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ABSTRACT

The federal No Child Left Behind Act has set the goal that all students in every state shall be proficient in reading by 2014. Arizona teachers face the challenge of having 100 percent of their students meeting or exceeding grade level reading standards assessed by Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS). One of my goals as a reading teacher is to widen the range of options my students will have. My goal every year is to have my students read at or above grade level. I also am committed to inspiring students to become motivated to love literacy because voluntary lifelong reading is important in peoples’ lives.

The purpose of this study was to investigate conducting brief, interactive, weekly reading conferences during daily Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading (ScS-SR) sessions while incorporating Transactional Strategy Instruction with a pair-share with a partner, and to see if it would improve my students’ reading motivation and comprehension. Data were collected via the Motivation to Read Profile Survey and Interview, informal observations, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Oral Reading Fluency Test (DIBELS: ORF), and Oral Reading Records used by my school district.

Findings concluded that students tended to become more willing readers, with several of them explicitly attributing their newfound willingness to read to my efforts. Most students became somewhat more aware of their reading experiences, explaining how different types of books in ScS-SR affected them. All students’ reading comprehension performance improved, with measurable increases in students’ instructional reading levels, retellings, and meaningful
miscues that students attributed to leveled books, strategy instruction, and retellings.
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Chapter 1 Leadership Context and Purpose of the Action

Excellent, research-based reading instruction is a must for students in the primary grades. The federal No Child Left Behind Act has set the goal that all students in every state shall be proficient in reading by 2014 (No Child Left Behind, 2002), and the Race to the Top initiative offers substantial financial incentives to states for raising their standards (Finn & Petrilli, 2009). Arizona teachers face the challenge of having 100 percent of their students meeting or exceeding grade level reading standards assessed by Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS). Many teachers believe that building basic literacy skills is the most important goal for education (Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1994). Teachers also rank motivation to read as a top concern in the classroom and many researchers think it should be a major goal in reading instruction.

Having students read at or above grade level by the end of third grade is important. Content area textbooks in fourth grade and above provide fewer scaffolds for negotiating text. Additionally, students’ reading skills by the end of third grade frequently indicate their academic success in high school (Allington, 2009). Students who are not skilled readers by the end of third grade have fewer chances to graduate from high school than skilled readers (Slavin et al., 1994).

Students can gain academic achievement if they read texts fluently and with good comprehension. Research also indicates that students should practice reading in order to learn how to read, and once students know how to read, they need to read even more. Thus, teachers would do well to provide excellent
research-based reading instruction, keeping in mind that students’ reading problems often can be prevented in the early years, especially by third grade.

Teaching students how to read is very important to me because it influences students’ life trajectories. Reading is important in a student’s school career and beyond. Of all the subjects I teach, I feel that reading is the most important to students’ lives. Reading achievement determines the choices available to students as they grow older. One of my goals as a reading teacher is to widen the range of options these students will have. My goal every year is to have my students read at or above grade level. I also am committed to inspiring students to become motivated to love literacy because voluntary lifelong reading is important in peoples’ lives.

Context

Motivation and achievement are important reading outcomes. For the purpose of this study, motivation is defined as the value the student places on reading and the student’s self-concept about reading. Motivated students learn to read for enjoyment, have on-task behavior while reading, and seek to construct meaning from what they read (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Such readers spend 500 percent more time reading than unengaged students (Guthrie et al., 2004). Motivation is an important contributor to reading achievement as well as an important outcome by itself. Many students do not value reading; therefore, they do not read much outside of school (Moore, Jones & Miller, 1980; Watkins & Edwards, 1992). In my past classes, I have seen students get constantly up and down during independent reading by selecting yet another book or asking if they
can go to the bathroom. They do not value the time it takes to finish the books they have started. I even have found some students coloring instead of reading. Some students do not view themselves as good readers. They may realize that they do not read as well as the proficient readers in class, resulting in their low self-concept as a reader. Further, when poor readers find reading to be unrewarding, they react by avoiding reading.

Motivated proficient readers are involved in meaningful talk about what they read. This talking contributes to a reader’s motivation and achievement. Dialogue can deepen students’ understandings of what they read and develop their independent strategies for future reading. Lately, I have noticed some students coming to me to discuss their books; in fact, they are competing for face-time. For instance, one of my recent students Grace\(^1\) likes to talk about her book and retell a funny story she has read. Shy Kimberly will come up at the beginning of the day and patiently wait to ask a question or retell a part of her book. I have come to realize that I am required to provide time during the day for my students to have meaningful talk, or dialogue, about their reading with each other as well as with me.

A leading cause for students’ lack of motivation to read is the amount of time spent actually reading in school; students attach importance to activities to which teachers devote a lot of time (Wojciechowski & Zweig, 2003). I should devote more reading time for my students because when they come to school and tell me what they have done over the weekend, it often is not about a great book.

\(^1\) All names are pseudonyms.
they have read but rather about seeing the movie *Monsters Versus Aliens in 3D* or playing *Guitar Hero* on a game system.

To improve my students’ motivation, I plan to explain to them the importance of reading to me, and I will show them the books I am reading. I will model my motivation by showing them how I recommend books to other teachers and by starting an after school book club for students. I will also have the students recommend books they like to each other in the class and to the school on the morning announcements.

In this study, reading achievement refers to fluency and comprehension. Fluency is defined as accuracy, prosody, and rate (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2006). Reading comprehension is defined as taking and making meaning from written language, from the writer to the reader, and relating this new information to the reader’s background knowledge (through connections, experience and prior knowledge).

Many aspects of reading instruction contribute to reading achievement. Students can achieve if they read texts fluently and with good comprehension. Research suggests that extensive, independent reading improves reading achievement. For example, reading independently for as little as 15 minutes a day can improve the reading achievement of struggling readers (Samuels & Wu, 2003).

With so many distractions for children, choosing to read a book over the latest video game or television show is not as appealing as it was for previous generations (Leonhardt, 1996). If reading teachers can motivate their students to
like to read, then these students will read more independently outside of the school setting and reading more outside of school is linked to higher reading achievement.

**Purpose**

Even though primary grade teachers teach all subjects, I believe our two top responsibilities are to promote students’ reading motivation and reading achievement. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the contributions of my instruction to my students’ reading motivation and achievement. The action research questions are as follows:

1. What will Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading contribute to my students’ reading motivation?
2. What will Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading contribute to my students’ reading achievement?
Chapter 2 Review of Supporting Scholarship

This review of supporting scholarship covers three categories. First, it describes sociocultural theory, the theoretical framework used for this study. Second, it presents research and professional reports of reading instruction used to inform my instructional initiative, Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading. Finally, this review describes two action research cycles I conducted earlier that contribute to this study.

Sociocultural Theory

According to sociocultural theorists, learning takes place in a social context (Vygotsky, 1978). Children are thought to develop twice: first on a social, interpsychological, level and second on an individual, intrapsychological, level (Woolfolk, 2003). Social interaction, zone of proximal development, and scaffolding are key concepts within sociocultural theory.

Social interaction. Meaningful social interaction, especially through language, is more than influence; it is the origin of higher mental processes. Cognitive development is dependent on the social interaction between teachers, students, and their peers. When students explain, elaborate, or defend to others what they are thinking, they are in the process of cognitive growth (Vygotsky, 1978). This interaction is a learning experience that guides children’s actions and helps them gain new skills; it can actually change the way children think and behave. How students develop intellectually is said to be related directly to how they interact with adults. Teachers play crucial roles in this cognitive development as the facilitator in the education of students.
Interactive dialogue is vital to children when a learning situation becomes complex. They benefit from opportunities to interact with others in order to solve new tasks. This dialogue involves teachers and students in conversation and the contribution of ideas through open-ended discussion, resulting in new knowledge (Nystrand, 2006). When students engage in socially interactive dialogue, they collaborate and begin to work beyond their actual developmental level.

**Zone of proximal development.** Learners have a zone of proximal development where teachers can help them learn beyond what they are capable of learning on their own. The zone of proximal development is the distance between what learners can do on their own and the potential learning gained with a teacher or peer (Vygotsky, 1978). It is associated with tasks that are challenging but not defeating.

Teachers are to teach to the level just beyond the students’ actual developmental level, awakening their higher mental functions. When students interact with adults and cooperate with their peers, this zone of proximal development is activated (Vygotsky, 1978). One way teachers can make good use of this zone of proximal development is by scaffolding.

**Scaffolding.** Scaffolding is another key concept in sociocultural theory. It is defined as the support a tutor provides to help children with a task, helping them avoid frustration (Wood & Wood, 1996). Scaffolding is based on the idea that students require substantial support at the beginning of learning, then increasingly less support as they gain independence (Duke & Pearson, 2002). It involves a gradual release of responsibility, a practice where teachers initially
assume responsibility for students’ learning then hand over to students’ responsibility for their own learning.

Teacher scaffolding can be a tool which can lead to profound insights for both teachers and students. For example, when students interact, scaffolded by teachers and engaged in dialogue, they collaborate and begin to work beyond their actual development level, the zone of proximal development. Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading, the initiative in my action research, is informed by sociocultural theory, the theoretical framework used for this study.

**Scaffolded Reading Instruction**

Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading (ScS-SR), my initiative in this action research, is a form of scaffolded reading instruction. It is redesign of Scaffolded Silent Reading (Reutzel, Jones, Fawson, & Smith, 2008), which, in turn, is a redesign of traditional Sustained Silent Reading (Hunt, 1970; Pilgreen, 2000). This section presents professional research and opinion regarding these three reading instruction designs.

**Sustained silent reading.** Originated by Lyman Hunt (1970), Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) involves a short time span of about 15-20 minutes during school when students are allowed to read books of their choosing (Pilgreen, 2000). In my experience, primary-grade teachers tend to schedule SSR only 15 minutes at a time since struggling readers may find it difficult to independently read for longer than that. Even 15 minutes per day of independent reading can expose students to more than a million words of text in a year (Osborn & Lehr, 2003).
Traditional SSR has several guidelines. Students read self-selected materials silently while a teacher models reading silently at the same time. Students select one book, magazine, or newspaper to read for the entire time period. A timer is set. No reports are given during this independent reading time, and the whole class participates (Hunt, 1970; Pilgreen, 2000).

Research on the value of sustained silent reading is mixed. On one hand, motivation and time on task have been found to increase when students are provided time to engage in self-selected, independent level, silent reading (Cunningham, Cunningham, & Allington, 2002; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Students who have participated in a free reading program at school have been found reading more books up to six years later than students at schools that did not participate in SSR (Pilgreen, 2000). Advocates of independent reading report that it is consistently more effective than direct reading instruction (Krashen, 2004). Additionally, students tend to read more when they are given the time to read (Cunningham, Moore, Cunningham, & Moore, 2000).

