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The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on students’ reading self-concepts and use of decoding strategies in a first grade classroom. The intervention consisted of asking students create a drawing to respond to the prompt “What do you do when you’re reading and come to a tricky word?,” then conducting individual instructional conferences with students. The study was conducted in a 1st grade classroom with 23 students. Data were collected from seven struggling readers in the class, and an experimental mixed-methods design was used. Measures included the Self-Report Reading Scale and Interviews About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3), as well as student drawings. Data collection regarding students’ self-concepts was inconclusive: some students self-concepts became more positive while others became more negative. The selected also showed a very limited range of decoding strategies.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Throughout the course of his or her schooling, each student will construct a dynamic view of him or herself as a learner. Depending on the student’s individual successes and experiences, this self-concept may be positive or negative. In his book *Self Concept and School Achievement*, William W. Purkey (1970) described the impact of self-concept on a student’s performance in the school environment. He writes, “…the ways in which a student views himself and his world are (1) products of how others see him; and (2) primary forces in his academic achievement” (p. 2). Research has demonstrated the critical role self-concept plays in a student’s academic achievement. As such, helping students to build a positive self-concept can be a powerful factor in impacting their academic success.

Background

The current study was conducted at one of ten elementary schools within an urban school district in the Midwestern United States. The school served 428 students from kindergarten to sixth grade. One hundred percent of the student population at this school was considered economically disadvantaged and was eligible to receive free and reduced lunch. On the 2013-2014 State School Report Card, the school did not meet the indicators for Reading Achievement for the third, fourth, fifth, or sixth grades. The school did meet the standard for Value-Added, however. Based on their performance on
the first grade diagnostic, 34.8% of the first grade students were considered to be not on track for reading. According to the K-3 Literacy Improvement measure, only 31% of kindergarten through third grade students were able to transition from being not on track to being on track from one school year to the next (Ohio Department of Education, 2014).

The researcher graduated from Wittenberg University in 2012 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Education. She received dual licensure in both early childhood PK-3 and special education K-12. She has since obtained both a 4/5 endorsement and a reading endorsement. The 2014-2015 school year was her second year employed as a full-time teacher. During 2012-2013, the researcher worked as a Title I reading tutor within the same school building.

**Significance of the Study**

Helping students to build positive images of themselves as readers can have a powerful influence on their overall reading achievement. As such this study could make a lasting impact on students. This research will have significance for the researcher and her students first and foremost. In particular, this research could be significant for those struggling readers in the classroom who have a low level of self-concept. The researcher has used various methods (e.g., utilizing positive feedback, offering students reading selections at their independent reading level, and providing students with choices) to attempt to address the needs of these students but has not seen enough of a positive increase in the students’ concepts of themselves as readers. It is absolutely essential that young readers are encouraged and able to develop and maintain positive self-images in order to become proficient readers throughout their schooling and in their lives outside of the classroom.
In addition, this research could be significant for other interested teachers and staff within the school. Many other teachers may have experienced similar difficulties with their own students. Teachers having similar concerns about students’ lowered self-images could find similar benefits from using the intervention strategy detailed within the study.

Because this study has the potential to help students learn to use different strategies for decoding, as well, this could also have significance for students’ reading skills. The ability to decode unknown words, and to have a repertoire of different strategies for doing so, is a critical component of reading, and one which is often lacking among struggling readers. As such, providing these students with additional support in developing their word attack skills could be essential to helping them improve their reading and to developing independent readers.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to explore a strategy with the potential to impact students’ views of themselves as readers and their use of decoding strategies. Throughout the course of the 2013-2014 school year, the researcher noticed a trend of low student self-concept in the area of reading among her first grade students. Teacher observations revealed a decreasing level of engagement in classroom reading activities among several students throughout the school year. Furthermore, several of these same students began to demonstrate avoidance behaviors as they attempted to get out of completing reading assignments by creating excuses or simply refusing to participate. Some students also began making comments about their own worth or about their own abilities as readers. These negative comments also extended to comments about reading
itself, as well. Furthermore, when faced with words they did not recognize or could not
decode, students most often shut down or simply gave up on trying.

According to Tracey and Morrow (2012), Engagement Theory can be used to
describe engaged readers as “those who are intrinsically motivated to read and who
therefore read frequently. Engaged readers are mentally active, using metacognitive
strategies to build their understanding of the conceptual content of texts” (p. 75).
Reading engagement is particularly significant due to its impact on a students’ reading
achievement. For example, when a student has a high level of reading engagement, he or
she may be able to overcome traditional achievement barriers such as gender and income
(Guthrie, 2004). Unfortunately, many young struggling readers experience difficulty in
decoding unknown words. “These negative experiences generally cause those struggling
readers to read less while their higher reading ability peers read more, therefore widening
the gap between the two groups” (Gale, 2005, p. 23). Therefore, because these readers
struggle with decoding and demonstrate lower levels of reading engagement, it is
particularly important to find ways to motivate and encourage these students to read both
in and out of the classroom.

Furthermore, research has clearly demonstrated that the ways in which students
view themselves are of critical importance in the classroom. As such, there is a body of
research examining the importance of students’ self-concept as readers and the various
ways in which teachers can help their students to develop a positive image of themselves
as readers. For example, DeNaeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, and Rosseel (2012)
demonstrated that students who have a higher level of reading self-concept spend more
leisure time reading, show higher levels of engagement, and have higher levels of reading
comprehension. In combining the work of DeNaeghel et al. (2012), which demonstrates the connection between positive self-concept and higher engagement, with the understanding that higher engagement is connected to higher academic achievement as demonstrated by Gale (2005) and Guthrie (2004), it can be reasoned that positive self-concept can also be linked to higher academic achievement. In addition, the work of Aunola et al. (2002) indicated that the first months of primary school are critical to the positive development of students’ reading self-concepts, so it is important to address this area with young students in our elementary schools.

In all, the researcher’s classroom observations of struggling readers demonstrating lessened engagement in classroom reading activities, avoidance behaviors, poor self-esteem, and negative comments about reading were suggestive of low levels of self-concept among struggling readers. In conducting a review of the literature related to the problems the researcher was observing in her classroom, she discovered a strategy called “drawings and dialogue” which was suggested to have a positive impact on students’ motivation to read. This claim was not backed up by quantitative data to substantiate it, however. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the impact of a “drawings and dialogue” strategy (Zimmerman, 2012) on struggling students’ self-concepts as readers and on their use of decoding strategies.

**Research Questions**

As a result of the literature review conducted, two guiding questions emerged. These were used as the basis for exploration in the present study.

1. What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts?
2. What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ use of decoding strategies?

Establishing the Study

This study was conducted during the second semester of the 2014-2015 school year. In order to determine the impact of the intervention particularly on students with reading difficulties, seven struggling readers were selected specifically for data collection throughout the duration of the study. These students were chosen based on their performance on the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver & Carter, 2006), a school-wide reading assessment, as well as based on the researcher’s classroom observations and assessments. These students were among the lowest performing in the class, based on these assessments. Prior to implementing the intervention, the researcher administered the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005) with all 23 students in her first grade classroom to gauge students’ initial concepts of themselves as readers. The researcher also conducted the Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) one-on-one with just the selected students to collect additional qualitative data about these students’ self-concepts. These interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed.

After collecting this pre-intervention data, the researcher implemented the “drawings and dialogue” strategy (Zimmerman, 2012) with her students weekly over a period of eight weeks beginning March 18, 2015. During the study, the students continued to read the weekly selections from the *Journeys* (Baumann et al., 2011) basal reading series. This intervention consisted of the researcher asking students to draw a picture depicting what they did when they were reading and came to an unknown word,
then conducting one-on-one conversations with students about their drawings and their thinking. The researcher took notes during these conversations to collect data regarding the decoding strategies students were using. In order to maintain the confidentiality of the selected students, the intervention was conducted with all 23 students in the class while data were only collected from those seven students. The seven students’ drawings were collected and analyzed for evidence of decoding strategy use. After completing the intervention on May 13, 2015, the researcher administered the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005) and Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) again with the same procedures as before to collect post-intervention data.

Limitations and Assumptions

This study was limited in several aspects. First, the study was limited to the class, school, and district of the researcher, which required the use of the district-approved basal reading series. It was also limited to the number of students in the researcher’s class. This number was further limited, as two of the students selected for data collection began the study but were unable to finish as they were no longer attending the school. The implementation of the intervention was also limited because the study was conducted over a relatively short period of time, spanning only eight weeks. Further, the study was also limited by the subjects’ motivation, desire, and understanding of their participation in the study.

The study was also guided by several assumptions. The researcher assumed that the school district would continue to use the Journeys (Baumann et al, 2011) basal reading series throughout the course of the study. She also assumed that first grade
students would continue to be assessed using the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver & Carter, 2006).

**Definition of Terms**

The researcher used the following terms consistently throughout this study.

- **Decoding strategy**: an approach used to figure out an unknown word. For the purpose of this study, the following strategies were examined in particular: picture cue strategy, analogy strategy, cross-checking strategy, letter-sound strategy, and chunk strategy (Fox, 1996).
  - **Analogy strategy**: a decoding strategy in which the reader uses the relationship between onsets and rimes in known words to determine an unknown word (Fox, 1996).
    - **Onset**: the initial consonant in a syllable (e.g. c- in cat).
    - **Rime**: the vowel and any final consonants in a syllable (e.g. -at in cat).
  - **Chunk strategy**: a decoding strategy in which the reader uses known groups or units of letters to determine the pronunciation and meaning of an unknown word (Fox, 1996).
  - **Cross-checking strategy**: a decoding strategy in which the reader uses meaning to determine if a word makes sense in context (Fox, 1996).
  - **Letter-sound strategy**: a decoding strategy in which the reader segments words into individual sounds and blend them together to form words (Fox, 1996).
o **Picture cue strategy:** a decoding strategy in which the reader uses the illustrations to infer the meaning of the words on the page (Fox, 1996).

