescent girls in a home-based literature discussion group. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(08A), 257–3429. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Davis, B. H., Resta, V., Davis, L. L., & Camacho, A. (2001). Novice teachers learn about literature circles through collaborative action research. *Journal of Reading Education*, 26(3), 1–6. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Day, C. (2003). *Reading and responding in literature circles*. Marrickville, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Day, D. (2009). “A taste of college”: Children and preservice teachers discuss books together. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 23(4), 421–436. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

## References *(continued)*

### **Additional source:**

Day, D. L. (2002). "A taste of teaching": Preservice teachers and children engage in literature circles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(12A), 429–4262.

Deane, J. A. (2001). The influence of collaborative learning on students' understanding of mathematics and literacy content. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(12A), 248–4064. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

DeNicolò, C. P., & Franquiz, M. E. (2006). "Do I have to say it?": Critical encounters with multicultural children's literature. *Language Arts*, 84(2), 157–170. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

### **Additional source:**

DeNicolò, C. P. (2004). Connecting literacy, language, and lived experience: Examining the use of literature discussion circles in a fourth-grade classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(06A), 197–2065.

DeVault, N. (2009). Literature circles in library class. *Library Media Connection*, 28(1), 24–25. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Dewey, A. (2006). *Improving high school students' reading comprehension, attitude, and reading skills through literature circles* (Unpublished manuscript). Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Docken, E. M. (2003). *Literature circles: Examining the affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Portland, OR. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Driessen, D. L. (2005). Authoring identities: Eight girls create a literacy community. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(9-A), 3263. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Drotts, A. R. (2008). *How can explicit instruction foster growth in low socioeconomic fourth grade students' vocabularies* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Edmonds, G. W. (2007). *Multiculturalism: (Re) intellectualising teaching* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Ballarat, Australia. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

Eeds, M., & Wells, D. (1989). Grand conversations: An exploration of meaning construction in literature study groups. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 23(1), 4–29. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Egle, C. H. (2002). Will instruction in how to conduct a literature circle improve a student's ability to discuss literature in a small group setting? In T. F. Sherman & M. Lundquist (Eds.), *Compilation of K–12 action research papers in language arts education*. Winona, MN: Winona State University. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Elson, P. (2007). *Using literature circles to increase sixth grade students' motivation and interest in reading* (Unpublished thesis). Gratz College, Melrose Park, PA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Evans, K. S. (1996). A closer look at literature discussion groups: The influence of gender on student response and discourse. *New Advocate*, 9(3), 183–196. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.

## References (continued)

### **Additional source:**

- Evans, K. S. (1993). Just when you thought it was complicated enough: Literature discussions meet critical theory. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(03A), 138–466.
- Evans, K. S. (2002). Fifth-grade students' perceptions of how they experience literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(1), 46. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Evans, K. S., Alvermann, D., & Anders, P. L. (1998). Literature discussion groups: An examination of gender roles. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 37(2), 107–122. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Ewbank, A. D. (2005). Literature-based instruction and the role of teacher-librarian as readers' advisor: A teacher research study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(11A), 227–3908. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Fabrikant, W., Siekierski, N., & Williams, C. (1999). *Improving students' inferential and literal reading comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). Saint Xavier University, Chicago, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Fain, J. G. (2003). Children's dialogue about issues of language diversity and culture. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(01A), 226–95. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Farinacci, M. (1998). "We have so much to talk about": Implementing literature circles as an action-research project. *Ohio Reading Teacher*, 32(2), 4–11. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Farrar, D. A. (2005). A descriptive survey of the level of internalization of literature in students who participate in discussion groups. *Masters Abstracts International*, 43(06), 79–1896. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Farver, M. (2001). *Literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Fiore, B. R. (1999). *A quasi-experimental analysis of the effect of literature circles on students' reading attitudes* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Dayton, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Fisher, P. J., Blachowicz, C. L., & Smith, J. C. (1991). Vocabulary learning in literature discussion groups. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 40, 201–209. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Fisk, J. S. (2006). *Effects of literature circles and book clubs on reading attitudes and motivation of high school students* (Unpublished thesis). California State University, Stanislaus. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Flynn, R. A. (2003). Exploring the use of children's literature to affect the gender role expectations of fifth-grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(09A), 185–3232. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Fore, M. E. (2006). Creating a classroom community of literacy. *Masters Abstracts International*, 45(03), 64–1186. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Foster, A. D. (2006). Books, authors, and ideas on the open market: A sociolinguistic study of a high school book club. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(07A), 203–2522. The