On the other hand, teachers have long been encouraged to promote silent reading, but experimental and quasi-experimental research rarely has focused on whether independent silent reading actually improves reading comprehension or fluency. Most of the research that supports independent silent reading comes from correlational research which cannot demonstrate cause-effect relationships. It cannot determine whether good readers achieve more because they read more or whether they simply choose to read more because they are good readers.
Of the few experimental studies conducted, most have found few gains in reading achievement as a result of independent silent reading (Osborn & Lehr, 2003). Because of the lack of experimental research, the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000) neither endorsed nor rejected independent silent reading. The report called for more experimental research. However, the panel members deduced that independent silent reading in the classroom is not likely to increase reading fluency and takes away time from necessary reading instruction.

SSR is one way to engage students in reading; however, there has been an absence of scaffolding by teachers. Teachers are not directly involved with instruction during traditional SSR. SSR is traditionally performed by students reading at any level while teachers model reading during the same time. No interactions or dialogue are performed by students or teachers. Students usually select a book of their own choosing regardless of the reading level of the book, and it might be outside their zone of actual development. There traditionally is no feedback given or goals set by the students. There is a lack of teacher monitoring; students are not held accountable for what they read due to the belief that this accountability would interfere with students’ motivation. Teachers do not provide feedback about book selection or actively develop comprehension with the students (Reutzel et al., 2008).

Readers have a zone of proximal development (i.e., instructional reading level) in which teachers can help them learn beyond what they are capable of learning on their own. Readers also have a zone of actual development, or
independent reading level, where they can learn on their own, often with the aid of well crafted books. SSR involves self-selection, so the students may not be selecting books at their independent reading level. A student’s independent level is where the student is self-sufficient, reading orally at 99-100% accuracy with appropriate rate, expression, and comprehension (Allington, 2009).

**Scaffolded Silent Reading.** For the reasons just stated, I sought a more appropriate version of SSR. Students should practice reading in order to get better at reading, and SSR provides that practice, but a hybrid approach using Scaffolded Silent Reading (ScSR) (Reutzel et al., 2008) where the students are supported with their independent reading could have even better results.

ScSR, which involves scaffolding the students’ reading during SSR, is a promising instructional practice. Teachers can scaffold their students by finding their reading levels so that they know their independent reading levels (Samuels & Farstrup, 2006) and by providing time to socially interact in dialogue with them. Scaffolding students to learn how to select books at their appropriate reading levels and to discuss what they have read silently are research-based ways to make SSR more productive (Osborn & Lehr, 2003). Teacher scaffolding and social interaction are necessary for independent reading to become more productive. In ScSR, teachers are actively engaged with the students, conducting brief (four to five minute) interactive weekly reading conferences, scaffolding students’ selections of books at their independent reading levels, reading aloud, and having students set goals for reading books within certain time periods and complete book response projects.
ScSR supports the teacher-to-student interactions that sociocultural theorists advocate. Teachers scaffold their students’ silent reading process. Teachers interact with students during the silent reading, promoting their understanding. ScSR provides students with support, guidance, structure, accountability, and monitoring during silent reading (Reutzel et al., 2008).

While ScSR adds sensible scaffolds to SSR, to my mind it includes some questionable scaffolds such as genre selection wheels to guide book selection. It also disregards some promising scaffolds such as student-to-student dialogue and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies. Consequently, I customized a plan for supplemental reading instruction that includes student-to-student dialogue and Transactional Strategy Instruction (Pressley et al., 1992). I refer to this plan as Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading (ScS-SR).

**Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading.** ScS-SR is structured to allow teachers to support their students’ silent reading process through student choice, providing interesting texts, having students read in independent level texts, encouraging social interaction after reading, and the teacher scaffolding the students’ motivation.

Choice is a huge motivator; thus, teachers do well to allow their students to self-select the books they are reading (Guthrie et al., 2004; Margolis & McCabe, 2006). Effective teachers not only provide choice but also provide interesting texts for the students to select. Whenever students (especially struggling readers) read independently, books at their independent levels
contribute to their motivation and confidence in their reading due to the success they experience.

ScS-SR calls for teachers to interact with students during their silent reading, promoting their comprehension strategies and gradually releasing them to working independently. Students’ engagement in ScS-SR provides them with support within their zones of proximal development, giving guidance, structure, accountability, and monitoring during their silent reading. Instructional reading levels are within the zone of proximal development which is just above the student’s level when they can read on their own. When a teacher does provide academics that are moderately challenging it increases the student’s willingness to do the work and ultimately increases their academic achievement.

One way to promote reading motivation and achievement is for students to engage in social interaction via dialogue with other students and with their teacher, sharing and discussing the books they read (Gambrell, 1996; Pilgreen, 2000). Engaging readers in conversations with their peers and their teacher helps the students become more successful. Dialoguing helps students construct meaning and reflect on their constructions, thus increasing deeper thinking (Guthrie et al., 2004; Peterson & Eeds, 2007). After students have read, they do well to recapture and think about the experience (Rosenblatt, 2005). Encouraging student-to-student dialogue after reading assists readers in text interpretation, critiquing, and inquiry, helping them to express themselves effectively.

Unfortunately, some students are involved in discussion for less than a minute a day (Nystrand, 2006).
After learning new reading comprehension strategies, students do well to interact with each other first and then their teacher in order to make sense of the new knowledge gained. The purpose for student-to-student dialogue prior to teacher-to-student dialogue is to help students become more accurate and confident when they speak with their teacher (J. Welsh, personal communication, February 27, 2010).

Dialogue with peers permits readers to socially construct meaning (Gambrell, 1996; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Keene & Zimmerman, 1997). Sharing with peers is also motivating because students benefit from a social environment (Pilgreen, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978). Talking with each other about what they read deepens the students’ understanding and helps to sustain their excitement and motivation about the books they have read. Readers feel more comfortable when they can verbally share with their peers about the books they have read. This talking gets the students to think metacognitively about their thinking, and this helps build their comprehension of what they are reading (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997). The students can later on recall these discussions with others when they are working independently and apply these insights to new situations.

Discussion-based instruction can significantly enhance reading comprehension and literature achievement. Teachers can be the starter of discussions that help students build understanding (Roen & Karolides, 2005). Teachers are the catalyst of discussion in brief, interactive reading conferences with their students, such as in ScSR. After the students have dialogued with other
students, they are now ready to be informally assessed and supported by their teacher.

Along with student-to-student dialogue, I will include Transactional Strategy Instruction (TSI, Pressley et al., 1992) in ScS-SR. Transactional Strategy Instruction involves teachers in explicitly teaching comprehension strategies in sets, then gradually releasing responsibility. Teaching strategies in sets, then having students share and develop them, helps students comprehend. In real life, students do not use strategies in isolation but in sets, using multiple strategies at a time.

The eight comprehension strategies taught in TSI are activating prior knowledge, understanding text structure, predicting, goal setting, questioning, imagery, monitoring, and summarizing. Readers do well when they take responsibility for their own learning using strategies like these (Cambourne, 1995; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). Teaching learning strategies can help students assume personal responsibility as well as promote their academic achievement. When struggling readers learn to use reading strategies, they develop confidence in their ability to read, resulting in increased motivation and academic success. Teachers also do well to scaffold students to become aware of their thinking while using these strategies. If students become aware of their thinking through using these reading strategies, then they can be expected to read more confidently, deeply, and independently (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997).

Research suggests that students do well when they are explicitly and directly taught reading comprehension strategies (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997;
Reutzel, Smith, & Fawson, 2005). TSI is an effective model through which teachers demonstrate their thinking while using sets of reading comprehension strategies such as predicting, monitoring, and summarizing. Teachers present a reading strategy by first modeling it during read alouds to the class, then showing how to orchestrate a repertoire of strategies, then providing a gradual release of responsibility until the students are independently using the strategies in concert with one another (Duke & Pearson, 2002). Students who see reading comprehension strategies modeled by their teachers can be sent on their own to independently apply and share these strategies (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997). Students can share their uses of reading strategies after reading. This dialogue can be both student-to-student and student-to-teacher. ScS-SR, using student-to-student dialogue as a scaffold in conjunction with TSI, promises to make a positive difference in young readers in their motivation and achievement.

**Previous Action Research Cycles**

I have conducted two previous cycles of action research on SSR. Both occurred in my third grade classroom.

**Cycle one.** During the first action research, I doubled SSR to twice a day for a total of 30 minutes over a five week period. Every student in my class increased in their reading comprehension as measured by an informal pre-post comprehension test and the Oral Reading Record, which my district provides (see Appendix J). Every student also increased in fluency as measured by their words read correctly per minute. In this experience, increasing SSR time and scaffolding independent reading levels increased reading comprehension and fluency.
After I started doubling the sustained silent reading, students groaned when the timer rang at the end of the preset time. My students indicated that they enjoyed reading at their independent levels out of a book they chose. I felt that the students were developing a love for reading, which was illustrated later in their pre/post Motivational Assessment results. This survey was a teacher-made survey with ten questions. Three answers were given represented by a smiley face, neutral face and sad face. By the end of this cycle of action research, I had all of my third grade students at third grade reading level with the exception of one student. This student improved three reading levels, but was still below grade level.

One trend I noted was that the higher level readers were more motivated to read, whereas some of the lower readers were easily distracted and didn’t seem as involved in their book. However, I believed that this action met the differentiated needs of my students. I also continued to believe that motivating students to like to read, promoting the love of literature, and demonstrating a love for reading is definitely one of the secrets to improving reading motivation in students.

**Cycle two.** The initiative in the second action research cycle involved me incorporating scaffolds during SSR while keeping the previous cycle’s two sessions of SSR per day. I used Scaffolded Silent Reading, which redesigns traditional SSR and incorporates brief, interactive, weekly reading conferences with a teacher, as well as students setting goals for the completion of their books. Three findings resulted from this round of action research. Qualitative data suggested that non-engaged students frequently were playing, looking around, or
getting out of their seat. The data also showed that the higher the reader achieved, 
the higher the engagement, although a causal connection between achievement 
and engagement was not established. The qualitative data also suggested that 
students’ motivation increased due to the teacher conferences, goal setting, or 
both. Finally, higher-achieving readers read more books according to the goal 
setting charts the students kept.

I became a more effective reading teacher due to this second round of 
action research. I felt more confident and could defend the ScSR approach since 
my students grew as readers and many actually looked forward to their silent 
reading, even clamoring to do so at times. I learned that I should make more 
observations during independent reading and help all readers, not just the students 
reading below grade level. I also learned to pay attention to the average readers 
as their engagement was about the same as the low readers. After reading some 
notes and listening to what students told me, I learned that some students were 
actually choosing to read at home versus watching television or playing video 
games.
Chapter 3 Method

The following describes the method used for this action research project. It presents the setting, participants, action plan, and data sources and collection.