- **Reading self-concept:** the way an individual views his or herself as a reader (De Naeghel et al., 2012).

**Summary**

After observing several struggling readers in her classroom struggling to build positive views of themselves as readers, the researcher embarked on this study in order to determine the impact of the “drawings and dialogue” intervention on her students’ reading self-concepts and their use of decoding strategies. Chapter Two will present the body of literature which was used to inform the present study.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

In order to inform the current research study, the following literature topics were reviewed:

1. Self-Concept Theory: A Brief History
2. Reading Self-Concept in the Classroom
3. Strategies to Enhance Self-Concept in Reading
4. Strategies for Decoding Unknown Words

Self-Concept Theory: A Brief History

The way an individual views him or herself as well as the ways in which this view develops through the individual’s life is a subject of psychological study known as self-concept. In his book *Self Concept and School Achievement*, William W. Purkey (1970) outlines the history of self-concept theory in the field of psychology. Various psychological theorists have had different ideas about self-concept and how it develops. Among these theorists was psychologist George H. Mead (1934) who believed that the individual’s concept of him or herself is shaped largely by the interactions with his or her environment. Building further upon this concept, psychologist Carl Rogers (1947) saw the self as being shaped by the various ways the individual perceives his or her environment which he also believed to be essential to the development of the individual’s behavior.
Within the construction of an individual’s self-concept, success and failure are critical. Diggory (1966) determined that when individuals view a particular ability of theirs as being important, a failure in that area can have a negative impact on the way they evaluate other abilities, even if they seem to be unrelated. Successes and failures can also have differing impacts dependent upon the nature of an individual’s self-concept. Once an individual has established a particular picture of who he or she is, he or she will tend to work to maintain this view. In essence, those who have a positive self-concept are more likely to accept positive feedback while those who have a negative self-concept are more likely to understand and accept negative feedback about themselves. More importantly, this means that those who have a negative self-concept are unlikely to accept positive evidence about themselves as it is contradictory to their previously established self-concept (Purkey, 1970, p. 11). This is important in a school setting as it may explain some of the difficulty students with a low self-concept face in changing their views of themselves.

Self-concept is a very important factor in the school environment. In his book *The Self Concept: Theory, Measurement, Development and Behaviour*, R. B. Burns (1979) describes the educational environment in which students develop their concepts of self. He writes:

…educational institutions are the arenas in which all young persons are compelled to compete, and in doing so are forced to reveal personal adequacies and inadequacies in public contests, frequently on unequal terms with others in events not even of their own choosing, against externally imposed standards. (p. 275)
This type of environment can have a critical impact on the ways in which students view themselves and their worth, particularly because students enter this environment during their formative years. One study found that many students had already begun to develop negative trends of self-concept before they had even entered first grade. Further, the study determined that the self-concept of these students was more highly predictive of their reading achievement years later than their general intelligence (Wattenberg & Clifford, 1964). Building a positive self-concept with students has the potential to extend benefits into their academic attainment as well.

**Reading Self-Concept in the Classroom**

The research has clearly demonstrated that the ways in which students view themselves are of critical importance in the classroom. As such, there are numerous articles which examine the importance of students’ self-concept as readers and the various ways in which teachers can help their students to develop positive images of themselves as readers. The following is a synthesis of several of those articles and their findings about students’ self-concepts as readers.

Aunola, Leskinen, Onatsu-Arvilommi, and Nurmi (2002) examined the dynamics between reading skills and self-concept as they related to the cumulative cycle known as the “Matthew effect.” This developmental cumulative cycle refers to the assumption that “the previous levels of a certain phenomenon are assumed to have consequences for the developmental trend of the same phenomenon later on” (Aunola et al., 2002, p. 344). Through their study, the researchers found that good reading skills seemed to contribute to a positive self-concept later on, while poor reading skills seemed to lead to more negative self-concept. On the other hand, students with poor reading skills improved
more over the course of the first-grade year than those students with higher reading skills. Thus, while the “Matthew effect” was found for developing self-concept, it was not for reading skills. As a result, the first months of primary school are important to the development of students’ reading self-concepts (Aunola et al., 2002).

De Naeghel, Van Keer, Vansteenkiste, and Rosseel (2012) outlined a research study conducted with the dual purposes of creating a questionnaire to measure recreational and academic reading motivation and clarifying the relationships between reading motivation and reading self-concept and reading engagement, reading frequency, and reading comprehension. Through this study, the researchers constructed a model relating reading motivation and self-concept and reading engagement, frequency, and comprehension. In particular, the researchers found that students who had a higher level of reading self-concept spent more leisure time reading, showed higher levels of engagement, and had higher levels of reading comprehension (De Naeghel et al., 2012).

Förster and Souvignier (2014) noted a lack of research into the subject of student-set goals. As a result, they launched a study with the aim of determining the impact of learning progress assessment (LPA) with and without goal setting on reading achievement, reading self-concept, and reading motivation. For their study, the researchers divided 900 German students in the fourth grade randomly into three groups: LPA with goal setting, LPA without goal setting, and no intervention. The LPA data were derived from internet-based testing conducted periodically. Those students in the goal setting group set a goal prior to taking the test and reflected upon these goals afterwards. Through this study, the researchers found that the goal setting process did not enhance students’ achievement, and it also had a negative impact on students’ reading
motivation and reading self-concept. In part, the researchers believed that this could be attributed to students’ difficulties with the goal setting process which led students to be more self-critical (Förster & Souvignier, 2014).

These research studies have shown that self-concept is shaped largely by an individual’s environment, his or her interactions with it, and his or her successes and failures. Further, this self-concept or identity, once shaped, is resistant to change, despite evidence to the contrary. Self-concept is important in the school environment and has been shown to have an impact on students’ reading achievement, comprehension, engagement, and time spent on leisure reading.

**Strategies to Enhance Self-Concept in Reading**

As the research suggests, self-concept is an essential element in students’ reading success in the classroom. As such, it is critical that teachers take measures to help enhance their students’ concepts of themselves as readers. There are multiple strategies teachers can employ in order to help their students develop positive images of themselves as successful readers and learners. Burnett (2003) examined the impact of teacher feedback on students’ self-talk and self-concept in both reading and mathematics. In this study, conducted with 747 Australian students in grades three through six, the researcher gathered data about students’ response to both effort feedback and ability feedback. In the area of reading, the researcher found that negative feedback from teachers was related to negative self-talk. Effort feedback, or feedback which attributes students’ success to the effort they put forth, did not seem to be related to positive self-talk. On the other hand, ability feedback, or feedback which attributes students’ success to their ability, did impact both positive and negative self-talk. In addition, self-talk was found to be related
to self-concept. In other words, students who liked reading seemed to feel that way because they believed that they were good at it. As a result, the researcher stressed the importance of teacher feedback as students internalize this information and recommended providing elementary students with some ability feedback in particular in order to enhance the students’ self-concepts. The researcher also acknowledged that different students have different feedback preferences and as such teachers should get to know these preferences and be balanced and strategic in providing student feedback (Burnett, 2003).

Zimmerman (2012) described a strategy for building students’ repertoire of word decoding skills with the additional potential to impact students’ reading self-concepts. This strategy, which Zimmerman calls “drawings and dialogue,” is intended to help students increase their knowledge and use of different methods for solving unknown words. As a part of this strategy, the teacher guides students in drawing a picture to answer the question “What do you do when you come to a tricky word?” (p. 579). Within these drawings, students are intended to depict themselves within their reading environment. These illustrations should also include a caption to describe the word solving strategy the child is representing in the picture. After students have completed their drawings, the teacher conducts interactive conversations with the students. This dialogue allows the teacher to help guide students in exploring their own thinking and reading strategies (Zimmerman, 2012).

This strategy has the potential to help young students and struggling readers in particular because the drawing aspect allows these students to communicate through a medium which is accessible to them. As described within the article, “The drawing
provides a buffer in the word-solving process that allows students to step back and think about the strategies they know and can use” (Zimmerman, 2012, p. 582). This is critical in engaging students in their own learning process. The information gathered from the drawings as well as the dialogue also offer teachers an excellent source of formative assessment data which can be used to inform future lessons and learning.

Zimmerman (2012) also suggested that the drawings and dialogue strategy can impact students’ self-concepts in addition to their decoding skills, particularly for those students who have difficulty learning to read.

For struggling readers to stay motivated in the face of difficulty, they need a vivid and compelling vision of themselves learning. Such an image provides a sense of possibility. As students imagine themselves successfully reading, they are more likely to believe they can succeed. (p. 578)

The drawings and dialogue strategy can be effective in this manner because it provides young students an opportunity to envision themselves as readers and to use drawing as a method for expressing their literacy knowledge. Within the article, Zimmerman (2012) provided examples from two separate teachers who had employed the strategy within their classrooms: one first grade and one second grade. Student drawings from one struggling reader from each of the classes were included in the article, one each from a beginning lesson and a later lesson, as well as a record of the conversations that occurred about these images. Through examining the students’ drawings and descriptions, Zimmerman noted the apparent progress these students made throughout the year, as well as their increasing confidence in their abilities. The students began to describe their thinking in a more concise and expressive manner, relying less on the teacher’s guidance.
In this way, drawings and dialogue has the potential to help students to construct a positive concept of themselves as readers and develop skills in decoding.