## References (continued)

- study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Fowler, L. A. (1996). A qualitative investigation of fifth graders' talk in book clubs of varying ability configurations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(09A), 132–3873. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Frank, C. R., Dixon, C. N., & Brandts, L. R. (1998). "Dear book club": A sociolinguistic and ethnographic analysis of literature discussion groups in second grade. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 47, 103–115. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Franks, N. (2005). *The relationship between students' learning styles and the use of literature circles to increase reading comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). Benedictine University, Lisle, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Frasier, A. J. (2005). *Can students' negative attitudes toward reading be improved through literature circles?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Troy University, Dothan, AL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Fredrick, T. (2006). Choosing to belong: Increasing adolescent male engagement in the ELA classroom. *Changing English: Studies in Culture & Education*, 13(1), 151–159. doi:10.1080/13586840500523596 The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Freeman, S. (2003). *The effects of literature circles on reading comprehension of 7th grade reading students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mercer University, Atlanta, GA. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Gale, C. M. (1995). *My posse can read!: Motivating the urban middle school reluctant reader via literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Otterbein University, Columbus, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- George, M. A. (2001, April). *Teachers learning together: Faculty book clubs as professional development in an urban middle school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Glazer, L. E. K. (2000). *What did you think of the book?: Creating literature circles in intermediate grades* (Unpublished master's thesis). Antioch University, Seattle, WA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Goatley, V. J. (1996). The participation of a student identified as learning disabled in a regular education book club: The case of Stark. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*, 12(2), 195–214. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Goatley, V. J., Brock, C. H., & Raphael, T. E. (1995). Diverse learners participating in regular education "book clubs." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 352–380. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Goatley, V. J., & Raphael, T. E. (1992). *Moving literature-based instruction into the special education setting: A book club with nontraditional learners* (Elementary Subjects Center Series, no. 65). East Lansing, MI: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.

## References *(continued)*

- Goatley, V. J., & Raphael, T. E. (1992). Non-traditional learners' written and dialogic response to literature. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 41, 313–322. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Goier, R. (1996). A descriptive study of literature discussion groups in a fourth-grade classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(09A), 329–3855. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Goschen, S. (1998). *The effects of students' attitudes when using literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minot State University, ND. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Greenberg, S. I. (2002). Raising cultural consciousness through children's literature. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(05A), 154–1752. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Gutraj, K. J. (1999). *Does the composition of literature circles affect the comprehension, enjoyment level, and participation of Hispanic, eighth-grade students?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Governors State University, University Park, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Hajek, M. D. (2002). *Literature circles and the impact on attitudes toward reading in low-ability readers* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minot State University, ND. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Hanssen, E. (1998). They gotta do it themselves: Students raising questions for literature discussion. *New Advocate*, 11(4), 357–359. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Haring, D. K. (2007). The impact of peer discussion groups on the recreational reading of seventh-grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(12A), 127–4497. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Harmon, J. M. (1998). Vocabulary teaching and learning in a seventh-grade literature-based classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 41(7), 518. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Haskins, B. A. (1998). *How do literature discussion groups facilitate learning?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Pacific University, Forest Grove, OR. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Hayek, D. M. (2003). *The benefits of three different types of discussion groups among fifth graders using expository text* (Unpublished master's thesis). Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Helt, M. (2003). Writing the book on online literature circles: Raising reading achievement through web-based mentoring. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 30(7), 28–31, 58. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Henley, A. M. (2001). A naturalistic study examining talk of second-grade students and their teacher in a teacher-led literature discussion group. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(01A), 201–91. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Henry, J. (2004). *The impact of literature circles on intermediate students' reading motivation* (Unpublished thesis). State University College at Buffalo, NY. The study is ineligible for review