Setting

The school in which I teach is located in a large suburban school district of a large city in the southwest region of the United States. This school district serves over 37,000 students in 30 elementary and 8 high schools. My school is in a middle-class neighborhood and has 752 students in kindergarten through eighth grade. Seventy five percent of the students are White, 20% Hispanic, and 5% African-American. My school had a 96% attendance rate in 2009. The promotion rate is 99%. Twenty percent of the students have a disability requiring special educational services. Twenty nine percent receive free and reduced price lunch.

Four years prior to this study, my class had been entering third grade with lower reading scores than the year before, heightening my concern for their reading motivation and achievement. These students scored low on their second grade spring Terra Nova Tests (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 2003) and on their second grade spring Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral Reading Fluency Test (DIBELS: ORF, Good & Kaminski, 2002). Typically, 1 student falls far below the national reading standard as scored on the Terra Nova test, 12 students approach the standard, and only 9 students meet the standard. They also have scored low on their informal reading comprehension pretests at the beginning of the third grade and on the fall Arizona Assessment Collaborative (AZAC) reading test (WestEd, 2001).
For the study reported here, the participants' spring DIBELS scores from second grade showed the following: 14 students tested at grade level, 4 students tested at strategic level (i.e., they require additional intervention), and 4 students scored intensive level (i.e., they must have substantial intervention). I did not have second grade data for six of the students since they were new to our school district. The students who scored at the strategic or intensive levels qualified for remedial reading lessons in third grade, which were initially offered for thirty minutes per day, for three days a week, and were taught by a specially-trained reading teacher. The reading scores presented above were low, so I, as their regular third-grade teacher, looked forward to developing a reading initiative via action research, especially considering that 8 out of 28 of my students qualified for a reading intervention.

My core reading instruction used few worksheets or other seatwork that took students away from authentic reading. It involved the students for about an hour each day in the following practices:

- Word study (15 minutes daily)
- Fluency practice (15 minutes daily)
- Reading with partners (15 minutes daily)
- Answering comprehension questions (15 minutes daily)
- Participating in guided reading groups or literature circles (20 minutes, three times a week)
- Reader’s theater (one week a month)
I used ScS-SR in addition to my core reading instruction. This supplement lasted about an hour each day. In ScS-SR, the silent reading time, including self-selected reading and teacher-student conferences, lasted 40 minutes daily, in two sessions per day, and Transactional Strategy Instruction lasted an additional 45 minutes a day, three times a week.

**Participants**

I taught third grade at this school for four years, had a master’s degree with a reading endorsement, and was state certified as a reading specialist at the time of this study. I was a doctoral student at the local university. My elementary school had a very supportive principal who allowed me to develop and present my own reading curriculum along with the mandated district materials. An interactive, dialogue-filled classroom was very important to me. I served as the students’ classroom teacher as well as the researcher in this study.

The initiative in this action research was conducted with the third graders in my classroom. My class consisted of 29 eight- and nine-year olds, 15 boys and 14 girls. The ethnicity of the class consisted of White (83%), Hispanic (10%), African American (3%), and Asian (3%). I conducted the action research with 28 of the students because one student participated in special education. Students in special education programs were frequently out of my classroom, and they missed a considerable amount of my reading instruction, so I did not include this particular special needs student in my study. However, whenever he was in my room, he received the same instruction as the other students.
In my classroom, I had three English Language Learners (ELL) who exited from ELL services. These students were included in my study because their services were inclusion based and they were present for my reading instruction. I also had eight students who received brief reading intervention in my district’s intervention program, and three who received speech support. The students who received the reading intervention were seen once a week by the reading specialist. Once the students tested out of being intensive, they no longer received services. One student was gifted. All these students were included in my study.

To generate detailed understandings of my initiative’s contribution to my students’ reading motivation and achievement, I tracked a focal group. I initially identified six focal student participants - using a stratified approach, two above grade level, two at grade level, and two below grade level. Ultimately, the participants ended up being two above grade level, one at grade level, and three below grade level.

**Action Plan**

The sixteen-week initiative in this action research involved my third grade students and me in Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading (ScS-SR), a supplement to my core reading instruction. It was conducted from August 16 to December 3, 2010 (see Appendix A). This initiative consisted of three main teaching practices, scaffolded silent reading, dialogue, and Transactional Strategy Instruction. These practices were intended to promote my students’ reading motivation and achievement.
Scaffolded silent reading. On August 16, 2010, the procedures for my initiative were taught and implemented in my classroom at first once a day, then slowly growing to twice a day, 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes in the afternoon. I involved students in sustained silent reading utilizing some of Pilgreen’s (2000) guidelines (e.g. students read self-selected materials, a timer was set, no reports were given, and the whole class participated). Scaffolding the students in line with ScSR, I tested them for their independent level, then they had access to the classroom library that was leveled so that they knew which books to select that would enable them to recognize the words with 99-100% accuracy.

To acknowledge the diverse students in my class, the classroom library had an assortment of genres within fiction and nonfiction, along with multicultural literature. The room had an environment that was quiet and comfortable. The students freely read self-selected materials without worry of being assessed or having to complete worksheets. Unlike traditional sustained silent reading, I modeled sustained silent reading only once or twice a month; other times I conferred with students one at a time about their reading.

Dialogue. An element of the scaffolding in ScS-SR is student-to-student dialogue. The student-to-student dialogue occurred through three minute pair-share interactions right after the scaffolded silent reading sessions. The students discussed the contents of their books as well as the strategies they used that promoted their understandings. I modeled for the students effective and ineffective dialogues, and the students role played effective ways to dialogue with
one another. I displayed productive dialogue criteria for students’ reference (e.g., Stay on task, Talk only about your reading, Discuss which strategies you used).

Throughout the first month, I reminded the students of the behavior expected during the dialoguing process. The students took notes about their reading on sticky notes or whiteboards to prompt them to share specific thoughts when silent reading was over. A timer was set for three minutes, and partners shared what they just read, alternating who would go first at each session. Additionally, the students had student-to-student Prompt Cards (see Appendix B) to remind them of the questions they might ask their partners. Partners changed every day to keep their interest and prevent partner fatigue. I circulated about the class, responding to the sharing. After the three minute discussion was up, for accountability I drew at least two numbers (my students are assigned a number) at random, and those students shared with the whole class what they or their partner talked about.

In line with ScSR, student-teacher dialogue occurred in brief four to five minute reading conferences during the scaffolded self-selected silent reading sessions. Sample questions that I used to prompt students about their reading are presented in Appendix B. I met with each student in the focal group at least once a week for a brief, interactive conference. I prompted students to respond to the books they were reading and talk about the comprehension strategies they selected and used. I also had students read aloud to me, and I took notes about their oral reading to inform my future dialogues with each student. I conferred with some students more than others in the name of equity because some students
required more scaffolding than others. I also verified that the students were reading independent level books.

**Transactional Strategy Instruction.** Starting August 23, I began the explicit comprehension instruction aspect of ScS-SR by teaching reading comprehension strategies 45 minutes a day, 3 days a week according to a Transactional Strategy Instruction framework (Pressley et al., 1992; Reutzel et al., 2005). TSI includes eight reading comprehension strategies: (a) activating prior knowledge, (b) text structure, (c) predicting, (d) questioning, (e) goal setting, (f) imagery, (g) monitoring, and (h) summarizing. I taught seven of the strategies, excluding goal setting. Questioning, imagery, and monitoring were taught twice during the week as suggested by Reutzel et al. (2005). I excluded goal setting because it overlapped other strategies and seemed likely to confuse my students.

I followed the TSI framework of initially presenting each strategy, handing it over to students, and helping them orchestrate their expanding repertoires of strategies. This framework is based on a gradual release of responsibility, a practice where teachers are responsible for using strategies, then fading out and encouraging students to fade in and become responsible for using the strategies (Duke & Pearson, 2002). This framework consists of five steps:

1. Describe the strategy: Explain what the strategy is and when and how to use it.

2. Model the strategy: Demonstrate by thinking aloud how good readers select and perform the strategy before, during, and after reading. Use a
shared reading text that all students have. Record strategic thinking explanations for all to use as a later reference.

3. Collaboratively use the strategy: Work with students to jointly apply the strategy. Record students’ pertinent explanations of their strategic thinking.

4. Guide application of multiple strategies: Gradually release responsibility to students to select and use the strategy along with other strategies they have learned.

5. Support independent application of multiple strategies: Continue releasing responsibility to students to select and use the strategies they have learned when they are reading on their own.

As shown in Table 1, TSI lasted four months and moved through a gradual release of responsibility from the teacher to the student. The first month was devoted primarily to me describing and modeling the strategies and collaboratively using them with students. I devoted fifteen minutes per strategy when introducing them. During the second month I began shifting to my students the responsibility for selecting and using the strategies. The third and fourth month was devoted to me mainly responding to students’ efforts at selecting and using the strategies.
Table 1

*Transactional Strategy Instruction Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month One</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• activating prior knowledge</td>
<td>• questioning</td>
<td>• summarizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• text structure</td>
<td>• imagery</td>
<td>• questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• predicting</td>
<td>• monitoring</td>
<td>• imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share responsibility in selecting and applying the strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months Three and Four</strong></td>
<td>Respond to students’ efforts at selecting and applying the strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Sources and Collection**

Both quantitative and qualitative data were generated in this mixed-methods study. Data were collected from August 12, 2010 through December 15, 2010 (see Appendix C). Following recommendations of Gay, Mills, & Airasian (2009) confidentiality of recorded data was ensured. Table 2 presents the data sources according to their type (quantitative and qualitative) and outcome (motivation and achievement). Four main sources of data were generated: (a) Motivation to Read Profile Survey and Interview (MRP: Survey, MRP: Interview, Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996), (b) field notes, (c) Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral Reading Fluency Test (DIBELS: ORF, Good & Kaminski, 2002), and (d) the Oral Reading Record used by my school district.
Table 2

*Data Sources by Outcome*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Oral Reading Comprehension Achievement</th>
<th>Oral Reading Fluency Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Motivation to Read Profile: Survey</td>
<td>Oral Reading Record</td>
<td>Oral Reading Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● retelling</td>
<td>● fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● modified miscue analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Reading Level</td>
<td>DIBELS: Oral Reading Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Motivation to Read Profile: Interview</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motivation to Read Profile: Survey.** The Motivation to Read Profile: Survey (MRP: Survey, see Appendix D) is recommended for teachers who want to measure motivation and who are implementing innovations - such as SSR - in their classrooms (Gambrell et al., 1996). I administered it on August 20, 2010 and again on December 3, 2010. It has a total of 20 items with a four-point response scale to avoid neutral answers. I read the items aloud to the whole class and gave specific directions to the students so reading ability did not confound the results. Administration took about 15-20 minutes.

The MRP: Survey assesses two measureable dimensions of reading motivation: self concept as a reader (ten items) and value of reading (ten items). The MRP developers report internal consistency reliability measures (Cronbach’s alpha) yielding coefficients of .75 for self concept as a reader and .82 for value of
reading. They determined validity by noting that two students known to be highly motivated and two known to be less motivated differed as predicted on the survey. Additionally, students’ MRP scores were positively associated with their levels of reading achievement and grade levels, findings that fit the research base in reading.