**Strategies for Decoding Unknown Words**

Reading research has found that skilled readers approach unknown words by utilizing information gathered from meaning, language structure, and visual cues (Dorn, French, & Jones, 1998). Further, skilled readers have a wide repertoire of strategies for solving these unknown words (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). Students who struggle with reading, on the other hand, frequently have difficulties when approaching unknown words and accessing word-solving strategies. Therefore, it is critical that teachers provide these students with explicit instruction in these word-solving or decoding strategies (Pinnell & Fountas, 2009). Similarly, the National Reading Panel found that systematic phonics instruction enhanced students’ growth in word-reading skills, particularly regularly spelled words (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). The Panel also found that alphabetic knowledge was helpful in building connections in the memory that would help students to read irregular words that they had previously read, as well.

Fox (1996) describes five of these decoding strategies in depth. First, *picture cue strategy* refers to when students use the illustrations to infer then meaning of words written on the page. Second, *analogy strategy* is the process of connecting the onsets and rimes in known words with those in unknown words. Students who use this strategy use the letter patterns to determine the pronunciation of a word. Third, when a student uses meaning to determine if a word makes sense in the reading context, it is called *cross-checking strategy*. This strategy aids comprehension. The fourth strategy is *letter-sound*
strategy. Students who use this strategy segment words into individual sounds and blend them together to form words. Lastly, chunks are “groups of letters in words that learners recognize and automatically know how to pronounce” (p. 114). Students who use chunk strategy use these units of letters to determine the pronunciation and meaning of unknown words. Each of these strategies can be used by readers to help in identifying words that they do not know (Fox, 1996). Among the many strategies readers use to determine unknown words, research has shown that sounding out and asking for help are the two most often identified by students (Reutzel & Sabey, 1996).

Compton-Lilly (2005) suggests that students, parents, and other members of society subscribe to sounding out as a “cultural model” for reading. Cultural models involve the simplification of much larger, more complex phenomena, so they can often be misleading. In this particular example, the overestimation of the importance of using phonetic knowledge to sound words out can seem to lessen the significance of other decoding strategies, such as those that use context or other features of language to solve unknown words. In this study, Compton-Lilly (2005) sought to address a lack of research as to whether or not students were actually sounding words out as often as they self-identified doing so. The study found that while students most often identified this strategy, they were more often using other more varied strategies in their actual reading. As a result of the findings of the study, Compton-Lilly (2005) identified a need to help parents understand the limitations of using sounding out as a strategy for word-solving without belittling their attempts to help their children.

Kane (1999) alludes to the same over-emphasis of sounding words out, suggesting that the teaching of decoding skills is often comprised of a set of seemingly arbitrary
phonics rules which are taught in isolation. Instead, decoding should include context, often in combination with a knowledge of phonics through the letter-sound or analogy strategies. “Decoding skills must and can be introduced, taught, practiced, and reinforced within contexts meaningful to students” (Kane, 1999, p. 771). Authentic texts can be used as a tool for teaching decoding skills in a developmentally appropriate way such that students can build a repertoire of different decoding strategies to utilize in their reading.

These research studies have shown that skilled readers have a repertoire of strategies for solving unknown words, while struggling readers often experience difficulty with accessing word-solving strategies. While there are at least five different strategies for decoding unknown words—picture cue strategy, analogy strategy, cross-checking strategy, letter-sound strategy, and chunk strategy—students, families, and society seem to depend on the letter-sound strategy primarily as a cultural model of reading. Many students also relied on asking for help when faced with an unfamiliar word. Students are in need of explicit teaching of different decoding strategies taught in the context of authentic texts.

Summary

Chapter Two reviewed the literature related to self-concept and decoding which was used to inform the present study. In essence, self-concept is a dynamic aspect of a student’s schooling, and one which requires care especially in the first years of elementary school. A student’s self-concept as a reader, in particular, can have an impact on overall reading achievement, comprehension, engagement, and time spent on leisure reading. Furthermore, skilled readers have a range of decoding strategies to rely on in approaching an unknown word. In order to develop these skilled readers, direct
instruction of the different decoding strategies is needed. Chapter Three will discuss the methods that were used to investigate the impact of the “drawings and dialogue” strategy on students’ self-concepts and their decoding skills in the present study.
Chapter Three

Methodology

During the 2013-2014 school year, the researcher’s classroom observations revealed a trend of negative reading self-concept among her first grade students that sparked an interest in this area of study. As a result of the review of the literature conducted, the researcher developed two questions that formed the basis for the present study. The following questions were developed: What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts? and What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ use of decoding strategies? In order to address these questions, the researcher utilized an explanatory mixed-methods design (Mertler, 2014, p. 104) which required the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. This chapter will lay out the design of the study, describing the participants and setting of the study, as well as providing an in-depth description of the data collection measures used and the analysis process.

Participants

For this study, the researcher used a purposive sampling technique. The participants of this study included the researcher and her class of 23 first grade students. From this group of students, seven struggling readers were selected specifically for data collection. These students were considered to be struggling based on their performance
on the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver & Carter, 2006) conducted in December 2014 as well as the general classroom observations of the researcher. The “drawings and dialogue” intervention was conducted within the general education classroom during the regular school day. It was implemented for all students in the class, but data were specifically collected from the seven selected students.

Student A was a six-year-old, Caucasian female student. She experienced reading difficulties in Kindergarten, so she was invited to attend summer school during summer 2014. Student B was an eight-year-old, Caucasian female student. She also attended summer school and was repeating first grade. Due to persistent academic difficulties, Student B was going through the Response to Intervention process during the 2014-2015 school year. Student C was a six-year-old, multiracial female student. Student D was a seven-year-old, multiracial male student. He also attended summer school and was repeating first grade. Student E was a six-year-old, multiracial male student. He participated in an off-campus, school-sponsored after-school tutoring program throughout the school year and the duration of the study. Student F was a six-year-old, multiracial male student. Student G was a seven-year-old, African-American female student. She participated in non-school-sponsored after-school tutoring throughout the school year and during the duration of the study. All of the selected students, except Student D, participated in Title I reading tutoring, which used the Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention curriculum (Fountas & Pinnell, 2014).

**Setting**

This study took place in an urban elementary school located in the Midwestern United States. One hundred percent of the students at this school qualified for free and
reduced lunch, 6.6% of the student population had limited English proficiency, and 14.5% of the student population had disabilities. The student body as a whole was composed of 35.8% non-Hispanic Black students, 9.5% Hispanic students, 15.5% Multi-racial students, and 38.9% non-Hispanic White students (Ohio Department of Education, 2014). The study was conducted in the researcher’s first grade classroom within this elementary school. Among the 23 students in the researcher’s class, there were three male and four female Caucasian students, three male and six female African-American students, and four male and three female multi-racial students.

During the time period of the study, the students’ desks were arranged in a U-shape, with two double rows of eight desks facing each other, connected by a row of five desks in the back. Their desks were arranged in this fashion so that none of the students would be sitting with his or her back to the front of the room where the SMARTBoard is mounted on the wall and where the teacher frequently uses a document camera for instruction. To the left of the students’ desks, there was a carpet area with two small bookshelves displaying a selected set of books to match students’ interests. In the carpet area, there was a third bookshelf containing teacher read aloud books. To the right of the students’ desks, there were three more bookshelves, one containing a set of leveled readers and the other two containing additional picture books sorted into categories such as books about animals. Around the classroom, there were five separate table areas set up for student and teacher use during literacy and math center activities, including one kidney bean table and one small round table.

During each intervention period, the students worked at their desks. Some students elected to spread out and sit at one of the tables typically used for centers or to
sit near a classmate to share art supplies for their drawings. In order to collect student data, the researcher circulated around the room while students worked and approached the students to initiate dialogue about their drawings. These individual student conferences occurred at the students’ desks or wherever they had chosen to sit in the classroom during the work period. The intervention was conducted after the third reading of the weekly story selection from the *Journeys* basal reader (Baumann et al., 2011) and occurred during the morning literacy block, typically at around 9:30 a.m. after thirty minutes of literacy activities and instruction.

**Data Collection**

This study was conducted using an explanatory mixed-methods design (Mertler, 2014, p. 104). The researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data from a total of four different data collection measures in order to triangulate the results of the data collected.

**Self-report reading scale.** The Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005) was used as a pre-/post-test to assess students’ concepts of themselves as readers before and after implementing the “drawings and dialogue” intervention. On this scale, students read 22 statements and responded by marking either *yes* or *no* to indicate whether the statement described them. Statements are phrased to include either those indicating a positive or a negative self-concept, such as “In school I wish I could be a much better reader than I am” or “Most of the time I can read the same books as well as the good readers.” Because of the age and reading abilities of the participants, the instructions and statements were read aloud for the students. All students in the class
were given this measure in order to ensure that the selected students were not singled out in any way. A copy of the scale is provided in Appendix A.

**Interview about reading (early reader: grades 1-3).** The Interview about Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) was conducted with the seven struggling readers selected to further assess students’ concepts of themselves as readers. Each of the seven students was interviewed individually. These interviews were conducted one-on-one, sitting side-by-side at the teacher’s desk while the rest of the class was out of the room with one of the special teachers. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. This was also used as a pre-/post-test to examine the impact of the intervention. This ten-question interview is designed to “determine the child’s understanding of the nature of reading, the purposes for reading, and the child’s attitude toward reading” (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006, p. 24). The interview is accompanied by a scale to record the interviewer’s qualitative judgments in nine categories, such as overall interest in reading. For the purpose of this study, however, the researcher only looked at overall trends in three of the nine categories: confidence in learning to read, motivation to learn to read, and knowledge of word identification strategies. Appendix B provides a copy of the interview.