## References *(continued)*

- because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Hernandez-Miller, M. E. (1998). Multiple ways of knowing in history: Eighth-graders' grand conversations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(11A), 379–4097. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Hill, B. C., Noe, K. L. S., & King, J. A. (2003). *Literature circles in middle school: One teacher's journey*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Hill, K. D., Lowery, R., & Fink, L. S. (2008). Conflict in a sixth-grade book club: The impact of a rule-driven discourse. *Voices from the Middle*, 16(2), 16–24. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Hill, M. H., & Van Horn, L. (1995). Book club goes to jail: Can book clubs replace gangs? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 39(3), 180–188. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Hillier, M. A. (2004). Implementation of literature circles in a rural high school English class: One teacher's journey of changing student attitudes toward reading. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(11A), 124–4090. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Hoelscher, C. L., & Mercer University. (2006). *The effects of using nonfiction literature circles on science comprehension of third-grade students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mercer University, Atlanta, GA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Hohenecker, A. L. (2003). *Reading comprehension: The use of literature circles at the fourth grade level* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, St. Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Holetz, K. L. (1995). *The impact of literature circles on reading attitudes* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, St. Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Hood, B. C. (2001). A description of literacy materials secondary school reading teachers identify as instructionally effective for struggling secondary readers in Texas and the United States. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(02A), 345–511. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Irwin, L. S. (1998). A reading specialist's story of reflection and collaboration: An endeavor to support peers as they practice flexible grouping to meet students' literacy needs. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(09A), 118–3392. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Janssen, A. (2006). *The effectiveness of literature circles in helping fourth graders comprehend historical fiction* (Unpublished master's thesis). St. Mary's College of California, Moraga. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it does not have at least three attempts to demonstrate an intervention effect at three different points in time.
- Jeziro, D. M. (2003). *Implementing literature circles in a second grade classroom: The effects of teacher modeling and scaffolding on student responses to literature* (Unpublished master's thesis). State University College at Buffalo, NY. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.

## References *(continued)*

- Johnson, H. (2000). "To stand up and say something": "Girls only" literature circles at the middle level. *New Advocate*, 13(4), 375–389. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Karnik, B. J. (2003). *Motivating student reading through the use of literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minot State University, ND. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Kendall, J. D. (2006). "Dinosaurs can't use computers, they don't have any plugs" and other "grand conversations": The journey through book club with kindergarten students. *Masters Abstracts International*, 44(06), 30–2518. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Ketter, J., & Lewis, C. (2001). Already reading texts and contexts: Multicultural literature in a predominantly white rural community. *Theory into Practice*, 40(3), 175–183. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Kim, S. (2007). Promoting student-led literature discussions for second language and literacy development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(11A), 204–4638. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Kimbell-Lopez, K. (1997). *Students mediating meaning: Oral discourse among fifth grade students in literature discussion groups* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Houston, TX. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- King, C. (2001). "I like group reading because we can share ideas": The role of talk within the literature circle. *Reading*, 35(1), 32. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Knecht, C. (2001). *Effect of literature circles on the reading comprehension strategies and confidence of eighth-grade students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Northern State University, Aberdeen, SD. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Kong, A. (2002, April). *Scaffolding in a learning community of practice: A case study of a gradual release of responsibility from the teacher to the students*. Paper presented at the 47th Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, San Francisco, CA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Kong, A., & Fitch, E. (2002). Using book club to engage culturally and linguistically diverse learners in reading, writing, and talking about books. *Reading Teacher*, 56(4), 352–362. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Kong, A., & Pearson, D. P. (2003). The road to participation: The construction of a literacy practice in a learning community of linguistically diverse learners. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(1), 85–124. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Additional sources:**
- Kong, A. (1999, April). *The role of the teacher: How a classroom learning community of culturally and linguistically diverse learners develops at the beginning of the school year*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Kong, A. (2000). The road to participation: The evolution of a literary community in an intermediate grade classroom of linguistically diverse learners. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(08A), 207–3108.

## References *(continued)*

- Konieczny, S. L. (2004). Inquiring into the intersections of race and subjectivity through the reading of multicultural literature. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(10A), 1–3729. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Koss, M. D. (2008). A literary analysis of young adult novels with multiple narrative perspectives using a sociocultural lens. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(06A), 255–2187. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Kozak, J. M. (2008). *Literature circles as an ESL instructional strategy* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, Canada. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Krenek, T. L. (2001). *The effects of peer discussions, through the use of literature circles, on motivation and comprehension skills* (Unpublished master's thesis). Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Krogh, C. (2000). *Using literature circles in a first grade classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minot State University, ND. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- LaFido, A. (2007). *Impact of literature circles on reading comprehension at the second grade level* (Unpublished master's thesis). Benedictine University, Lisle, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Larson, D. K. D. (2003). The impact of fifth-grade reading strategies acquired through guided reading on oral and written responses in literature discussion groups. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(08A), 187–2765. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Latendresse, C. (2004). Literature circles: Meeting reading standards, making personal connections, and appreciating other interpretations. *Middle School Journal*, 35(3), 13–20. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- LaTendresse, C. J. (1999). *How do literature circles effect the reading attitudes of fourth grade students?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, St. Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Law, D. (2002). *Literature circles in an elementary classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, St. Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Lee, Y. (2002). A case study of an experienced elementary teacher's implementation of literature circles within her literacy program. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(07A), 371–2463. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Leier, B. L. (1998). *Incorporating literature circles into the reading program* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minot State University, ND. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- LeJeune, M. A., & Giorgis, C. (2007). *Reading bodies: A case study analysis of adolescent girls' experiences in an after school book group* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