I administered this survey to the same participants before and after the sixteen week initiative to determine any changes in the students’ reading motivation. Moreover, I performed a member check with two participants, asking them if they understood the questions on the survey and ascertained the extent to which their oral responses to the items were commensurate with their scores (Gay et al., 2009). One student had no problems understanding the questions but wanted to know why she took the survey. Another student said he had a little trouble with question five, which asked what the student did when coming to a word he or she did not know.

**Motivation to Read Profile: Interview.** The Motivation to Read Profile: Interview (MRP: Interview, see Appendix E) added depth to my data collection and helped me gain insight into my students’ motivation (Gambrell et al., 1996). The MRP: Interview also helped me obtain additional data that the surveys or field notes could not provide alone (Gay et al., 2009). The interviews were conducted individually, with the purposefully formed focal group of six participants.

The MRP developers selected 16 items for the MRP: Interview from an initial pool of 60. Teachers identified 24 students known to be their most highly
motivated to read and 24 known to be their least motivated to read. Researchers then field tested the pool of interview items with these students and identified 14 questions that provided the most salient information about motivation to read.

The interview consists of three sections that address narrative text (three items), informational text (three items), and general reading (eight items). I interviewed my focal group members on August 25 and 27, 2010 then again between December 6-15, 2010. I conducted member checks on August 27, 2010 to ensure that the participants understood the questions and to test the results of the interviews with the participants so that they could correct any errors or challenge the results (Gay et al., 2009). Two participants (i.e., D, Z) thought Section A, question two was a little confusing. They did not know quite how to answer it. Student D did not know about authors, so Section C, question three was difficult. Both students D and Z found Section C, question four hard to answer. Student Z found Section C, question six hard.

**Field notes.** For purposes of triangulation and complementarity (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003), I recorded field notes relative to this study’s two research questions about the contribution of Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading to student motivation and achievement. Field notes helped corroborate and inform the results from the MRP Interviews and Surveys. I observed the focal group’s and all participants’ reading behaviors, focusing on their motivation and implementation of reading comprehension strategies that they mentioned to me directly or that I noticed indirectly. I recorded my field note observations immediately and as accurately as possible; I recorded what I observed and then recorded my
interpretations (Gay et al., 2009). I recorded field notes on a standard protocol (see Appendix F).

Particularly during the brief teacher-student conferences with the focal group, I took field notes on the students’ reading motivation and achievement. I questioned participants throughout the sixteen weeks in order to determine my action’s outcomes and adjust my instruction accordingly. I asked questions regarding reading motivation such as:

- What do you do at home for fun?
- What kind of schoolwork do you find yourself doing at home without anyone telling you to?
- What do you do when you have free time?

I asked questions regarding reading achievement such as:

- Is your reading improving or not improving? Tell me about it.
- Do any of the reading strategies seem to be really helping you? If so, which ones?
- Why does that strategy help you?
- Is reading more helping you become a better reader?
- How is talking to a partner about your books helping you?

**Oral Reading Record.** Reading achievement data were collected using my district’s Oral Reading Record twice during the four months of my action. The Oral Reading Record was given at the third grade level N in August and again in early December. Different level N passages were used before and after the initiative. According to my district, Level N is the where third graders should be
during the fall of third grade. I used the Oral Reading Record to track (a) oral reading comprehension through retellings and modified miscue analyses as well as (b) oral reading fluency through a rubric containing criteria for prosody, accuracy, and rate.

I primarily used the retelling scores from the Oral Reading Record to determine students' reading comprehension during the initiative. Retellings were assessed according to a rubric (see Appendix G), which contained the following criteria: main idea, organization, characters, interpretation, meaning vocabulary, and questions/prompts. For a scaffold, the retelling rubric was presented to the whole class, explaining each criteria and then posted in the classroom, thus prompting all students on how to retell a story according to academic expectations.

Participants’ oral reading comprehension retellings were reported out of a total of 24 points as follows: 6-9 (very little comprehension), 10-15 (some comprehension), 16-21 (adequate comprehension), and 22-24 (very good comprehension). To be considered at the appropriate reading level, the students needed to score at least 16 of the 24 points.

Additionally, I conducted a modified miscue analysis with my focal participants to deepen my assessments of their oral reading comprehension. This complementary analysis centered on readers’ tendencies to preserve the meaning of the passage when their oral reading responses differed from what was written on the page.
I also used the Oral Reading Record to determine participants’ oral reading fluency. Their oral reading fluency can range from 0.5-1.0 (all word-by-word), 1.5-2.0 (mostly word-by-word), 2.5-3.0 (mixture of word-by-word and phrases), and 3.5-4.0 (primarily in phrases) according to a fluency rubric (see Appendix H). To be considered at the appropriate fluency level, the students needed to score between three and four.

Students who enter third grade at Oral Reading Record book level N and exit third grade at book level P are considered to be on grade level (see Appendix I). These levels correspond to students’ instructional reading levels. For the purpose of this study, I reported participants’ oral reading comprehension and oral reading fluency levels pre and post based on the Oral Reading Record level N.

I also placed the participants at their instructional reading level when they had 90-99 percent accuracy during oral reading (Allington, 2009) and their rate and expression were appropriate (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2006). I reported participants’ instructional reading levels based on Oral Reading Records (e.g., book levels N, P) once a month during the initiative.

**Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral reading fluency.** My school’s assessment team administered the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral Reading Fluency (DIBELS: ORF) on the weeks of August 23 and December 6, 2010 to determine the students’ oral reading fluency. DIBELS: ORF is a state-required, curriculum-based assessment instrument which measures fluency by timing the students for one minute, then calculating the number of words read correctly. Each fictional and nonfictional
passage throughout the year becomes more challenging. Three times a year, my students are administered the DIBELS test by the assessment team at my school. Third grade students who exit their grade with at least 107 words per minute score at the 50th percentile according to the Hasbrouck and Tindal (2006) oral reading fluency norms table. For purposes of this study, participants’ DIBELS: ORF scores were reported as words correct per minute.
Chapter 4  Methodology, Analysis, and Results

This chapter reports the ways in which the data were analyzed and the corresponding results. It includes three sections: methodology, qualitative analysis and results, and quantitative analysis and results.

Methodology

This action research followed a mixed-methods methodology. Mixed-methods methodology supports the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data to give depth, breadth, and divergent perspectives to research (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2003). Mixing quantitative and qualitative methods and giving them equal emphases is thought to contribute to understanding social phenomena better than when relying on a single method.

Diversity is the signature characteristic of mixed-methods methodology (Greene, 2006; 2007). It privileges a combination of data sources and analytic methods that differ considerably from one another to enhance researchers’ perspectives on what they are studying (Greene, 2007).

Qualitative Analysis and Results

Qualitative analysis. As an active participant observer, I analyzed the raw data collected on-site from the MRP interviews with the focal group as well as field notes taken on all participants. Qualitative data sources were analyzed one at a time, in the order they were collected. Table 3 displays an inventory of the qualitative data gathered and analyzed in this study.
Using the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), I read my notes many times to become familiar with the data, then circled key words and phrases that pertained to reading motivation and achievement. Individual focal group participants’ contributions were identified (color coded) within each data source. I circled over 400 key words and then categorized the key words into codes. To assist in developing codes, key words were entered into Microsoft Office Excel 2003 to note the frequency of words according to each data source. The frequency was only part of what was analyzed; salience was also considered as I sought conceptual clusters of important words. I kept an open mind to the codes that started to develop, rereading the data and reforming the codes until the data were saturated.
**Qualitative results.** Codes were created relative to the research questions in this study addressing reading motivation and achievement. I constructed seven final codes, four for motivation and three for achievement. Table 4 shows the codes and their corresponding descriptions for reading motivation. Code descriptions include students' actual words.

Table 4

*Reading Motivation Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to read</td>
<td>Enjoying reading, hooked on reading, reading during free time, wanting to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about reading desires</td>
<td>Sucked into reading, addicted to reading, wanting to read a certain book, determining if a book is good or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of reading books</td>
<td>Books are interesting, exciting, or cool; thinking about books; practice reading books; reading more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about types of books</td>
<td>Adventure books, action books, mysteries, biographies, specific series of books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the codes and their corresponding descriptions for reading achievement.
Table 5

*Reading Achievement Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>I thought, I learned, I statements, awareness of uses of strategies, awareness of their reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retell</td>
<td>Characters, weird, freaky, predicting, visualizing, summarizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Fluent (or not), expressive (or not), phrasing (or not), added words, word omissions, word by word,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choppy, respected punctuation (or not), finger tracking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative Analysis and Results**

**Quantitative analysis.** The first set of quantitative data I collected were from the Motivation to Read Profile: Survey. I recoded its reverse-scored items.

The second set of quantitative data were from the Oral Reading Record and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral Reading Fluency. When the data were entered into Excel, I rechecked over 30% of my entries for reliability (Gay et al., 2009). Table 6 presents an inventory of the quantitative data gathered and analyzed in this study.
Table 6

*Quantitative Data Sources Inventory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Read Profile: Survey</td>
<td>The MRP: Survey assessed self concept as a reader (ten items) and value of reading (ten items). It had a total of 20 items with a four point response scale to avoid neutral answers.</td>
<td>280 one-sided, double-spaced pages</td>
<td>40 minutes (20 minutes for each pretest and posttest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reading Record</td>
<td>My district’s Oral Reading Record tracked (a) oral reading comprehension through retellings and modified miscue analyses as well as (b) oral reading fluency through a rubric containing criteria for prosody, accuracy, and rate.</td>
<td>168 one-sided pages</td>
<td>392 minutes (28 participants each pretest and posttest for about 7 minutes each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral Reading Fluency</td>
<td>My school’s assessment team administered the DIBELS: ORF, a state required curriculum-based instrument which measures fluency by timing the students for one minute each of three passages and then calculating the number of words read correctly.</td>
<td>28 test booklets</td>
<td>336 minutes (28 participants for each pretest and posttest for about 6 minutes each)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics were computed using Microsoft Excel and included measures of central tendency (i.e., means) and variability (i.e., standard deviations). Additionally, I calculated confidence intervals of the means, mean differences, and effect sizes. Effect sizes were used to measure the magnitude of
the impact of the initiative, using Cohen’s $d$ (Cohen, 1988) for the differences between the means divided by the pooled standard deviation. Cohen’s (1988) benchmarks of $d = .20$ as small, $.50$ as moderate, and $.80$ as large were used.

**Quantitative results.** Tables 7 and 8 convey results of the study participants’ reading motivation measures. Table 7 lists descriptive statistics for the pretest and posttest results of the Motivation to Read Profile for my entire third grade class. The results reported in Table 7 indicate that my students’ value of reading increased moderately ($d = 0.43$) while their self concept increased slightly ($d = 0.13$). The overall results for the MRP survey showed a slight increase in reading motivation ($d = 0.29$).