**Student drawings.** As a part of the intervention, students were given a blank piece of paper and asked to draw a picture to respond to the prompt, “What do you do when you get to a tricky word?” (Zimmerman, 2012, p. 579). Students were also instructed to include themselves and their reading environment in their picture, as well as to include a caption. The whole class was included in the intervention in order to preserve the confidentiality of the students selected for data collection. The prompt was
given to the students in a whole class setting. Students sat at their desks while they worked on their drawings, but they had the freedom to move to one of the tables around the room if they chose. The drawings students produced during the intervention were collected and used to determine the strategies students were illustrating and identifying. Example drawings are provided in Appendix C.

**Teacher notes from dialogue.** Individual student conferences were conducted in which the researcher asked students to discuss their drawings and explain what they meant to convey through their drawings. During these conferences, the researcher took brief notes. These conferences and discussions of the child’s drawing yielded information about the decoding strategies that the child was using.

**Data Analysis**

**Self-report reading scale.** Students’ raw scores were calculated and analyzed. These scores were determined by giving students one point for each answer demonstrating a positive self-perception as determined by the key (see Appendix A). The sum of these points created the student’s raw score out of a possible 22 points. A high score indicates a positive self-perception while a low score indicates a negative self-perception. The difference between students’ raw scores on the pre-/post-test was used to determine changes in students’ reading self-concepts over the period of the intervention. The researcher also selected six of the 22 statements which most closely reflected students’ concepts of themselves as readers for further analysis.

**Interviews about reading (early reader: grades 1-3).** Students’ responses were audio recorded and transcribed. Through this interview, students were able to provide more detailed and individualized information about their views on reading and
themselves as readers. The transcripts were coded to determine themes or patterns in the students’ responses. Qualitative judgments were also recorded on a continuum ranging from evident to not evident for nine categories including confidence in learning to read and motivation to learn to read (see Appendix B).

**Student drawings.** Student drawings were collected and copied (see Appendix C). These drawings were analyzed for evidence of use of decoding strategies. The strategy used and a description of the evidence of that strategy were recorded on a table. This table allowed the researcher to track the strategies students were using over the course of the intervention to see changes over time. An example of the table is provided in Appendix D.

**Teacher notes from dialogue.** Teacher notes from individual conferences were used in tandem with students’ drawings in order to determine students’ use of decoding strategies, such as a specific reference to a strategy such as “cross check” (Zimmerman, 2012, p. 582) or general statement suggesting use of a strategy such as “think about what the other words mean to get the tricky words” (Zimmerman, 2012, p. 580). As with the students’ drawings, the verbal evidence found of strategy use was synthesized on a table in order to track students’ use of decoding strategies (see Appendix D).

**Procedures**

Informed consent forms were sent home to students’ families on January 26, 2015. They were not all returned initially, so these forms were sent home again on several occasions and were discussed in person with parents on February 10 and 12, 2015 at parent/teacher conferences. After obtaining parental permission, the first step the researcher took in initiating this study was to administer the Self-Report Reading Scale
(Johns & Lenski, 2005) to the whole class on March 9, 2015. During the remainder of the same week, the researcher conducted the Interview about Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) with the seven selected students. These interviews were done one-on-one in the classroom while the remainder of the class was in a special. After collecting these data, the researcher initiated the intervention the following week.

The intervention used in this study was derived from “Drawings and Dialogue: Word Solving in Early Literacy” (Zimmerman, 2012). This intervention, which was done in a period of around twenty minutes, consisted of having students respond to the prompt, “What do you do when you come to a tricky word?” by creating a drawing illustrating how they approach unknown words. Students were given further instructions to include themselves, their reading environment, and a caption. Thus, the students were supposed to draw a picture showing what they do to figure out what the unknown word is and write a brief caption to clarify what they have drawn. The teacher then engaged students, particularly the seven selected, one-on-one in an instructional conversation about their thinking in order to draw out additional information. This dialogue between teacher and student provided an opportunity for the teacher to guide the student in self-reflecting on the strategies he or she was using to decode unknown words and reinforce these strategies.

The intervention was implemented weekly over a span of eight weeks, beginning March 18, 2015. Dialogue data were collected from the selected students every other week in a rotating pattern, from three of the students one week and the remaining four the next and so forth. In addition to these selected students, the researcher replicated the
same procedures with a minimum of three other students each week in order to maintain the confidentiality of the selected students. Each student in the class was also assigned a number in alphabetical order to further ensure confidentiality. The student drawings were collected from all students in the class. Table 3.1 presents the rotation of students as they engaged in the weekly dialogues.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Study Participants</th>
<th>Non-Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>5, 16, 19</td>
<td>2, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>4, 9, 14, 21</td>
<td>10, 11, 17, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>5, 16, 19</td>
<td>1, 13, 20, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>4, 9, 14, 21</td>
<td>6, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>April 23</td>
<td>5, 19, 21</td>
<td>3, 12, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>April 30</td>
<td>4, 9, 16</td>
<td>2, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>5, 19, 21</td>
<td>6, 10, 17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>9, 16, 21</td>
<td>3, 11, 15, 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final intervention session was May 13, 2015. The researcher then administered the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005) to the whole class to collect the post-intervention data on May 15, 2015. The following week, the researcher conducted the Interview about Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) again with the selected students. Just as before, the interviews were done one-on-one in the classroom while the other students were in a special.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the study which investigated the use of the drawings and dialogue strategy (Zimmerman, 2012). Utilizing an explanatory mixed-methods design (Mertler, 2014) the researcher collected data using the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005), the Interview About Reading (Early Reader:
Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006), student drawings from the intervention, and teacher notes about the dialogue conducted with students. Chapter Four will present the data collected from these measures.
Chapter Four

Findings

Based on the researcher’s observations of her students and a review of relevant literature, the researcher developed two questions that formed the basis for the present study. The following questions were developed: What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts? and What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ use of decoding strategies? The researcher collected data using the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005), the Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006), student drawings from the intervention, and teacher notes about the dialogue conducted with students as part of an explanatory mixed-methods design (Mertler, 2014). This chapter will present and offer analysis of the data collected throughout the course of the study. The results will be reported separately for each of the two research questions.

What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts?

In order to measure students’ concepts of themselves as readers, the researcher selected two different data collection measures. In order to collect quantitative data, the researcher utilized the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005). This measure yielded a numerical raw score based on students’ yes or no responses on 22 items. The
researcher also selected the Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) in order to supplement her quantitative findings with qualitative data. This ten question interview provided additional information about the ways in which the students were viewing themselves as readers with an opportunity to elaborate on their answers.

**Self-report reading scale.** The Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005) was given as a pre-/post-test to measure students’ concepts of themselves as readers before and after the implementation of the intervention. The scale was administered to students on March 9, 2015, the week prior to beginning the intervention, and was re-administered on May 15, 2015, during the week following the completion of the eight weeks of data collection. The scale, which was read aloud to students, included 22 statements and required students to check either yes or no depending on their agreement with the statement. Students were given one point for each answer that indicated a positive self-perception which made up their raw score out of a total of 22 points. Figure 4.1 shows the raw scores of each of the seven selected students on both the pre- and post-intervention administrations of the scale.
Figure 4.1. Students’ raw pre- and post-intervention scores on the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005).

As demonstrated on the graph, students’ results varied. Of the five students who finished out the intervention, two students showed a more positive self-perception at the end of the study while the remaining three showed a more negative view. Students B and G both showed an increased post-intervention raw score, while Students C, E, and F all showed decreased scores. With the exception of student B, the students’ pre-intervention scores were all within five points of each other, ranging from 12 to 17 points. After completing the intervention, their scores were even more similar, ranging from just 12 to 13 points. Three of the five students’ raw scores changed by only one point, as well, showing a minimal difference from pre- to post-intervention. Despite having the lowest pre-intervention score, Student B showed the greatest increase in score, nearly doubling in points from four to seven.
In order to further delve into students’ particular views of themselves as readers, the researcher selected six of the 22 statements which most directly dealt with reading self-concept. The researcher worked with an expert in the field in order to ensure validity of the selection of statements that attempted to measure the self-concept construct. The following statements were selected:

- In school I wish I could be a much better reader than I am. (Statement 4)
- If reading gets too hard for me, I feel like not trying to read anymore. (Statement 6)
- When I read in school, I worry a lot about how well I’m doing. (Statement 8)
- Most of the time when I see a new word, I can sound it out by myself. (Statement 9)
- Most of the time I feel I need help when I read in school. (Statement 11)
- Most of the time I feel I will never be a good reader in school. (Statement 20)

(Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006, p. 71-72)

Further breaking down students’ raw scores in this way revealed additional trends in the manner in which students were viewing themselves as readers. Table 4.1 shows students’ pre- and post-intervention responses to each of these six selected statements.
Table 4.1

*Number of Responses Indicating a Positive Perception to Selected Statements from the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S4 Pre (Post)</th>
<th>S6 Pre (Post)</th>
<th>S8 Pre (Post)</th>
<th>S9 Pre (Post)</th>
<th>S11 Pre (Post)</th>
<th>S20 Pre (Post)</th>
<th>Total Pre (Post)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Student A and Student D moved prior to the conclusion of the study.

When examining the students’ responses to these targeted questions, three out of five showed a more positive perception in their score. One of the remaining two, Student F, had the same score before and after the intervention. The fifth student, Student C, did have a more negative perception after completing the intervention.

Overall, the five students who finished the intervention showed a more positive perception on Statement 20, “Most of the time I feel I will never be a good reader in school” (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006, p. 72). While two out of the five students marked *no* initially, four out of five marked *no* following the intervention indicating that these students believe that they either are currently or are capable of becoming good readers.

The students also showed an overall more positive perception on Statement Four, “In school I wish I could be a much better reader than I am” (Elish-Piper, Johns, &
Lenski, 2006, p. 71). Initially, all seven of the students marked *yes*, indicating a negative view of their current reading skills. After the intervention, two out of the five students changed their answer to *no*, suggesting that they felt comfortable about their reading ability at school.