## References *(continued)*

- Leon, A. H. (2007). *Increasing independent reading in the intermediate grades through a book club approach* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). California State University, Sacramento. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Levy, R. J. (2007). Reading circles: Access to classroom conversations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(01A), 258–177. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Lilly, T. J. (1997). *Teacher influences on peer-led discussion in literature discussion groups* (Unpublished master's thesis). North Central College, Naperville, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Lin, C. (2002). *Literature circles* (ERIC Digest no. 469925). Bloomington, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading English and Communication. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Lloyd, R. M. (2006). Talking books: Gender and the responses of adolescents in literature circles. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, 5(3), 30–58. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Lohfink, G. S. (2006). Responses to postmodern picture books: A case study of a fourth grade book club. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(09A), 349–3334. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Lopez, T. J. (2008). Examining the sociocultural resources of Mexican-origin youth: A study of English language learners in a 7th grade language arts classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(12A), 340–4603. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Lulkin, E. R. (2001). Literature circles in the multicultural classroom: Who's learning what? *Masters Abstracts International*, 40(03), 206–551. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Additional source:**
- Lulkin, E. R. (2002). *Literature circles in the multicultural classroom: Who's learning what?* Ottawa, ON, CA: National Library of Canada.
- Lyons, B. A. (1996). *Peer-led literature discussion groups: An analysis of recent literature* (Unpublished manuscript). Dominican College, Orangeburg, NY. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- MacLeod, E. R. (2001). Literature circles: Fifth graders' perceptions of gender as a defining category. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(05A), 237–1718. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- MacRae, B. (2002). Comfort or chaos? The role of pleasure in creating reader-friendly spaces in classrooms. *Masters Abstracts International*, 41(04), 162–902. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Malcolm, S. L. (1998). A “book ends” approach: Implementing literature circles to foster emergent literacy in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(01A), 228–63. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Maloch, A. E. (2000). Scaffolding student talk: The teacher's role in literature discussion groups in a third-grade classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(03A), 240–934. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include a student outcome.

## References *(continued)*

- Maloch, B. (2005). Moments by which change is made: A cross-case exploration of teacher mediation and student participation in literacy events. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37(1), 95–142. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Maniotes, L. K. (2005). The transformative power of literary third space. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(03A), 291–881. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Mann, V. A. (2006). *Book clubs aren't just for adults: Using literature circles to motivate middle school students to read* (Unpublished master's thesis). Antioch University, Seattle, WA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Mappone, G. R. (2005). *Going around in circles: Using literature circles to increase student interest in reading and to enhance student perceptions of their reading abilities in an urban third grade classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gratz College, Melrose Park, PA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Marks, T. A. (1995). Gender differences in third graders' oral discourse during peer-led literature discussion groups. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(08A), 225–2997. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Marohn, M. A. (2003). *Can literature circles increase students' engagement of reading in a fifth grade classroom?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Marshall, J. C. (2006). The effects of participation in literature circles on reading comprehension. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(04A), 101–1273. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Martin, J. (1998). Literature circles. *Thresholds in Education*, 24(3), 15–19. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Martinez-Roldan, C. M. (2000). The power of children's dialogue: The discourse of Latino students in small group literature discussions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(08A), 526–3091. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Maxwell, F. C. (1993). Learning from at-risk students in the middle school: A qualitative analysis of a literature-based language arts curriculum. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(8-A), 2721. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- McBride, J. L. B. (2002). Half-day kindergarten literature discussion groups: A worthwhile endeavor. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(01A), 164–77. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- McCormack, R. L. (1995). Learning to talk about books: Second graders' participation in peer-led literature discussion groups. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(04A), 103–1244. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- McDonnell, M., & Montalto, R. (2004). *Literature circles: A tool for improving motivation to read in adolescents with learning disabilities* (Unpublished master's thesis). Benedictine University, Chicago, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- McElvain, C. (2005). Transactional literature circles and the reading comprehension of at-risk English learners in the