Table 7

**Survey Instrument Descriptive Statistics for All Participants (N = 28)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Pre Survey $M$</th>
<th>Post Survey $M$</th>
<th>$M_2 - M_1$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of Reading</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.54, 2.94]</td>
<td>[3.76, 3.32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Concept</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.53, 2.97]</td>
<td>[3.58, 3.10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.54, 2.94]</td>
<td>[3.68, 3.20]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Maximum score = 4

Table 8 presents descriptive statistics for the pre and post results of the MRP survey for my six focal group students. The results reported in Table 8
indicate that the focal group students' value of reading increased moderately ($d = 0.45$) while their self concept increased slightly ($d = 0.15$). The overall results for the MRP survey showed a slight increase in motivation ($d = 0.32$). Their results were just slightly above the class' results.

Table 8

*Survey Instrument Descriptive Statistics for Focal Group (N = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Reading</th>
<th>Pre Survey</th>
<th>Post Survey</th>
<th>$M_2 - M_1$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.77, 2.37]</td>
<td>[4.03, 2.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.78, 2.68]</td>
<td>[3.88, 2.78]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.77, 2.53]</td>
<td>[3.95, 2.81]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Maximum score = 4

Tables 9 through 12 convey results of participants’ reading achievement performance with the Oral Reading Record. Table 9 presents descriptive statistics for the pre and post ORR of the whole class. The class’ Retell (see Appendix G) showed a very large change ($d = 1.22$) as did their overall instructional reading level ($d = 1.47$). The class’ fluency measure, which contained criteria for prosody (see Appendix H), showed a large change ($d = 0.85$).
### Table 9

*Oral Reading Record Descriptive Statistics for All Participants (N = 28)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>$M_2 - M_1$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retell (Maximum score 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[2.50, 2.00]</td>
<td>[3.16, 2.76]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[15.94, 14.70]</td>
<td>[18.51, 17.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.11, 2.39]</td>
<td>[3.65, 3.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Maximum score = 4     **Maximum score = 26; mid-3rd grade score = 15

Table 10 presents the descriptive statistics for the pre and post ORR of the focal group. Retell showed an extraordinarily large change ($d = 2.25$), while the effect on the focal groups' instructional reading level was very large ($d = 1.09$). The fluency of the focal group also showed a very large effect ($d = 1.01$).

### Table 10

*Oral Reading Record Descriptive Statistics for Focal Group (N = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>$M_2 - M_1$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[2.16, 1.50]</td>
<td>[3.51, 2.49]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[16.67, 15.02]</td>
<td>[19.48, 15.52]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[3.28, 1.72]</td>
<td>[3.67, 2.83]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Maximum score = 4     **Maximum score = 26; mid-3rd grade score = 15
Table 11 displays the pre and post percentage of meaningful miscues that participants produced with the ORR. The percentage of meaningful miscues increased 5.23%, going from 6.7% to 11.93%.

Table 11

*Meaningful Miscue Analysis Scores for All Participants (N = 28)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Test</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
<th>Total Meaningful Miscues</th>
<th>Percent of Meaningful Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presents the pre and post percentage of meaningful miscues produced during the ORR for the focal group. The percentage of meaningful miscues increased 3.05%, going up from 3.85% to 6.90%.

Table 12

*Meaningful Miscue Analysis Scores for Focal Group (N = 6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Test</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
<th>Total Meaningful Miscues</th>
<th>Percent of Meaningful Miscues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 13 through 16 convey results of participants’ performance with fluency-related assessments. Table 13 presents the descriptive statistics for the
pre and post Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills: Oral Reading Fluency scores for the whole class. The DIBELS: ORF measures fluency by timing the students for one minute then calculating the number of words read correctly. The class demonstrated a large effect \((d = 0.91)\) for Correct Words Per Minute (CWPM), and their accuracy went up substantially \((d = 0.75)\).

Table 13

*DIBELS ORF Descriptive Statistics for All Participants \((N = 28)\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>(M_2 - M_1)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>95.25</td>
<td>130.18</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>42.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[108.63, 81.87]</td>
<td>[146.40, 113.96]</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>96.11</td>
<td>98.04</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[97.43, 94.79]</td>
<td>[97.38, 98.70]</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mid-3rd grade score at the 50th percentile = 92 CWPM

Table 14 presents the descriptive statistics for the pre and post DIBELS: ORF results of the focal group. The DIBELS: ORF measures fluency by timing the students for one minute then calculating the number of words read correctly. The focal group had a large effect \((d = 0.77)\) for CWPM and their accuracy went up very much \((d = 1.11)\).
Table 14

**DIBELS: ORF Descriptive Statistics for Focal Group (N = 6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>$M_2 - M_1$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency CWPM</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>92.83</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>34.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[127.41, 58.25]</td>
<td>[166.19, 88.81]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>94.83</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[98.03, 91.63]</td>
<td>[99.46, 96.54]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mid-3rd grade score at the 50th percentile = 92 CWPM

Table 15 displays the Oral Reading Record’s pre and post CWPM scores of the class obtained the first week of school in August then in December. The students performed a cold read from the same story but on a different page each month. The story was a level O (mid school year level). The students CWPM show a very large change ($d = 1.68$).

Table 15

**CWPM August - December Descriptive Statistics for All Participants (N = 28)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>$M_2 - M_1$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWPM</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>131.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>67.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>[75.72, 51.78]</td>
<td>[149.76, 112.24]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mid-3rd grade score at the 50th percentile = 92 CWPM
Table 16 presents the pre and post CWPM of the focal group from the first week of school in August until December. The CWPM show a very large change 
\(d = 1.46\).

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>CWPM</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>(M_2 - M_1)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>127.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>54.82</td>
<td>67.83</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[90.52, 28.48]</td>
<td>[172.08, 82.58]</td>
<td>(95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mid-3rd grade score at the 50th percentile = 92 CWPM
Chapter 5 Findings

After determining codes for the qualitative data and descriptive statistics for the quantitative data, I performed an integrative analysis to piece together data-based assertions that addressed the contribution of ScS-SR to my students’ reading motivation and achievement. This construction of assertions followed guidelines presented by Erickson (1986) and Smith (1997).

Using an inductive analytic approach, I gathered together and read the codes and descriptive statistics from all the data sources several times. All the while, I was taking notes and identifying and color coding patterns within and across the data sources. According to Erickson (1986),

An appropriate metaphor for this kind of pattern discovery and testing is to think of the entire data set ... as a large cardboard box, filled with pieces of paper on which appear items of data. The key linkage is an analytic construct that ties strings to these various items of data. Up and down a hierarchy of general and subsidiary linkages, some of the strings attach to other strings. The task of pattern analysis is to discover and test those linkages that make the largest possible number of connections to items of data in the corpus. When one pulls the top string, one wants as many subsidiary strings as possible to be attached to data. The strongest assertions are those that have the most strings attached to them, across the widest possible range of sources and kinds of data. (p. 148)
Based on my multiple readings and conceptualizations of patterns, I wrote speculative sentences that asserted the extent and ways in which ScS-SR contributed to my students’ motivation and achievement.

To refine my assertions, I took them one at a time and systematically searched across data sources for support or refutation of each. This was “an exercise in disciplined skepticism” (Smith, 1997, p. 81). Codes and descriptive statistics that supported or refuted my claims were recorded on sticky notes and physically attached to each assertion.

Assertions with a greater number of notes across all data sources were given more attention and were considered to be more valid. If the instances of discrepant notes caused me to doubt an emerging assertion, then I reworded its language so it applied to all pertinent data. I then conducted a reliability check, called check-coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994), with a critical friend as I worked to finalize these assertions. The critical friend looked over the notes and found more connections across the data, then we started to move notes around into more complex and extended assertions.

My integrative analysis of the data collected during this initiative led to four assertions. The assertions are as follows:

- Students tended to become more willing readers, with several of them explicitly attributing their newfound willingness to read to my efforts.
- Most students became somewhat more aware of their reading experiences, explaining how different types of books in ScS-SR affected them.
• All students’ reading comprehension performance improved, with measurable increases in students’ instructional reading levels, retellings, and meaningful miscues that students attributed to leveled books, strategy instruction, and retellings.

• Most students' fluency substantially improved, with noticeable increases in their prosody, accuracy, and rate.

**Motivation to Read**

As a result of my innovation, students tended to become more motivated readers, with several of them explicitly attributing their newfound willingness to read due to ScS-SR. As reported in Chapter Four, the quantitative results for the Motivation to Read Profile for the class in general and the focal group in particular showed only a slight increase in reading motivation. At the end of my ScS-SR initiative, students generally responded slightly more positively to items such as “Reading a book is something I like to do.”

On the other hand, the qualitative data generated from my interviews and field notes showed students reporting rather positive newfound motivations to read. These qualitative data balance the survey results, pointing to the complexities of assessing a construct like reading motivation. During the interviews and observations, students tended to comment quite positively on their new willingness to read and to the contribution of my efforts to their newfound motivation with many students mentioning the comprehension reading strategies taught in TSI and their increase in liking to read more.
**New willingness to read.** A few students openly stated that their willingness to read changed due to my innovation, although they did not explain reasons for the change. One student expressed it this way, "I didn't think I would ever like reading, but I guess I was wrong. I love reading. Bottom line" (FN.D.12-17-10). Another put it simply this way, "I miss reading in class on the weekends" (FN.K.12-17-10).

A few students commented on their reading outside of class, sometimes in the place of popular media. For instance, one student reported turning off his video game to read: "Reading has changed my life. When I would play my X-Box I'd look at my book then I'd start playing again. Now, I look at my book and shut off my X-Box and start reading" (FN.BB.12-17-10).

**Sources of newfound motivation.** Several students explicitly credited my teaching with their newfound motivation to read. For instance, one student explicitly linked new reading motivation with the new strategies presented during Transactional Strategy Instruction, "Reading is the best. I love reading. Thank you for teaching me the strategies. I use them really often. It makes me read more often at home" (FN.Z.12-17-10).