**Interviews about reading (early reader: grades 1-3).** In order to supplement the findings of the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005), the researcher also utilized the Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) with the seven selected students. These interviews, which were conducted one-on-one with each of the students, allowed students an opportunity to answer questions about reading and about their views of themselves as readers. The questions went beyond a “yes” or “no” answer, so students could elaborate on their thinking more so than on the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005). In order to really capture students’ responses in relation to the present study, the researcher and expert selected two of the ten questions for analysis. These two questions were selected because they most directly related to the areas of focus addressed in this study. Question 6 examined the students’ feelings about themselves as readers, and question 8 inquired about their decoding strategies. These questions were:

- Do you think you are a good reader? Why or why not? (Question 6)
- When you are reading and come to a word you don’t know, what do you do? (Question 8)

(Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006, p. 27)

Student responses to these two questions from both the pre- and post-intervention interviews were recorded in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

*Student interview responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Interview</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>#6: Did not think she was a good reader because there are too many words she doesn’t know.</td>
<td>No data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Ask daddy for help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>#6: Did think she was a good reader because she tries to sound words out.</td>
<td>#6: Did think she was a good reader because she is very smart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>#6: Did not think she was a good reader because she tries to sound words out but she can’t really do it.</td>
<td>#6: Did not think she was a good reader because she forgets the words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Break it up.</td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>#6: Did think he was a good reader because he has been practicing a lot.</td>
<td>No data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Sound it out or look at the picture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>#6: Did think he was a good reader but could not articulate a reason why.</td>
<td>#6: Did think he was a good reader because he tries his best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>#6: Did think he was a good reader because he tries to sound words out.</td>
<td>#6: Did think he was a good reader because he likes to sound the words out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>#6: Did think she was a good reader because she reads <em>The Cat in the Hat</em> a lot and because she tries to sound words out.</td>
<td>#6: Did think she was a good reader and identified a new book (with lots of pages) but said she was not sure why she was a good reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
<td>#8: Sound it out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, students’ responses from before and after the intervention were very similar. Students’ responses to question eight in particular were almost identical. Four out of the five students who completed the study responded that they would sound out an unknown word both before and after the intervention. The fifth student, Student C, also identified using the same strategy both before and after but changed her wording from “break it down” to “sound it out.” All student responses to question eight, both pre- and
post-intervention, were limited to asking for help, sounding the word out, or using picture cues.

There was limited change in students’ responses to question six. While all of the students remained unchanged in their overall answer as to whether or not they were good readers, the students had a shift in their reasoning. Student B originally said that she was a good reader because she sounds words out, but after the intervention said that she was a good reader because she is smart. Student C, on the other hand, said at first that she was not a good reader because she has a difficult time sounding words out, while after the intervention she said it was because she forgets words. Student E could not articulate a reason for feeling that he was a good reader before the intervention, but afterwards he said that it was because he tries his best. Both of Student F’s answers related to sounding words out. Before the intervention, he said he was a good reader because he tries to sound words out and after he said he was good because he likes to sound words out. Student G identified a particular book both times she was asked whether or not she was a good reader. The first time, she said that she was a good reader because she sounds out words while she reads *The Cat in the Hat*. The second time, though, while she said she was a good reader who liked to read her new *Care Bears* book, she could not think of a reason why she was a good reader.

In all, students’ responses to the Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006) did not show much of a difference from the beginning of the study to the end. The biggest change from pre- to post-intervention was seen in the reasoning they offered for their answers and for their opinions.
What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ use of decoding strategies?

In order to determine what decoding strategies students identified throughout the course of the intervention, the researcher collected data in two different ways. First, the researcher collected the drawings students produced during each of the eight implementations of the intervention. These drawings were collected from all students, and the seven selected students’ drawings were analyzed for evidence of decoding strategy use. This evidence was supplemented by teacher notes from the individual student conferences conducted each week. The strategies used were recorded week-to-week in a table, along with a description of the evidence found from either the drawing or the dialogue. These data are represented for each of the seven students in Tables 4.3 to 4.9.
### Table 4.3

**Drawings and Dialogue Results: Student A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>No caption.</td>
<td>She drew her aunt who has passed away. They used to read together and she would help her with unknown words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>Shows an angel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>No caption.</td>
<td>She drew the “gate of Cinderella.” She has a Cinderella book at home, and sounds words out while she is reading it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>Picture does not make intention clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>No caption.</td>
<td>She sounds out words when she is reading at home with her little sister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>Picture is made up of scribbles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>No strategy given</td>
<td>No caption.</td>
<td>Picture is made up of a series of rectangles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student A had a difficult time demonstrating her thinking through her drawings. Her drawings do not clearly show any strategy use, and she did not include a caption on any of them. She was, however, able to articulate her thinking during the individual conferences. In week two, she did not identify any strategy use, but rather said she would ask for help from others. In weeks four and six, she identified using the letter-sound strategy in her reading. Each week, her conference discussed a strategy that she uses in reading at home.
### Table 4.4

**Drawings and Dialogue Results: Student B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.18  | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I ray mat tas” [I raise my hand]  
She shows her hand raised.   | She raises her hand to get help from a teacher.                                      |
| 3.25  | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I kaailckI byam”  
She shows her with a book in one hand and the other one raised. |                                                                             |
| 4.8   | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I Raz.” [I raise]  
She shows her frowning with a book in one hand and a pencil in the other. | She raises her hand to get help when she is taking a test and does not know one of the words. |
| 4.15  | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I M”  
She shows her raising her hand. |                                                                             |
| 4.23  | Letter-sound            | “I bulet Raprc”  
She shows her with question marks above her head with another person on the sidewalk by a stop sign. | While she told me her caption said that she raises her hand, when I asked her to tell me about her picture, she told me about sounding out the word stop on a stop sign. |
| 4.30  | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I”  
She shows her with her hands raised. She has question marks above her head and both hands raised. |                                                                             |
| 5.6   | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I raz my hoed” [I raise my hand]  
She shows her sitting at her desk with a book in front of her. Her hand is raised and she is smiling. | She raises her hand to get help when she does not know a word. |
| 5.13  | No strategy (Ask for help) | “I may balpo a Dad”  
She shows herself and another person with a book, both with question marks above their heads. |                                                                             |

Student B’s drawings showed clear images of her in reading situations. Several of her pictures vividly show her experiencing confusion, with question marks drawn above...
her head (see Appendix E for examples). Seven out of the eight weeks, she said that she would raise her hand to get help, thereby not using any decoding strategies. In week five, while her caption was still meant to say that she would raise her hand, her conference revealed that her picture actually depicted a time when she saw a stop sign and used the letter-sound strategy to determine the word “stop.” In several of the first pictures she drew, Student B drew herself frowning. By the end of the intervention, however, she had begun to draw herself with a smile on her face.
### Table 4.5

**Drawings and Dialogue Results: Student C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>“when thar was a ward thay I didt no I sait it out and I pit it together” [when there was a word that I didn’t know, I sound it out and I put it together] Shows kids reading at desks.</td>
<td>She sound words out and puts them back together when she is reading during silent reading time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“when I get to a wrd I Brack it up and read” [when I get to a word, I break it up and read] Shows herself reading with friends under a rainbow.</td>
<td>Shows herself reading with friends under a rainbow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“when I get to a wod I wud sand it out” [when I get to a word, I would sound it out] Shows herself laying on her bed reading.</td>
<td>Shows herself laying on her bed reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“wen I get to a word I wood sad it at” [when I get to a word, I would sound it out] Shows herself on the beach reading with two friends.</td>
<td>Shows herself on the beach reading with two friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sund it at and Brack it” [I sound it out and break it] Shows herself reading in her bedroom.</td>
<td>She breaks the sounds down and says them fast when she is reading in her room at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I as sume Bote to help me” [I ask somebody to help me] Shows herself and another individual with a book in hand next.</td>
<td>Looks closely at the letters to know what they are, then uses the letters to sound words out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“I got to a word I say is that a e are a c?” [I got to a word I say “is that e or c?”] Shows herself reading under a rainbow.</td>
<td>Shows herself reading under a rainbow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I I got to a word I say is that a e are a c?” [I got to a word I say “is that e or c?”] Shows herself reading under a rainbow.</td>
<td>Shows herself reading under a rainbow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student C identified using the letter-sound strategy in six out of the seven weeks she was present. She used a variety of ways to refer to this strategy, as well, writing that...
she would sound the word out, that she would break it down, or that she would put it together. In week seven, she did not identify a decoding strategy, but said that she would ask someone for help. Each of her drawings and the dialogue about them suggested diverse reading situations, ranging from reading at school to reading at home in her room to reading with friends at the beach.