## References *(continued)*

- mainstream classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(02A), 200–534. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- McGee, L. M. (1992). An exploration of meaning construction in first graders' grand conversations. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 41, 177–186. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- McMahon, S. I. (1992). *Book Club: A case study of a group of fifth-graders as they participate in a literature-based reading program*. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(03A), 402–763. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- McMahon, S. I. (1992). *Book Club: Studying the written and oral texts of elementary children participating in a literature-based reading program* (Elementary Subjects Center Series, no. 52). East Lansing, MI: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- McMahon, S. I. (1992, April). *Classroom discourse during social studies: Students' purposes and topics of interest in peer-led discussion groups*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- McMahon, S. I., & Goatley, V. J. (1995). Fifth graders helping peers discuss texts in student-led groups. *Journal of Educational Research*, 89(1), 23–34. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- McMahon, S. I., & Raphael, T. E., with V. J. Goatley & L. S. Pardo (1997). *The Book Club connection: Literacy learning and classroom talk*. New York: Teachers College Press. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- McMahon, S., Raphael, T., & Goatley, V. (1995). Changing the context for classroom reading instruction: The *Book Club* project. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching: Learning and teaching elementary subjects* (pp. 123–166). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Mendoza-Wong, N. J. (2002). Using literature circles as a delivery system for multicultural literature in disengaging prejudice and stereotypes. *Masters Abstracts International*, 42(02), 98–374. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include a student outcome.
- Merrill, A. (1999). *Literature circles: How the elementary teacher facilitates a student-centered discussion* (Unpublished master's thesis). Antioch University, Seattle, WA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Meyer, D. (1998). *Literature circles in eighth-grade language arts* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mercer University, Atlanta, GA. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Miller, L., Straits, W., Kucan, L., Trathen, W., & Dass, M. (2007). Literature circle roles for science vocabulary. *Science Teacher*, 74(5), 52–56. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Miller, T. D. (2003). Literature discussion groups respond to culturally relevant children's literature in the kindergarten class-

## References (continued)

- room. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(03A), 236–834. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Milligan, C. L. (2000). *A study to investigate the impact of literature circles on student interest and enthusiasm in the subject of reading*. Unpublished manuscript. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Mizerka, P. M. (1999). The impact of teacher-directed literature circles versus student-directed literature circles on reading comprehension at the sixth-grade level. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(09A), 170–3307. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Moege, A. M. (2005). *Improving nonfiction reading comprehension skills through literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Northern State University, Aberdeen, SD. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Moliere, M. H. (2006). *Determining whether student-led literature discussions deepen students' connection to literature as evidenced by written responses* (Unpublished master's thesis). Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Molinar, A. I. (2004). *The effect of literature circles on apathetic first grade readers* (Unpublished master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Montes, T. H., & Au, K. H. (2003). *Book Club* in a fourth-grade classroom: Issues of ownership and response. In R. L. McCormack & J. R. Paratore (Eds.), *After early intervention, then what? Teaching struggling readers in grades 3 and beyond* (pp. 70–93). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Morrow, M. M. (2005). Incorporating literature circles in a third-grade classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(09A), 306–3254. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Mozer, C. M. (2005). *Use of literature circles to incorporate differentiated learning in literacy instruction* (Master of Education & Research Project). Regis University, Denver, CO. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Mozombite, A. (2000). *Literature circles and student response* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bowling Green State University, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Muehlberg, K. L. (2000). *Incorporating literature circles and critical reading to enhance reading enjoyment in a second grade classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Mullins, R. S. (2002). *The effect of using literature circles on the responses of at-risk readers in a second grade classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Otterbein College, Westerville, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Murphy, M. A. (2008). *The effects of reading strategies on motivating reluctant readers at the elementary and middle school level: A project in childhood education*. Buffalo, NY: State University College at Buffalo & Department of Elementary Education and Reading. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