Most students who attributed their reading motivation changes to my efforts and did so using somewhat general terms. As one student put it, "I came into this classroom not liking reading, and then I started liking reading"

---

2 Parenthetical information specifies data based support for the assertions. The first letter string identifies the data source (INT=interview; FN=field note). The second letter string identifies the pseudonym for the participant. The numerals identify the date.
Another reported being surprised to find herself opting to read at home during her favorite TV show as a result of my efforts. As she said, "Now reading is a hobby of mine because of you. Sometimes I even read on commercials on TV" (FN.N.12-17-10). Student J stated that he began to really like reading after entering my class: "I walked in hating reading but you really changed me. Reading is fun now. I love reading. I never knew it was that fun" (FN.J.12-17-10). Still another elaborated on this topic as follows,

Before walking into the classroom I didn't really care about reading. I really didn't. And so I'm just addicted to t.v., and now I'm addicted to books, and now I don't have time for anything, which sucks! Yesterday I was watching a show, I think it was called iCarly. It was a commercial, and I was just looking around, and I saw my Alice in Wonderland book, and I'm like... I had a light bulb over my head. It turned on my self conscious. So I just went "ding! book!" I don't know what you did to me, but I love reading. (INT.D.12-9-10)

Several students commented on how the books I made available to them during ScS-SR contributed to their reading enjoyment. To illustrate, one student had this to say, "Reading changed me and I love it now. I came in hating it and now I love it. It was awesome. You just need the right book for you" (FN.G.12-17-10). Talking about books with me helped Student Q: "I think this is how it works [learning to read]. I tell you what books I like, then you recommend a book, then I love it" (FN.Q.12-1-10). Still another student told of following up what I presented during book talks, "You tell us how the books are, and then it
sounds like exciting adventures. Like Ralph and the Motorcycle, it was like a little adventure" (INT.G.12-10-10). Another student echoed this statement as follows, "I used to hate reading, and now that you got me the right book, I love reading" (FN.U.12-17-10). One student reported becoming addicted to reading certain books:

Well, actually, it was, I was going through the O books in our bin, and I saw Bad Kitty, and I thought it looked interesting, and I started reading them. And then I got addicted, and so my friend actually showing me where they were in the library, and I've been checking them out, and they're so good. (INT.D.12-9-10)

Another had this to say about opportunities to find appropriate books in my class,

It was a really good book so I came here and looked through the bins and found a couple more, so then I read more, and then I found them in the library, and then I found Eva and the Penguins. (INT.S.12-10-10)

Still another student commented on my classroom collection of books this way,

I actually like the mystery books, A to Z Mysteries, and I saw The Jaguar's Jewel. I've read all of them to that one, and I couldn't find it anywhere, but I saw it in the classroom. And I was gonna ask, but then I got hooked on all these other books, and I forgot about it. I've heard about Happy Birthday Bad Kitty, and I want to read all the Bad Kitty books. (INT.D.12-9-10)
Awareness of Reading Experiences

Most students became somewhat more aware of their reading experiences, explaining how different types of books in ScS-SR affected them. During my interviews and observations, students frequently talked about their new feelings as they read. They described specific interests and emotions related to what they were reading during ScS-SR.

Several students commented on learning to like reading in general as well as particular kinds of books in my class. For instance, Student P had this to say:

I love reading. It's one of my favorite things to do. Reading is as good as football. I used to never read or like reading until you came along. Now I know my favorite author is Ron Roy, and my favorite books are A to Z Mysteries. (FN.P.12-17-10)

Another student showed a growing awareness of their reading when he/she reported learning to like action books: "Like Captain Underpants, how it has action, I like the action books. And that's how I get most into reading. I came into this classroom not liking reading, and then I started liking reading" (INT.J.12-14-10).

Other students talked about how learning to think, reading for extended periods, and understanding new things during ScS-SR affected their reading experiences. When asked what got him excited about reading, Student G replied, "Pretty much you, because you always say 'reading is thinking,' and I love thinking and reading" (INT.G.12-10-10). When I asked another student what contributed to her reading, she stated, "Maybe because I'm learning to read longer.
Last night I cried when I had to go to bed. I wanted to read more - I wasn't finished" (FN.D.9-8-10). Finally, Student D told of learning new things: "I started liking biographies because I never knew who made the first flag, and I read that, and it's amazing to me. I never knew like who stood up for rights about Blacks and Whites, I never knew that" (INT.D.12-9-10).

While explaining her newfound awareness of her experiences reading different types of books in my class, Student D put it quite sensitively:

Well, sometimes, like, I'm surprised, or I'm like, all worked up sometimes like, when I'm doing SSR, and some books I'm like excited! Sometimes I get excited, sometimes I can't even hear what I'm reading in my head because I just hear the reading in my heart. (INT.D.12-9-10)

**Reading Comprehension Performance**

All students’ reading comprehension performance improved based on my innovation. As Chapter Four showed, my students’ instructional reading levels, retellings, and meaningful miscues increased substantially during this initiative. The focal group especially showed extraordinary growth in their retellings. The difference in their experience from the rest of the class was consistently conferencing with me once a week during ScS-SR. Based on my student interviews and observations, the instructional factors that seemed to play a major role in this increase included leveled books, Transactional Strategy Instruction, retellings that focused on characters’ traits, and dialogue.

**Leveled books.** Several students commented on the value of reading the progressively challenging materials I provided. One student explained the process
this way: "You have to learn like, you have to kinda go through easier harder, harder, like hard harder, it gets harder and harder. And I think that's how I learned. Like go from easy books to hard books" (INT.J.12-14-10). Another student’s comment suggests a clear awareness of the level of books utilized during this initiative, “My reading went up to O to P to Q and R" (FN.M.12-17-10). These letters are referring to the reading levels set up in my classroom according to the Fountas and Pinnell (1996) guided reading levels. N, O, and P are third grade levels.

To be sure, some students acknowledged the role of closely reading single books. For instance, Student G found practicing helpful: "Well a book can like help you out with words because it has the letters, and you can spell it out, and it can make you smarter because when you read it, and if you practice it, you understand it more" (INT.G.12-10-10). He then elaborated, "I think you just have to keep reading other books, and when you read them, you see these words that you've never read, you learn about them, and you're like ‘So that's what it [the unknown word] means’ (INT.G.12-10-10).

**Transactional Strategy Instruction.** Several students acknowledged the value of the set of comprehension strategies I taught. To illustrate, one child explicitly acknowledged the value of my strategy instruction this way, "I've learned about reading strategies. I have become a better reader by using the strategies" (FN.B.12-17-10). Another student said simply, "I learned that reading is thinking” (FN.E.12-17-10).
One student’s comment suggests an emerging awareness of the value of my strategy instruction having been embedded in a complete instructional program, "You really like all the strategies, and I just love reading. I don't know what you're doing! I really don't! I don't know what you did to me! But you encourage me about books and it works" (INT.D.12-9-10). And still another student acknowledged my strategy instruction but was indirect about its outcome, "You teach us the strategies like monitoring, summarizing, connecting, visualizing, all of those" (INT.Z.12-14-10).

Quite a few students commented on the ways they used the specific strategies I taught. Visualizing was a well regarded strategy, as indicated by this comment, "It's weird how I imagined feeling it [visualizing] when I read that [a section in the story], I imagined it, and I was like, 'Wow!'" (INT.J.12-14-10) and by this comment, "Well, Magic Tree House books are really good visualizing books because they don't have many pictures" (INT.S.12-10-10).

Some students’ comments revealed the connections they learned to make while reading. As one student said when he made a text-to-text connection, "Because one of them, it was like Twisters on Tuesday" (INT.S.12-10-10). Another explicitly formed this text-to-world connection when discussing a book, "The thing about Lunch Lady is like it reminds me of other like movies that have maids and stuff" (INT.J.12-14-10).

One student stated the following during a retelling that suggested extensive use of monitoring,
And I always wondered if the other spiders, they crawl into another web they get stuck since it's a different kind of web, but since they all have sticky stuff I don't know if they get caught or if they are all the same. (INT.J.12-14-10)

Finally, this student clearly demonstrated an awareness of orchestrating multiple strategies while reading, "And you have to learn how to do like connect and stuff and question and visualize" (INT.S.12-10-10). This expresses the essence of my Transactional Strategy Instruction.

Passage retellings. A few students commented on the value of retelling as a tool for improving reading comprehension. For instance, Student C found retell to be important: "And retell, and so those are the most important things you really have to do" (INT.C.12-6-10). In addition, Student S found retelling to her partner helpful in becoming a better reader: "You have to learn, well, umm, to tell your partner what you've read" (INT.S.12-10-10).

Retellings that focused on characters’ traits seemed especially productive for my students. The following excerpt from a more complete retelling by Student G shows his attention to descriptions of the characters:

Well I read the Book Bone. It's a really good book. There's these two people who are white and have a big nose, and there's this girl like a grandma, but the grandma is not like an ordinary grandma. (INT.G.12-10-10)

Additionally, Student D retold the following about Eva and the Penguins noting characterization:
It's a Magic Tree House and Jack and Annie and they go and it's a little bit of they're friends, I forget what their names are, and they go to Antarctica and find these penguins. And because Marilyn I think was sad, and he, they went there and brought a baby orphan penguin back, and they had to keep her a secret because they went on this bus to see a volcano and there weren't supposed to be any kids and stuff. So the lady found out and she called somebody and she called somebody and they came back, they came back right before they got back there because they went to find the penguin. And then they brought her back and it made Marilyn happy.

(INT.S.12-10-10)

**Dialogue.** As mentioned before, the focal group especially showed extraordinary gains in their retellings. A noteworthy difference in their experience from the rest of the class was consistently conferencing with me once a week during ScS-SR. I supported their talk about texts by modeling how to talk, prompting them to think about important ideas, responding authentically to their comments, and taking up their comments in my responses. This support is consistent with the transactional element embedded in Transactional Strategy Instruction (Pressley et al., 1992).

Dialogue seems to have paid off especially in the focal group’s performance, and it should be noted that all students had opportunities to talk about their reading during the designated times. On the other hand, because the focal group had their level of concern raised when it came to retelling to me, this
heightening of their experience might have contributed to the increases in their retellings.

**Oral Reading Fluency**

As reported in Chapter Four, most students’ oral reading fluency substantially improved, with noticeable increases in the three defining elements, prosody, accuracy, and rate. Students’ comments during my interviews and observations shed some additional light on this improvement. In general, students talked more about their reading motivation and comprehension than their fluency. Students' talk about fluency mostly consisted of students stating changes in their reading rates in precise terms.

During my informal interactions with my students, several specified their exact reading fluency rates. For instance, Student S told me: "You have taught me a lot about reading. We have read so much that I was at 28 words per minute at the beginning of the school year, and the last time I was at 110, and so I went up 82 words per minute" (FN.S.12-17-10). Moreover, my field notes showed that this student moved from being monotone in August (FN.S.8-23-10) to reading fluently with expression in October (FN.S.10-8-10).

Student W is another student who knew her fluency scores well, expressing concern about them: "I walked in scared about what you would think about my reading. I had a 54 words per minute to 102 to 107 and then 116 words per minute. Now, reading has changed me" (FN.W.12-17-10). Similarly, Student H put it this way, "On the first day of school I sucked at reading. Now, I rock. I went up 40 words per minute" (FN.H.12-17-10).
Finally Student C saw some improvement in her reading fluency rate "'Cuz I usually read slowly, and now I'm reading faster and I love it" (FN.C.9-20-10). My field notes showed improvement in prosody for this student. She went from slow, word by word phrasing, and monotonic in August (FN.C.8-19-10) to somewhat slow but expressive in November (FN.C.11-3-10).
Chapter 6 Conclusion

I conducted the action research reported in this dissertation to help determine how I could raise my third-grade students’ reading motivation and achievement. This chapter reports the discussion, implications for practice, implications for research, and closing words about the contribution of Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading to my students' reading motivation and achievement.