Table 4.6

*Drawings and Dialogue Results: Student D*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sod it out” [I sound it out] Shows him holding a book.</td>
<td>He uses the pictures to help him solve unknown words. He used the picture of the porcupine in the weekly selection to figure it out the word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“sod out” [sound out] Shows him reading with a bear, a bee, and a snake.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“sad it out” [sound it out] Shows him next to another person who is holding a book.</td>
<td>He drew himself and his mother reading at home. He sounds words out when he is reading with her after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student D, who did not finish the study, showed the greatest range of decoding strategies. In the four weeks of the intervention in which he participated, he moved back and forth between the letter-sound and picture cue strategies. He also identified strategies he was using both in school and at home. In week two, he identified a strategy he had used to solve an unknown word in the weekly story selection. In week four, on the other hand, he identified a strategy he had used at home while reading with his mother.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“sod it out” [sound it out] Word bubbles “the” “told”</td>
<td>He said he sounds words out. He attempted to sound the word “the” out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sud it out” [I sound it out]</td>
<td>He said he sounds words out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>No caption included. Picture shows him with a word bubble containing the word “the.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>No caption included. Picture shows him with a word bubble containing the word “the.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sad It out” [I sound it out] Picture shows him.</td>
<td>He said he sounds words out when he is reading with his mother at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>No strategy</td>
<td>No caption. Picture is his name in bubble letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sud uat” [I sound it out] Picture shoes him and has the word “ball” written above him.</td>
<td>He said he sounds words out. He sounded the word “ball” out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student E identified the letter-sound strategy throughout the entire intervention. His drawings and the dialogue surrounding them, however, demonstrate an imperfect understanding of the use this strategy. In three of his drawings, he included a word bubble containing the word “the.” This word, which cannot be sounded out, is a poor example for this strategy. During his conference in week one, the researcher asked him how he would sound “the” out. He attempted to do so, appearing confused when he realized it did not sound correct. He then shut down. Despite this experience, the following week he included another word bubble containing the word “the.”
Table 4.8

*Drawings and Dialogue Results: Student F*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“I wraz my hand” [I raise my hand] Shows him raising his hand.</td>
<td>He raises his hand to get help from the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“I will raz my hand” [I will raise my hand] Shows him sitting at his desk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“I will raz my hd” [I will raise my hand] Picture does not include him, but depicts a house with three hearts.</td>
<td>He raises his hand to get help. When asked about his picture, he said he asks for help from his mom when he is reading at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“Hand I ras my” [I raise my hand] Shows him with a word bubble containing the caption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“sand It out” [sound it out] Shows him with a book and a smile on his face.</td>
<td>He sounds words out when he is reading by himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“I raz my hand” [I raise my hand] Shows him at his desk reading a book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>No strategy (Ask for help)</td>
<td>“I raz my hand” [I raise my hand] Shows him and his brother, both labeled by name.</td>
<td>He asks for help from his brother when he is reading at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student F primarily suggested that he would get outside help by raising his hand. He identified that he would raise his hand to get help in six out of the seven weeks he was present. In his conferences, he identified a variety of sources he would ask for help, including his teacher, his mother, and his older brother, a fourth grade student attending the same school. In week five, however, he identified using the letter-sound strategy. He
wrote that he would sound the word out, and his picture this week showed him reading a book with a smile on his face.

Table 4.9

*Drawings and Dialogue Results: Student G*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Evidence from Drawing</th>
<th>Evidence from Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>No strategy</td>
<td>“tacks cir of thim Because I Love thim” [takes care of them because I love them] Drew and labeled several characters from the weekly story, <em>The Tree from Poppleton Forever.</em></td>
<td>Shows her reading the weekly story, <em>The Tree from Poppleton Forever.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sawd it out” [I sound it out] Shows her and two others under a rainbow. Also includes a picture of a porcupine.</td>
<td>Shows her and two others under a rainbow. Also includes a picture of a porcupine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>No strategy</td>
<td>No caption. Shows two girls labeled with her and her friend’s initials.</td>
<td>Shows two girls labeled with her and her friend’s initials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sand it ontward” [I sound it out word] Shows her reading with two others under a rainbow.</td>
<td>Shows her reading with two others under a rainbow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sod that out” [I sound it out] Shows her with two other girls.</td>
<td>Shows her with two other girls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sad it out” [I sound it out] Shows a person in a castle and another person outside the castle.</td>
<td>Shows a person in a castle and another person outside the castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Letter-sound</td>
<td>“I sad it out” [I sound it out] Picture shows her next to a rainbow.</td>
<td>Shows her next to a rainbow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student G identified the letter-sound strategy throughout the intervention. Her drawings from the first two weeks also incorporated elements from the weekly story selection, such as including a porcupine during the week she had read a story about amazing animals. From week to week, her conferences revealed several different situations in which she was using the letter-sound strategy, ranging from reading at school tasks to reading with friends to reading favorite books at home.

Overall, trends from the seven students’ drawings and conferences show a very limited range of decoding strategies. Primarily, students identified either seeking outside help, thereby not using any of the decoding strategies, or using the letter-sound strategy. Furthermore, some students showed an imperfect understanding of this strategy, reporting using it to solve words that cannot be successfully decoded in this manner. Despite showing a limited range of strategy use, students did illustrate and identify themselves reading in a variety of different reading environments. Students drew themselves reading and word-solving with a variety of people at school, at home, and around their city.

**Summary**

This chapter presented the data collected throughout the course of this study. It offered a review of the data collected from the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005), the Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006), student drawings from the intervention, and teacher notes about the dialogue conducted with students. Chapter Five will provide a discussion of the results of this study, based on the data collected and reviewed in this chapter.
Chapter Five

Discussion

In this study, the researcher investigated two research questions: What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts? and What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ use of decoding strategies? Multiple points of data were collected in order to triangulate the methods of data collection and ensure the credibility of the study. In order to explore the research questions, the researcher collected data from the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005), the Interviews About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3) (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006), student drawings, and teacher notes from individual conferences about their drawings. The analysis of this provided insights into students’ views on themselves as readers, as well as their use of decoding strategies in solving unknown words. This chapter will discuss the findings of this study, as well as their implications for future instruction and research.

What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts?

Based on the data collected, the “drawings and dialogue” intervention strategy had an inconclusive impact on students’ reading self-concepts. This section will provide a discussion of the findings from each of the data collection measures.
**Self-report reading scale.** At the end of the intervention, the majority of the students’ raw scores demonstrated a more negative self-perception than their pre-intervention scores. Overall, though, several students’ scores were very similar from the beginning of the intervention to the end. This can be attributed to the difficulty of changing one’s self-concept, as discussed by Purkey (1970). Some students’ raw scores increased, however. The student who started with the lowest pre-intervention raw score, Student B, was also the student who made the largest gain. This student, who had been retained in first grade, exhibited a very low reading self-concept but was able to make some gains in viewing herself in a more positive light. The opportunity to have one-on-one dialogue with the teacher about her thinking, and to have that opportunity for the teacher to provide praise and validation at the same time, really seemed to instill a greater sense of self-confidence in this student. This relates to the powerful role of teacher feedback on impacting students’ self-concept as found by Burnett (2003).

Breaking down students’ responses by targeted individual statements gave an even more in-depth look at their views of themselves. Students’ more positive responses to Statement 20, “Most of the time I feel I will never be a good reader in school” (Elish-Piper, Johns, & Lenski, 2006, p. 72) indicate a general sentiment among students that, while they may not feel that they are skilled yet, they have confidence that they are capable of becoming good readers. They also indicated that, although they may not feel that they are good readers, they still feel comfortable with their skill level. Burnett (2003) described the positive impact of ability feedback, or feedback attributing student success to his or her ability. While it was not powerful enough to totally reverse a student’s self-perception, the ability feedback provided by the teacher during the
intervention period could have had some impact on their belief about their ability to improve their reading skills and their comfort with their current level of skill.

**Interviews about reading (early reader: grades 1-3).** The responses students gave during their interviews provided a more specific picture of their thinking. Overall, students did not change their answer as to whether or not they were a good reader. Those who initially answered that they were good readers still felt the same way after, and those who answered that they were not good readers also maintained their negative view. This aligns with the concept that an individual naturally tends to preserve his or her identity (Purkey, 1970). Students did offer some different reasoning for their opinions, though. Student F, for example, initially said he was a good reader because he tried to sound out words. At the end of the intervention, he modified this answer saying instead that he was a good reader because he liked to sound out words. This simple difference is a critical one: he transitioned from just attempting to use a strategy to decode to actually enjoying the act of decoding.

Student C, on the other hand, initially answered that she was not a good reader because she experienced difficulty with sounding words out. This aligned with her answer to a different question in which she identified that the defining characteristic of a good reader is the ability to sound words out. Throughout the intervention period, however, she cited using the letter-sound strategy nearly every week. Through these drawings and the dialogue she conducted with the researcher about them, she built up her confidence in sounding words out over the eight weeks. In her post-intervention interview, however, Student C still answered that she was not a good reader. This time, however, she explained that she was not a good reader because she often forgets words.
Thus, despite her building skill and comfort with sounding words out and her belief that this is a defining characteristic of a good reader, she rejected the evidence that this might mean that she is a good reader, too. As demonstrated by Purkey (1970), an individual has a natural inclination to preserve his or her identity, despite evidence to the contrary. This can be seen in Student C’s reluctance to accept the evidence that she had improved her decoding skills.

**Student drawings and teacher notes.** While these data were collected in order to determine the intervention’s effect on decoding strategy use, students’ drawings and their individual conferences discussing them also shed light on the students’ concepts of themselves as readers. Students’ drawings depicted some clues about their relative levels of self-confidence in their decoding ability.

Zimmerman (2012) suggested that the use of drawing “provides a buffer in the word-solving process that allows students to step back and think about the strategies they know and can use” (p. 582). For Student B, and the other struggling readers who participated in this study, their knowledge and use of decoding strategies was very limited. Thus, she used her drawings as a way to express some of the confusion she was feeling. Despite being a repeating first grade student, she experienced profound reading difficulties throughout the school year. In many of her drawings, she illustrated these difficulties by writing a series of question marks above her head (see Appendix E). Many of these drawings depict her with a frown on her face as well, illustrating the discouragement she felt. By the end of the intervention, however, she had begun to draw herself with a smile on her face. The researcher also noticed an increased level of classroom participation during the daily literacy block. This, combined with her
increased raw score on the Self-Report Reading Scale (Johns & Lenski, 2005), suggests that the intervention did have a positive effect on Student B’s self-concept.