## References *(continued)*

- Nice, J. M. (1999). *Literature circles in the middle school classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Northrup, C. (2007). *Investigating the use of technology, ideas, and instructional strategies in an online literature discussion group*. Warrensburg, MO: University of Central Missouri & Educational Leadership and Human Development. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Oberg, M. (2006). *Literature circles in a climate of testing: Putting literature circles to the test* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Wisconsin, River Falls. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- O'Brien, C. (2007). Using collaborative reading groups to accommodate diverse learning and behavior needs in the general education classroom. *Beyond Behavior*, 16(3), 7–15. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- O'Brien, C. P. (2006). Investigation of the impact of video-based anchored instruction on the implementation of inclusive practices by students with learning disabilities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(09A), 315–3362. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- O'Donnell, M. A. (2001). *"It's all in the preparation": An interpretive look at how one teacher prepares her students for participation in literature discussion groups* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Olmstead, C. M. (2001). Improving reading comprehension using online literature circles: A university-elementary school collaborative project. *Masters Abstracts International*, 40(01), 77–22. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Osterman, J. C. (2002). *Assigned roles in literature discussion groups: Student participation in two fourth grade book clubs* (Unpublished master's thesis). Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Owocki, G. (2003). *Make way for comprehension: Strategic instruction for young children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Paille, E. W. (1991). Interaction in reader response: A one-year study of fifth-graders' literature groups and dialogue journals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52(06A), 322–2089. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Pardo, L. S. (1992, December). *Accommodating diversity in the elementary classroom: A look at literature-based instruction in an inner city school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Parker, S. M., Quigley, M. C., & Reilly, J. B. (1999). *Improving student reading comprehension through the use of literacy circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight, Chicago, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

## References *(continued)*

- Paterson, P. O. (2000). Negotiation of text in peer-led literature discussion groups. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(06A), 208–2221. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Paxton-Buursma, D., & Walker, M. (2008). Piggybacking. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(3), 28–34. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Peck, A. A. (2009). Literature circles: *The effects on struggling middle school readers*. Gwynedd Valley, PA: Gwynedd-Mercy College. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Peralta-Nash, C. (2003). Literature circles in a bilingual classroom: The power of language choice. *New Advocate*, 16(1), 57–61. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Peralta-Nash, C., & Dutch, J. A. (2000). Literature circles: Creating an environment for choice. *Primary Voices K–6*, 8(4), 29–37. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Pesik, K. (2000). *Creating connections: Using literature circles to link adolescents' hearts, minds and voices* (Unpublished master's thesis). Antioch University, Seattle, WA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Peterson, S., & Belizaire, M. (2006). Another look at roles in literature circles. *Middle School Journal*, 37(4), 37–43. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Phillips, D. S. (2003). *Literature circles on reading comprehension in third grade language arts* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mercer University, Atlanta, GA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Piatt, S. H. (2006). *The use of study guides vs. literature circles in the teaching of Great Expectations: Enhancing journal writing, increasing comprehension, and boosting student attitudes* (Unpublished master's thesis). Otterbein College, Westerville, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Pitman, M. (1997). *Literature circles*. Unpublished manuscript. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Porter, S. B. (2005). Learning about learners: Struggling readers in a fourth grade literature discussion group. *College Reading Association Yearbook*, 27, 35–57. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Additional source:**
- Porter, S. B. (2003). *Learning about learners: Struggling readers in a fourth grade literature discussion group* (Unpublished master's thesis). Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Porter, S. B. (2005). Learning about learners: Struggling readers in a fourth grade literature discussion group. In P. E. Linder, B. Bryant, & M. Miller (Eds.), *Building bridges to literacy: The twenty-seventh yearbook: A peer reviewed publication of the College Reading Association 2005* (pp. 35–57). Logan, UT: College Reading Association. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Prillaman, B. (2008). Conversations to help make meaning: ELLs and literature circles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(01A), 202–97. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Ramsey, K. L. D. (1995). *The effect of initiating literature circles in a middle school language arts classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Texas at Austin. The study is