Discussion

My use of ScS-SR seems to have played a large role in my students’ reading growth during this semester-long action research study. My use of ScS-SR helped me be well on my way to meeting my goal this year, to have my students read at or above grade level. Students improved on their reading levels, growing to like reading more, retell better, and process print more fluently. Research on scaffolding and dialoguing, two key elements of ScS-SR, indicated that these factors could help increase motivation and achievement, and I found this to be credible in my situation.

Scaffolding, a key concept in sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978), occurred in this action research especially by the students conferencing with me during ScS-SR. Scaffolding seems imperative when the students are silently reading. How students develop intellectually is related directly to how they interact with adults. Cognitive development is dependent on the social interaction between teachers, students, and their peers. When students explain, elaborate, or defend to others what they are thinking, they are in the process of cognitive growth. Teachers play crucial roles in this cognitive development by providing
scaffolds to support students’ development. A few scaffolds that I provided during this innovation were some retell rubrics the students could select from in order to retell what they just read to their partner. These rubrics prompted the students about what to say. They kept notes right on the laminated rubric and then erased them for the next time they used it. The listener in the retell portion could also keep notes on what was said in case he was called on to tell the class what his partner revealed.

Dialoguing helps students construct meaning and reflect on their constructions, thus deepening their thinking (Guthrie et al., 2004; Peterson & Eeds, 2007). Looking at my study, the focal group had huge gains in retellings, even more than the class as a whole. My focal group ended up having half its members being low readers, which is a higher average of low readers than in my classroom, yet the focal group made the greatest gains in retelling. The difference with this group was the teacher conferencing. Dialoguing seemed invaluable for these students. When they explained, elaborated, or defended to me what they were thinking, they were in the process of cognitive growth as portrayed by Nystrand (2006) and Vygotsky (1978). Students started using the same vocabulary and using the comprehension strategies in their retell. They understood each other since they knew what the terms meant and helped each other with their retells. It was impressive while walking around the room to see notes on whiteboards, sticky notes, and on rubrics all using these seemingly difficult words.
Implications for Practice

I can utilize the outcomes of this action research to inform my instruction several ways. For instance, I learned that students became willing readers, even finding themselves reading instead of watching TV or playing video games. The more they read, the more they wanted to read. It seems to reason that the more one reads, the better they become at reading, resulting in liking to read because they became good at it. Good readers read more than poor readers (Allington, 2009) and my students viewed themselves at good readers.

Because of the use of the zone of proximal development, reading was challenging but not defeating, and seemed to contribute to the students' increasing desires to read. I helped the students learn beyond what they were capable of doing on their own by testing them for their independent reading levels. Once the students learned what their independent reading level was, they suddenly found themselves reading books where they understood what they were reading, resulting in increased desire to read. Also, when the students interacted with each other and me, this zone of proximal development was activated.

I learned to offer time throughout the school day for the students just to read. I agree with Cunningham et al. (2000) that students tend to read more when they are given the time to read. My initiative began with providing 15 minutes of independent reading once a day and eventually to 20 minutes, twice a day. We are now at 25 minutes twice a day with the goal of 30 minutes twice a day by the end of the year. I gradually built up the students' reading minutes as though we were
in training. I would not expect the students to jump right in and read 30 minutes at one sitting without building their reading muscles.

Choice is a huge motivator, and, in line with recommendations by Guthrie et al. (2004) and Margolis and McCabe (2006), I know to allow students to self-select the books they are reading. I was reminded that my classroom library should be well-rounded and full of plenty of books for the students to read. It is very important to provide interesting texts for the students to select in order to keep their interest. The texts must be nonfiction as well as fiction. I found that the new comic-style books were particularly popular with the boys in my classroom.

I will never again teach one reading comprehension strategy at a time. Transactional Strategy Instruction was more fun and engaging for the students as well as for me, the teacher. I think TSI helps the students understand that we simultaneously use all of the comprehension strategies and not just one at a time. However, I found that the gradual release of responsibility in TSI was a little too slow for my class. Modeling the reading strategies for the first month as suggested by Reutzel et al. (2005) did not work with my class. At the three and a half week mark, I found that my students were very eager to start participating in using the reading comprehension strategies with me during my think alouds. So depending on my students, I may find myself moving faster or slower than the suggested gradual release of responsibility.

I was so enthusiastic about TSI that I was explaining it to the teachers at my school one day. We were at a teacher book study about reading instruction. The teachers were so interested in what I was doing that they asked me to help
them set up TSI in their classrooms. Eight teachers at my school are now trying out a smaller version of TSI in their classrooms. As a result of this study, I started seeing myself as an instructional leader. I grew in confidence and started sharing what I found to be successful in my classroom. I can now conduct professional development to teachers and in fact already have.

I do have to make it clear that implementing scaffolding, zone of proximal development, dialoguing, choice, TSI, and giving time to read is not the only factor in this study. I must say I am a rather enthusiastic teacher who can be quite contagious. I talk to my class about my love for reading. I tell them that I do not go anywhere without a book or something to read. Even when I watch television, I have a book open on my lap for the commercials. I explain to my students how I do not like to start or finish a book but that I like to be right in the middle of it. In fact, one time when we were finishing a book I was reading to the students they called out for me to slow down on the last page because they too found themselves not wanting to finish the book. As I collected the books, one student kissed the book as she handed it to me. I also show my students how I read several books at once, most of the time a fiction and a nonfiction book.

I also have developed the type of warm classroom climate where students are safe and can take risks. From the first week of school, they are encouraged to be kind to each other and not to judge each other regardless of their academic levels. So, in my classroom the students are aware of and celebrate their diversity. Everyone understands they are all at different levels and that it is okay. My
students are comfortable with announcing their reading levels to each other and recommend books to each other because of this comfort zone.

**Implications for Research**

Originally I thought this initiative would increase motivation more than achievement. Upon further reflection, my action research was geared more towards achievement with TSI, retelling with a partner, and brief conferencing with the teacher. Of course, with such a heavy emphasis on achievement I should have known it would strongly effect the achievement in my classroom. Motivation could have actually been increased more than the results showed due to the students wanting to answer on the pretest how they thought I wanted them to.

Next time, I would really stress that my students should be honest in their first administration of the Motivation to Read Profile or better yet, have an outside person conduct the survey so the students would feel like they could be very honest in their answers. I think the students produced socially desirable responding in their first surveys. It was the beginning of the school year, and they did not know me yet. I wonder if they just filled in answers that they felt I would want to hear. However, I believe they were much more honest in their post survey after they got to know me and realize that I truly wanted to know how they felt about their reading. Maybe I did not stress this enough at the pre MRP survey. Also, students may have meant they are good at reading versus liking to read (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000). There is one last factor in the MRP survey which is
that it is on a 4 point scale. The pretest showed the class average at 3.24 showing
they already had high motivation. There was not much room for growth.

On the other hand, I wish I could have conducted the MRP interview
earlier in the study. I had already begun teaching and utilizing ScS-SR from the
very first week of school beginning, so when I finally had parent permission,
student permission, and district permission, I was well on my way into teaching
reading. I possibly did not get a proper pre-post effect for motivation because of
the students’ reading experiences gained prior to the interview.

During my next action research cycle, I will examine ways to increase
motivation even more and, more specifically, raise students' self concepts as
readers in my classroom. I should help the students believe that they can succeed
(Margolis & McCabe, 2006). Students must feel successful in order to boost their
confidence and their willingness to keep trying. I will schedule more times to
meet with the struggling readers to record and chart progress made in order to
provide quick feedback. I will demonstrate more ways about how books are used
and provide more time for interactions with others and me about books.
(Gambrell, 1996). All of these ideas are productive ways to increase motivation.
Motivation is important to me because it is connected to frequent reading and
reading achievement (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000) and plays a critical role in
learning (Gambrell, 1996).

Another change I would make in this study would be in the selection of
the focal group. Because I created the group so early in the year, I thought I
identified six focal participants - two above grade level, two at grade level, and
two below grade level. In reality, it was two above grade level, one at grade level, and three below grade level. I would have liked a student who achieved at average level and one less below grade level during this study. Also, one of my focal group students was very reticent. He would respond to my interview questions and mini conferences with very little conversation. I would have selected a more verbal participant if I had known how quiet he was.

I would not start this initiative until at least a month into the new school year, however I would still collect baseline data the first week of school. Due to this initiative being at the very beginning of the year, I had some unplanned interruptions to my ScS-SR. Events such as school assemblies, fire drills, and testing sometimes interfered with my conferencing with the students.

A new question that arises out of my study involves sustainability. After all of this growth in my third-grade classroom, how long will the students’ motivation and achievement last in their future once they leave me? Will what my students accomplished in third grade continue on a sustained trajectory in future grades? Longitudinal research would go far in responding to these questions.

Closing Word

To my mind ScS-SR made a difference in the reading lives of my students. I think the words of my lowest achieving reader say it all: "I like books because you inspired me to read, Mrs. Lehman" (FN.X.12-17-10).
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August 16

- The procedures of ScSR will begin to be taught and implemented in my classroom twice a day, building to 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes in the afternoon.

August 23 through September 17 - Four weeks (First Month)

- Transactional Strategy Instruction begins – defining, explaining, and modeling the strategies three times a week as follows:
  - Mondays – Three strategies will be taught within 45 minutes- activating prior knowledge, text structure, prediction.
  - Wednesdays - Three strategies will be taught within 45 minutes - questioning, imagery, monitoring.
  - Fridays – These three strategies will be reviewed within 20 minutes- questioning, imagery, monitoring, and within 15 minutes summarization will be taught.

- ScSR will be conducted twice a day 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes in the afternoon.

- Three minute pair/share begins after each ScSR session.
September 20 through October 15 - Four weeks (Second Month)

- The gradual release of responsibility for using the seven strategies.
  
  Shared responsibility with teacher and student in selecting, explaining and applying the strategies.

- Mondays – Three strategies will be used in a shared responsibility within 45 minutes - activating prior knowledge, text structure, prediction.

- Wednesdays – Three strategies will be used in a shared responsibility within 45 minutes - questioning, imagery, monitoring.

- Fridays – These three strategies will be used in a shared responsibility within 20 minutes - questioning, imagery, monitoring, and within 15 minutes summarization will be reviewed.

- ScSR continues twice a day 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes in the afternoon.

- Three minute pair/share continues after each ScSR session.
October 18 through December 3 - Eight weeks (Third and Fourth Month)

- The gradual release of responsibility for using the seven strategies.

The students will assume near complete responsibility for selecting, explaining and applying all of the strategies while reading.