In her individual conferences, Student C often told about her reading experiences at home and outside of school. In this way, the dialogue portion of the intervention allowed the researcher to take a look at her students’ literacy habits outside of school. Similarly, Student G frequently depicted herself reading outside of school as well. These students’ description of their reading outside of school suggests that they might be spending time reading for leisure at home which could indicate a higher level of self-concept. The results for these students were similar to De Naeghel et al.’s (2012) finding that those students with a higher self-concept spent more time reading for leisure.

Overall, the data collected suggest that the “drawings and dialogue” strategy had a partially positive effect on the students’ reading self-concepts. While it was not sufficient to change students’ self-concepts entirely, the strategy did help to change students’ senses of their potential for future success. These seven first grade students’ views of themselves, whether positive or negative, appeared to already be resistant to change, so the intervention did not overcome their previously established identities. It did, however, modify most of the students’ feelings about their ability to be successful in reading. The strength of these first grade students’ previously established self-perception, despite being such young students, suggests the power of self-concept in the early grades. As such, the first years of school are a critical time for helping each student to build positive view of him or herself, just as suggested by Wattenberg and Clifford (1964).
What is the effect of using a reflective “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ use of decoding strategies?

The “drawings and dialogue” intervention had a limited impact on students’ use of decoding strategies. Throughout the intervention, students relied primarily on either seeking help from an outside source or using the letter-sound strategy to sound out words, much like the students studied by Reutzel and Sabey (1996). Student D, who was unable to finish the study, demonstrated the biggest range of strategy use. He identified the letter-sound strategy in three out of the four weeks he participated in, and used the picture cue strategy in the remaining week. He was the only one of the targeted students who identified using any strategy other than letter-sound. Thus, rather than supporting the use of the “drawing and dialogue” intervention as a way to increase students’ use of decoding strategies, this study exposed an area of student need. Students, particularly struggling readers, are in need of more direct instruction on the different strategies readers use to decode unknown words in order to build their own repertoire of skills (Pinnell & Fountas, 2009).

The letter-sound strategy was the strategy that students most frequently identified in their drawings and dialogue. The data collected from students through their pictures and individual conferences, as well as their interview responses, suggest that students saw sounding words out as being a particularly important ability in reading. For example, in her pre-intervention interview, Student C defined a good reader as someone who sounds words out while reading. Student F demonstrated a similar sense of the importance of sounding words out, as well. Despite most often identifying that he would ask for help from someone else, he depicted using the letter-sound strategy during the fifth week of
the intervention. In his post-intervention interview, Student F suggested that he enjoyed sounding words out. Similarly, his illustration from this week depicted him at his desk reading with a smile on his face.

Student E identified using the letter-sound strategy consistently throughout the intervention. Through his drawings and the conferences discussing them, though, he demonstrated an incomplete understanding of this strategy. His drawings suggest that he was overly dependent on sounding words out, even when this strategy was not appropriate. This could be due to the pervasive “cultural model” of sounding out that many students and parents subscribe to as described by Compton-Lilly (2005). The overuse and inappropriate use of the letter sound strategy suggests that students are lacking an understanding of alternative decoding strategy options. This highlights a need for more instruction and for teachers to provide students with more options for instances when sounding out will not work.

Through this study, the researcher determined that some of her students are in need of more direct instruction about decoding strategies, as was recommended by Pinnell and Fountas (2009). This need was highlighted by students’ over-dependence on the help of others to word-solve, as well as their occasional misuse of the letter-sound strategy. While the Journeys (Baumann et al., 2011) basal reading series focuses on a particular comprehension and vocabulary strategy each week, it does not include any focus on decoding strategies. As such, it is left up to teachers to find ways to incorporate this into their teaching. However, the results of this study suggest that it is critical that these strategies are taught in order to provide students a greater repertoire of strategies to use in word-solving.
Reflections

By using an action research model, the researcher was able to address an issue of personal significance to her and her students. The present study offered insight into the effect of the “drawings and dialogue” strategy on this particular class of students, but it also presented opportunities for further research and study.

Recommendations for future research. Research has demonstrated that the first years of school are a critical time in the formation of students’ self-concepts (Aunola et al., 2002; Wattenberg & Clifford, 1964). The “drawings and dialogue” intervention had mixed results for the seven student participants in this study. As such, there is a need for further research on how to best help our youngest students build positive views of themselves as readers and as students.

In future research utilizing the “drawings and dialogue” strategy, the length of the study could be extended. If used less frequently over a longer period of time, students would have more of an opportunity to grow and extend their thinking and their strategy use between implementations. The intervention might also be more effective if implemented concurrently with the use of more strategic explicit instruction on the different decoding strategies.

Researcher learning. While it was not an element of direct study, an additional finding of this study was that the simple act of spending time devoted to one-on-one conferences about students’ drawings was so impactful. Students really responded well to having this time with the teacher’s undivided attention. The intervention provided an opportunity to take time with individual students while the rest of the class was busy drawing their pictures. It was beneficial to the researcher, as well, because it provided an
opportunity to really delve into students’ thinking which is not always possible amidst the hustle and bustle of the regular school day.

Student A, for example, really appeared to benefit from the use of individual conferences. The dialogue portion of the intervention helped this student to unlock thinking that she was simply not articulating. From week to week, her drawings were not clear and did not include captions to illuminate her intentions. This was not necessarily an indication that she was not participating, though. Instead, she was experiencing difficulty expressing her thoughts through her drawings. For example, in week two she drew a picture of an angel. While this picture did not include the student reading or the environment she was reading in, she was immediately able to explain her intention to the researcher, telling about reading with her aunt and sounding out words together before she passed away. This study really highlighted the importance of the dialogue aspect of the intervention. While many students were able to express themselves well through their pictures and captions, some students were better able to verbalize their thinking instead.

The findings of this study will impact the researcher’s teaching practice in several ways. First, the researcher will continue the practice of conducting the “drawings and dialogue” strategy with students on a regular basis, though less frequently than during the course of the intervention period. This strategy allowed an opportunity for students to express themselves and some of their literacy understanding through their drawings, and gave the researcher an opportunity to attend individually to students’ thinking and provide feedback and praise right away.

Along this same line, the researcher has developed a commitment to providing regular opportunities for one-on-one conferencing with students beyond just the use of
this particular intervention strategy. The benefits of having these private conversations were evident in the dialogue with students, as well as the researcher’s expanding understanding of her students’ thinking and skill base. These benefits could have a positive impact in numerous other areas of classroom and student need.

Finally, the researcher will seek to address the exposed need for stronger instruction on decoding strategies. Students demonstrated a clear lack of understanding and skill in utilizing multiple decoding strategies, which could certainly have a negative impact on their reading achievement. As such, the researcher has determined that more explicit instruction on the different decoding strategies is needed for her students, particularly those struggling readers.

Summary

The effect of the “drawings and dialogue” strategy on first grade students’ reading self-concepts was inconclusive. Students’ views of themselves seemed to already be resistant to change, highlighting the critical importance of building a positive concept of self in the very early grades. In addition, the strategy did not increase students’ use of decoding strategies. Instead, it exposed an area of need for further instruction on these different strategies in order to expand their use by readers. It is essential that teachers of young children find ways to help their students build their repertoire of reading skills while also fostering a positive self-perception in order to set their students up for success throughout their schooling.
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Appendix A

Self-Report Reading Scale
Appendix A: Self-Report Reading Scale

Self-Report Reading Scale
Beatrice Dubnow and Martin H. Jason

Purpose
To help measure elementary students’ self-perceptions of their reading abilities.

Administration
1. Reproduce the scale on pages 71–72.
2. Explain how students should mark their answers. Because words above the third-grade reading level were not included in the items, most students should be able to complete the scale independently. For younger or less able readers, read the items aloud.

Scoring and Interpretation
1. Students are given one point for each item to which they give an answer representing a positive self-perception. Use the key that follows.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The student’s total score is a qualitative self-perception of his or her reading abilities.
3. Teachers can use the results to help plan intervention strategies.

Jason, M.H., & Dubnow, B. (1973). The relationship between self-perceptions of reading abilities and reading achievement. In W.H. MacGinitie (Ed.), Assessment problems in reading (pp. 96–101). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Copyright © 1973 by Beatrice Dubnow and Martin H. Jason, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois 60605. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission. Permission is granted to reproduce the scales for classroom and/or research purposes only. Users may copy these pages. No changes may be made in either the items or those eliciting background information.
SELF-REPORT READING SCALE

Please Print

Name _______________________________ Boy [ ] Girl [ ]

School _______________________________ Grade _______________________________

Room _______________________________ Today’s Date _______________________________

Date of Birth _______________________________

Year [ ] Month [ ] Day [ ] Year [ ] Month [ ] Day [ ]

What to do: 1. These are sentences about reading.
2. Read each sentence and make an ✐ in the Yes or No box.
3. There are no right or wrong answers. Just mark the way you feel about each one.

1. I can do better in my other school work than I can in reading.  Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. There are too many hard words for me to learn in the stories I read. Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. If I took a reading test, I would do all right on it. Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. In school I wish I could be a much better reader than I am. Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. I can help other pupils in my class to read because I'm a good reader. Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. If reading gets too hard for me, I feel like not trying to read anymore. Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Most of the time I can read the same books as well as the good readers. Yes [ ] No [ ]

(continued)


Copyright © 1975 by Beatrice Dubnow and Martin H. Jason, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois 60605. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission. Permission is granted to reproduce the scale for classroom and/or research purposes only. Users may copy these pages. No changes may be made in either the items or those eliciting background information.
8. When I read in school, I worry a lot about how well I’m doing. Yes □ No □
9. Most of the time when I see a new word, I can sound it out by myself. Yes □ No □
10. I can read as well as the best readers. Yes □ No □
11. Most of the time I feel I need help when I read in school. Yes □ No □
12. If my teacher called on me to read to the class, I would do well. Yes □ No □
13. I can read as fast as the good readers. Yes □ No □
14. Most of the things I read in school are too hard. Yes □ No □
15. Pupils in my class think I’m a good reader. Yes □ No □
16. Most of the time I can finish my reading work. Yes □ No □
17. Most of the time I feel afraid to read to the class. Yes □ No □
18. I can read a long story as well as a short one. Yes □ No □
19. It’s hard for me to answer questions about the main idea of a story. Yes □ No □
20. Most of the time I feel I will never be a good reader in school. Yes □ No □
21. My teacher thinks I’m a good reader. Yes □ No □
22. I know what most of the hard words mean when I read them. Yes □ No □
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# Appendix B: Interview About Reading (Early Reader: Grades 1-3)

## Interviews About Reading

**OVERVIEW**

Interviews about Reading are designed to determine the child’s understanding of the nature of reading, the purposes for reading, and the child’s attitude toward reading.