## References *(continued)*

- ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Raphael, T. E. (1991). *Teaching literacy through student book clubs: A first-year teacher's experience* (Elementary Subjects Center Series, no. 41). East Lansing, MI: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Raphael, T. E. (1996, April). *Assessing the literacy growth of fifth-grade students: A question of realigning curriculum, instruction and assessment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Raphael, T. E. (2001). *Book Club Plus: A conceptual framework to organize literacy instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Raphael, T. E., & Brock, C. H. (1992, December). *Mei: Learning the literacy culture in an urban elementary school*. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Raphael, T. E., Florio-Ruane, S., & George, M. (2004). *Book Club Plus: Organising your literacy curriculum to bring students to high levels of literacy*. *Australian Journal of Language & Literacy*, 27(3), 198–216. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Raphael, T. E., Goatley, Y. J., Woodman, D. A., & McMahan, S. I. (1994). Collaboration on the *Book Club Project*: The multiple roles of researchers, teachers, and students. *Reading Horizons*, 34(5), 381–405. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Rickey, M. J. (1992). Literature circles in process in elementary classrooms. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(06A), 354–1829. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Ritenour, T. W. (2001). *The effects of literature circles with basal readers on reading comprehension and attitudes of third grade students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Shenandoah University, Winchester, VA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Rodrigo, J. (2004). *Which reading strategy produces better comprehension results: Directed reading thinking activity or literature circles?* (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, San Marcos. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Ruhme, M. C. (2003). *Community enhancement in the third grade classroom through literature circles and read-aloud* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Rush, K., & Lipski, K. (2009). Teaching social skills through children's literature. *Illinois Reading Council Journal*, 37(4), 20–25. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Sandmann, A., & Gruhler, D. (2007). Reading is thinking. *International Journal of Learning*, 13(10), 105–113. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Schneider, T. (2001). *Literature circles in the middle school: Comprehension assistance* (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, San Marcos. The study is ineligible for

## References *(continued)*

- review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Schroeder, J. S. (1994). Finding value in literature discussion. *Teaching and Change*, 1(2), 154–169. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Schultz, K. L. (2008). *Improving students' attitudes toward reading and increasing students' response to literature by utilizing literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Minot State University, ND. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Scott, S. C. (1992). Reading into literature groups: A classroom study of student-directed literature discussion groups (fifth-grade). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(08A), 146–2683. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Sengupta, R. (2008). Exploring masculinity in a boys' book club: Teacher and student perspectives. *Masters Abstracts International*, 46(06), 130–2975. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Sharp, B. J. (2003). *Literature circles in the third grade classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Sheehan, S. (2005). *Are literature circles effective independent guided reading instruction for third graders?* (Unpublished master's thesis). Winona State University, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Smiles, T. L. (2005). Student engagement within peer-led literature circles: Exploring the thought styles of adolescents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(05A), 265–1681. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Smith, J. (2005). *Using student selected and teacher selected texts in literature circles: Differences in student attitudes and achievement* (Unpublished master's thesis). Weber State University, Ogden, UT. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Smith, K. M. (2002). *Literature discussion groups: Examining the effectiveness of the reading log method and the discussion roles method* (Unpublished manuscript). Brigham Young University, Provo, UT. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Smith, R. M. (2008). *Examination of interactions among eighth-grade language arts students during literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis) Brigham Young University, Provo, UT. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Smith, S. A. (1997, March). *Book club is "da bomb": Early adolescent girls engage with texts, transactions, and talk*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Stebner, L. (2007). *Increasing higher-level thinking through literature circle* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Steinberg, R. B. (2004). *Using literature circles to increase fourth grade students' engagement in reading* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

## References *(continued)*

- Stolo, M. L. (1999). *Literature circles versus direct instruction* (Unpublished master's thesis). Shenandoah University, Winchester, VA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Straits, W. (2007). A literature-circles approach to understanding science as a human endeavor. *Science Scope*, 31(2), 32–36. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Stringer, S. J., Reynolds, G. P., & Simpson, F. M. (2003). Collaboration between classroom teachers and a school counselor through literature circles: Building self-esteem. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 30(1), 69–76. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Suffel, B. D. (2007). *Determining the benefits of implementing literature circles into a secondary language arts classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Defiance College, OH. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Swaggerty, E. A. (2006). "Is someone reading us?": Fourth grade students respond to postmodern picture books. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(02A), 101–475. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- Takeuchi, M. (2007). Social identity negotiation in critical literacy learning: A case study in a Japanese heritage/community language classroom. *Masters Abstracts International*, 46(06), 102–2947. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Tedmon, K. (2004). Motivational strategies for young readers. *Masters Abstracts International*, 43(02), 106–375. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Tenwinkel, A. J. (1998). *Using readers' workshop and literature circles in a second grade classroom* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, WI: The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Thomas, M., & Hofmeister, D. (2002). Assessing the effectiveness of technology integration: Message boards for strengthening literacy. *Computers & Education*, 38(1–3), 233. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Additional source:**
- Thomas, M., & Hofmeister, D. (2002, July). *Virtual learning circles: Utilizing online message board interactions for strengthening literacy development*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual International Reading Association World Congress on Reading, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Tiballi, B., & Drake, L. (1993). Literature groups: A model of the transactional process. *Childhood Education*, 69(4), 221–224. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Torgesen, J. K., Houston, D. D., Rissman, L. M., Decker, S. M., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., . . . Lesaux, N. (2007). *Academic literacy instruction for adolescents: A guidance document from the Center on Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Turner, L. T. (2006). *What is the effect of literature circles on third graders questioning skills?* (Unpublished master's thesis). St. Mary's College of California, Moraga. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.