**MATERIALS NEEDED**

1. Record Sheets on pages 25–28
2. Tape recorder (if desired)

**PROCEDURES**

1. Duplicate the appropriate Record Sheet on pages 25–28. If the child does not yet read, choose the Emergent Reader Interview. If the child is beginning to read, use the Early Reading Interview.

2. You may decide to tape-record the interview rather than write the child’s responses on the page in the Record Sheet during the interview. If you tape-record the interview, set up the tape recorder and test it to make sure it is working properly.

3. With the child, say, “Today we’re going to talk about reading and your ideas about reading. There are no right or wrong answers. I’m going to ask you some questions. To answer the questions, just tell me what you are thinking.”

4. If you are tape-recording the interview, say, “I’m going to turn on the tape recorder so that I can remember what you say. Do you mind?” (Teacher: Be sure to test the tape recorder.)

5. If you are writing the child’s responses, say, “I will be writing down what you say so that I can remember your comments. Is that all right with you?”

6. Begin asking the interview questions in the order they are written. If the child does not answer, prompt with easy questions such as “Do you have any brothers or sisters?” and “What animals do you like?” Once the child feels comfortable answering the questions, proceed with the interview.

**SCORING AND INTERPRETATION**

Record the child’s responses as accurately as possible. Then read the responses looking for overall patterns. Informally determine whether the child views himself or herself as learning to read and whether the child has a positive or negative attitude toward reading. Record your qualitative judgment of the child’s attitude and understanding about reading with an X on the continuum provided on the separate record sheets on page 26 and page 28.
Interviews about Reading  
(Early Reader: Grades 1–3)

Name ___________________________ Date ____________

1. Do you like to have someone read to you? ______ Yes ______ No
   Who do you like to read to you?

2. What kinds of stories do you like?

3. Tell me the name of a favorite story.

4. Do you have many books at home? ______ Yes ______ No
   How many books do you think you have?

5. Who do you know that likes to read?

6. Do you think you are a good reader? ______ Yes ______ No
   Why or why not?

7. What makes a person a good reader?

8. When you are reading and come to a word you don’t know, what do you do?

9. What do you do when you don’t understand what you are reading?

10. What is reading?

From Laurie Elish-Piper, Jerry L. Johns, and Susan Davis Lezni, *Teaching Reading Pre-K–Grade 3* (3rd ed.). Copyright © 2006 by Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company (1-800-247-3458, ext. 4). May be reproduced for noncommercial educational purposes.
# RECORD SHEET

**Qualitative Judgments of Interviews about Reading**  
*(Early Reader: Grades 1–3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Evident</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Overall interest in reading**
- **Familiarity with specific stories**
- **Availability of books**
- **Knowledge of reading role models**
- **Confidence in learning to read**
- **Motivation to learn to read**
- **Knowledge of word identification strategies**
- **Knowledge of comprehension strategies**
- **Knowledge of purpose for reading**

---

**Observations, Comments, Notes, and Insights**

---

From Laurie Elish-Piper, Jerry L. Johns, and Susan Davis Lenski, *Teaching Reading Pre-K–Grade 3* (3rd ed.). Copyright © 2006 by Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company (1-800-247-3458, ext. 4). May be reproduced for noncommercial educational purposes.
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Student C—Week 2
Student C—Week 6
Student D—Week 2
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### Student: A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 25</strong></td>
<td>none $\rightarrow$ help</td>
<td>drew an angel (her aunt) used to read together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 15</strong></td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>the &quot;gate&quot; of Cinderella.&quot; from her book $\rightarrow$ sounds out when she reads it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 30</strong></td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds out words when she reads with her little sister at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student: B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 18</strong></td>
<td>none $\rightarrow$ raise hand</td>
<td>raises her hand to get my help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 8</strong></td>
<td>none $\rightarrow$ raise hand</td>
<td>raises her hand during a test if she needs help with a hard word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 23</strong></td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounded out the word &quot;stop&quot; on a stop sign (wrote @ raising hand though)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 6</strong></td>
<td>none $\rightarrow$ raise hand</td>
<td>raises her hand to get help with the word words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student: C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td><strong>letter-sound</strong></td>
<td>sounds out words and puts them together (silent reading time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td><strong>letter-sound</strong></td>
<td>sounds words out when she reads at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30</td>
<td><strong>letter-sound</strong></td>
<td>break it down and say it fast” (reading at home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td><strong>letter-sound</strong></td>
<td>looks closely at the letters then sounds it out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student: D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td><strong>picture-cue</strong></td>
<td>used the picture of the porcupine to figure the word out (from Amazing Animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td><strong>letter-sound</strong></td>
<td>sounds words out when he reads with mom at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student: E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out (tried sounding “the” out - shut down when unsuccessful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out at home with mom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out (sounded “bail” out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student: F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Data Collection</th>
<th>Strategy Depicted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>none → raise hand</td>
<td>raises his hand to get my help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>none → raise hand</td>
<td>raises his hand to get help from his mom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out when he reads by himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>raise hand</td>
<td>raises his hand to get help - brother helps him at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Data Collection</td>
<td>Strategy Depicted</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out (did this with Amazing Animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out with her friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out when she reads with her mom and sister at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>letter-sound</td>
<td>sounds words out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student B—Week 2
Student B—Week 5
Student B—Week 7
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INFORMED CONSENT

Background
Your child is being asked to participate in a research study being conducted by Adrienne Liefeld, a graduate student at Wittenberg University, seeking a Master’s degree in Education. This research seeks to investigate the impact of a new instructional strategy on students’ views on themselves as readers. The study further seeks to determine the strategies that students are using to help themselves figure out unknown words. The researcher further proposes that the strategy has the potential to expand students’ use of different decoding strategies. Please read the following information carefully and please ask questions about anything you do not understand. Contact information is included at the end.

Study Procedure
The research for this study will be conducted during the morning reading block and will involve all students in the class. The study will be 8 weeks in duration. Each session will be approximately 20 minutes. The data collection will be concluded by April 2015. Audio recording will be used. The researcher will be giving students a written pre-/post-test to determine their feelings about themselves as readers, audio-recording her conversations with them about how they sound out words and how they feel about reading, and photocopying their drawings related to the study.

Risks
The risks involved in this study are considered to be minimal, as the participants may experience discomfort in changing classroom instructional procedures. Furthermore, while all students will participate in the new strategy, only a few students have been selected for data collection. Students might feel some discomfort if they believe that their classmates will know that they were the ones chosen. Your child has the right, at any time, to abstain from answering any question and has the right to choose not to participate in the study, without repercussions. The confidentiality of the student will be maintained at all times, and the results of the study will not reveal any personal information.

Benefits
A benefit to the participating student is potentially improving their concept of themselves as a read and/or increasing their repertoire of decoding strategies. Another possible benefit from participating in this study includes contributing to results that will provide information to the researcher, as well as the faculty and administration in the research site school, which could be used in the development of future instructional strategies. Since there has been little research in the impact of the strategy, the results of this study will also inform the larger research community in reading self-concept.

Alternative Procedures
The only alternative for participating in this study is choosing not to participate.

Confidentiality
Every effort will be made to protect your child’s confidentiality, including:
1. Only the researcher will know that your child is participating in this study.
2. Pseudonyms will be used on all student work samples related to this study.
3. Pseudonyms will be used on all written material (e.g., reports, thesis) related to this study.
4. All data collected during the study will be placed in a locked file cabinet that is only accessible by the researcher.
**Persons to Contact**
For questions regarding this study or any related matters, you may contact the principal investigator, Adrienne Liefeld, at 505-4360 or the researcher’s thesis chair, Dr. Roberta Linder at 327-6342 or email rlinder@wittenberg.edu.

For questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact Ralph Lenz, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, at 327-7305.

**Voluntary Participation**
Your child’s participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide to allow your child to take part in this study, you will be asked to sign this consent form. You are free to withdraw your child from this study at any time without penalty. Choosing to withdraw your child from the study will not affect the relationship you or your child has with the Investigator.

**Costs to Subjects**
Your participation in this research study will not result in any additional costs.

**Consent**
By signing this consent form, I, ____________________________ (print your name), confirm that I have read and understood the above information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my child’s participation is voluntary and I am free to withdraw my child at any time, without reason. I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form. I voluntarily agree for my child to take part in this study.

Child’s Name: ______________________________

Your signature ____________________________ Relationship to child ____________________________ Date ____________________________

Signature of researcher ____________________________ Date ____________________________
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Email communication.

Ralph Lenz <rlenz@wittenberg.edu>

Jan 14

to me, Nancy, Regina, feltz, Roberta, June

Hi Adie,
I have looked over your materials and I believe that I can justify expediting your request. So on behalf of the Witt IRB I am communicating our approval of your petition.

Good luck with your research.
Ralph Lenz
Witt IRB chair