## References *(continued)*

- Urba, J. A. (2003). The evolution of a literature discussion group: How young children in special education and at risk children developed into literary discussants. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(05A), 165–1602. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Van Dyke, J. (1997). A group case study of student teachers' reactions to multicultural literature discussion group readings (Preservice, book club). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58(08A), 299–3094. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include a student outcome.
- Van Gemert, J. M. (2005). *Implementing literature circles in seventh grade* (Unpublished master's thesis). Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Vasquez, E. (2007). *Literature circles with English learners: The benefits and effects on reading comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). Saint Mary's College of California, Moraga. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% general education students.
- Villaume, S. K., & Hopkins, L. (1995). A transactional and sociocultural view of response in a fourth-grade literature discussion group. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 34(3), 190–203. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- von Unruh, V. F. (2000). Grade five students' discussion of novels: Factors affecting change in discourse. *Masters Abstracts International*, 39(01), 112–26. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Walsh, Z. (2003). *Slavery: An integrated approach through literature circles* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, WI: The study is ineligible for review because it does not include a student outcome.
- Walston, S. (2006). Literature circles in the high school setting: An inquiry from comprehension to synthesis. *Masters Abstracts International*, 45(02), 131–533. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Ward, J. L. (1993). *Literature circles: A motivational strategy for teaching literature to adolescents* (Unpublished master's thesis). Maryville University, St. Louis, MO. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Weih, T. G. (2008). A book club sheds light on boys and reading. *Middle School Journal*, 40(1), 19–25. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Wellman, D. K. B. (2000). Implementing literature circles: Three case studies of teachers in transition. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(10A), 217–3960. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Wellsandt, D. (2000). *The effectiveness of using literature circles in sixth grade to increase reading level and comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). Whitworth College, Spokane, WA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Whitin, P. (2002). Leading into literature circles through the sketch-to-stretch strategy. *Reading Teacher*, 55(5), 444. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Wiggins, J. (2000). *The effects of peer discussion on intermediate students' level of comprehension in written response* (Unpublished manuscript). Western Washington University,

## References *(continued)*

- Bellingham. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Wilfong, L. G. (2009). Textmasters: Bringing literature circles to textbook reading across the curriculum. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(2), 164–171. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Williams, B. G. (1999). Emergent readers and literature circle discussions. In J. R. Dugan, P. E. Linder, W. M. Linek, & E. G. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Advancing the world of literacy: Moving into the 21st century* (pp. 44–53). Readyville, TN: College Reading Association. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Williams, C. (2004). *What impact does literature circles have on struggling readers' comprehension?* (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, San Marcos. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Witt, S. (2007). "I love reading!": Fifth and sixth graders react to literature circles. *Lutheran Education*, 141(3), 179–190. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Wollman-Bonilla, J. (1994, July). *Frustration and fulfillment: The talk of literature discussion groups*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Council of Teachers of English, Orlando, FL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Wollman-Bonilla, J. (1994). Why don't they "just speak"? Attempting literature discussion with more and less able readers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 28(3), 231–258.
- The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Wollman-Bonilla, J. E. (1991). Discourse practices and the social construction of meaning in small group literature discussions among sixth-graders and their teacher. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52(06A), 430–2091. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Wood, K. D., Roser, N. L., & Martinez, M. (2001). Collaborative literacy: Lessons learned from literature. *Reading Teacher*, 55(2), 102–111. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Wynhoff Olsen, A. S. (2007). Literature circles and ninth-grade students: A student-centered approach to reading. *Masters Abstracts International*, 45(05), 117–2170. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Zadonowicz, D. (2001). *A literature circles program design for a third grade classroom* (Unpublished manuscript). State University College, Buffalo, NY. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Zook, V. (2005). *Literature circles vs. novel studies as a measure of comprehension* (Unpublished master's thesis). Benedictine University, Lisle, IL. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.