  - Mondays – Three strategies will be used in a near complete responsibility by the students within 45 minutes- activating prior knowledge, text structure, prediction.

  - Wednesdays - Three strategies will be used in a near complete responsibility by the students within 45 minutes - questioning, imagery, monitoring.

  - Fridays – These three strategies will be used in a near complete responsibility by the students within 20 minutes- questioning, imagery, monitoring, and within 15 minutes summarization will be reviewed.

- ScSR continues twice a day 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes in the afternoon.

- Three minute pair/share continues after each ScSR session.
APPENDIX B

DIALOGUE PROMPT CARD
• What did you like about this book?

• Is the book fiction or nonfiction? How do you know?

• If fiction - Who are the characters? What is the plot?

• If nonfiction - What is the main idea? What are some details you learned about?

• Before reading you made predictions. Show me a couple of predictions that you made and tell me why you made them.

• Who would you recommend this book to and why?

• Which reading strategy/ies did you use?

• How does that strategy/ies help you remember the story?

• Which words gave you any trouble?

• How did you solve figuring out the difficult words?
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH PLAN
August 16 - The students took the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP) survey and interview (Gambrell et al., 1996).

August 23 – September 2 - I tested each student at reading level N via the Oral Reading Record used by my district. The reading assessment team will administer the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Oral Reading Fluency Test (DIBELS: ORF) (Good & Kaminski, 2002). I will test each student for their instructional reading level via the Oral Reading Record used by my district.

September 10 - The at-risk students, identified based on the results of the DIBELS test, will receive progress monitoring every two weeks. (The some risk and benchmark students will receive progress monitoring once a month. These levels are defined in the DIBELS results.)

September 24 – 30 - All students will be progress monitored. I will test each student for their instructional reading level via the Oral Reading Record used by my district.

October 22 – 28 - All students will be progress monitored. At-risk students will be progress monitored. I will test each student for their instructional reading level via the Oral Reading Record used by my district.

November 5 - At risk students will be progress monitored.
December 6 – 10 - The teacher will retest the students via the Oral Reading Record at level N to determine any student improvement. I will test each student for their instructional reading level via the Oral Reading Record used by my district.

December 3-15 - The students will retake the Motivation to Read Profile survey and interview.

December 6 – 10 - The reading team will give the DIBELS test to the students.
APPENDIX D

MOTIVATION TO READ PROFILE: SURVEY
MOTIVATION TO READ PROFILE

Name ___________________________ Date __________________

Sample #1: I am in ______________________________.

- O 1st grade
- O 2nd grade
- O 3rd grade
- O 4th grade
- O 5th grade
- O 6th grade

Sample #2: I am a ______________________.

- O boy
- O girl

1. My friends think I am ________________________________.

- O a very good reader
- O a good reader
- O an OK reader
- O a poor reader

2. Reading a book is something I like to do.

- O Never
- O Not very often
- O Sometimes
- O Often

3. I read ________________________________.

- O not as well as my friends
- O about the same as my friends
- O a little better than my friends
- O a lot better than my friends

4. My best friends think reading is ________________________.

- O really fun
- O fun
- O OK to do
- O no fun at all
5. When I come to a word I don’t know, I can __________________________.
   O almost always figure it out
   O sometimes figure it out
   O almost never figure it out
   O never figure it out

6. I tell my friends about good books I read.
   O I never do this.
   O I almost never do this.
   O I do this some of the time.
   O I do this a lot.

7. When I am reading by myself, I understand __________________________.
   O almost everything I read
   O some of what I read
   O almost none of what I read
   O none of what I read

8. People who read a lot are __________________________.
   O very interesting
   O interesting
   O not very interesting
   O boring

9. I am __________________________.
   O a poor reader
   O an OK reader
   O a good reader
   O a very good reader
10. I think libraries are ____________________________.
   O a great place to spend time
   O an interesting place to spend time
   O an OK place to spend time
   O a boring place to spend time

11. I worry about what other kids think about my reading ________________________.
   O every day
   O almost every day
   O once in a while
   O never

12. Knowing how to read well is ________________________.
   O not very important
   O sort of important
   O important
   O very important

13. When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I ____________.
    O can never think of an answer
    O have trouble thinking of an answer
    O sometimes think of an answer
    O always think of an answer

14. I think reading is ________________________.
    O a boring way to spend time
    O an OK way to spend time
    O an interesting way to spend time
    O a great way to spend time
15. Reading is __________.

   O very easy for me
   O kind of easy for me
   O kind of hard for me
   O very hard for me

16. When I grow up I will spend ________________.

   O none of my time reading
   O very little of my time reading
   O some of my time reading
   O a lot of my time reading

17. When I am in a group talking about stories, I ________________.

   O almost never talk about my ideas
   O sometimes talk about my ideas
   O almost always talk about my ideas
   O always talk about my ideas

18. I would like for my teacher to read books out loud to the class ________________.

   O every day
   O almost every day
   O once in a while
   O never
19. When I read out loud I am a __________________________.
O poor reader
O OK reader
O good reader
O very good reader

20. When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel _________________.
O very happy
O sort of happy
O sort of unhappy
O unhappy
MOTIVATION TO READ PROFILE

CONVERSATIONAL INTERVIEW

Student Name: ______________________  Date: ____________________

A. Emphasis: Narrative Text

Suggested Prompt (designed to engage student in a natural conversation):

I have been reading a good book…I was talking with…about it last night. I enjoy talking about good stories and books that I’ve been reading. Today I’d like to hear about what you have been reading.

1. Tell me about the most interesting story or book you have read this week (or even last week). Take a few minutes to think about it. (Wait time). Now, tell me about the book or story.

Probes: What else can you tell me?  
Is there anything else?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. How did you know or find out about this story?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

___ assigned  ___ in school
___ chosen  ___ out of school

3. Why was this story interesting to you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
B. Emphasis: Informational Text

Suggested Prompt (designed to engage student in a natural conversation):
Often we read to find out about something or to learn about something. We read for information. For example, I remember a student of mine…who read a lot of books about…to find out as much as he/she could about…Now, I’d like to hear about some of the informational reading you have been doing.

1. Think about something important that you learned recently, not from your teacher and not from television, but from a book or some other reading material. What did you read about? (Wait time.) Tell me what you learned.
   Probes: What else could you tell me?
   Is there anything else?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. How did you know or find out about this book/article?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
___ assigned ___ in school
___ chosen ___ out of school

3. Why was this book (or article) important to you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C. Emphasis: General reading

1. Did you read anything at home yesterday? _____ What?

________________________________________________________________________
1. Do you have any books at school (in your desk/storage area/locker/bookbag) today that you are reading? _____ Tell me about them.

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

2. Tell me about your favorite author.

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

3. What do you think you have to learn to be a better reader?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

4. Do you know about any books right now that you’d like to read? Tell me about them.

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

5. How did you find out about these books?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

6. What are some things that get you really excited about reading books?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

7. Who gets you really interested and excited about reading books?

__________________________________________________________________

Tell me more about what they do.

__________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F

FIELD NOTES TEMPLATE
Field Notes

1. What did Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading contribute to my students’ reading motivation?
2. What did Scaffolded Self-Selected Reading contribute to my student’s reading achievement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Oral Reading Comprehension</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date _____________________   Week # ______ (Take notes twice a week)
APPENDIX G

COMPREHENSION RETELLING SCORING RUBRIC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little Comprehension</th>
<th>Some Comprehension</th>
<th>Adequate Comprehension</th>
<th>Very Good Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Idea</strong></td>
<td>1 Tells story beginning, middle, or end</td>
<td>2 Tells 2 of 3 (beginning, middle, end)</td>
<td>3 Tells story beginning, middle, end; problem or solution</td>
<td>4 Tells story beginning, middle, end; problem, and solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>1 Includes few/no important events/details</td>
<td>2 Includes some important events/details</td>
<td>3 Includes many important events/details, many in sequence</td>
<td>4 Includes most important events/details in sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characters</strong></td>
<td>1 Refers to characters or topics using pronouns (he, she, it, they)</td>
<td>2 Refers to characters or topics by generic name or label (boy, dog, chair)</td>
<td>3 Refers to characters or topics by name in text (Ben, Cowboy Sam)</td>
<td>4 Refers to characters or topics by name in text with descriptor (tall Ben, green turtle Yertle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>1 Retells with incorrect information</td>
<td>2 Retells with some misinterpretation</td>
<td>3 Retells with literal interpretation</td>
<td>4 Retells with higher-level interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>1 Clearly does not know meanings of majority of words</td>
<td>2 Knows meanings of enough words to get general idea</td>
<td>3 Knows enough word meanings to understand story</td>
<td>4 Clearly knows all or most word meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions/Prompts</strong></td>
<td>1 Requires many questions or prompts</td>
<td>2 Requires 4-5 questions or prompts</td>
<td>3 Requires 2-3 questions or prompts</td>
<td>4 Requires 1 or no questions or prompts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comprehension:** VLC (6-9) _____ SC (10-15) _____ AC (16-21) _____ VGC(22-24) _____

**Analysis of retelling:** Total: _____/24 (Circle number for each category then total)
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1: Very little fluency; **all word-by word reading** with significant pauses between words; no attempt at expression; doesn’t attend to punctuation; may have a few two-word phrases; some word phrasings awkward; does not blend sounds into words; voice-print match inaccurate; uses picture clues inappropriately all or most of time.

2: **Mostly word-by word** reading with two-word phrasings and perhaps some 3-4 word phrases; some attempt at expression; awareness of punctuation but not attended to consistently; may re-read for problem solving; sounds choppy; some blending of sounds into words; voice-print match most of time; may use picture clues inappropriately.

3: Hesitations though most words known; phrased reading for expression; **mixture of word-by-word and phrases**; mostly attends to punctuation; re-reads for problem solving; sounds mostly fluent; if breaks words into sounds always blends them together; accurate voice-print match; uses picture clues appropriately most of time.

4: Smooth, flowing; all/most words known; expressing; **reading primarily in phrases** with few word-by-word slow downs; attends to punctuation; may re-read for problem-solving but generally fluent; accurate voice-print match; uses picture clues appropriately.

**Fluency Level:** 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 3.5 4.0
(Fluency level of 3 or 4 to be expected for this reading level.)

Adapted from PUSD #11 Revised 09.10.07 Curriculum Department
APPENDIX I

READING LEVELS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>August Benchmark</th>
<th>October Benchmark</th>
<th>December Benchmark</th>
<th>January Benchmark</th>
<th>March Benchmark</th>
<th>May Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A; 1</td>
<td>B; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td>C; 3/4</td>
<td>D; 5/6</td>
<td>E; 7/8</td>
<td>F; 9</td>
<td>F; 10</td>
<td>H; 13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G; 11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I; 15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>J; 17</td>
<td>J; 18</td>
<td>K; 19</td>
<td>K; 20</td>
<td>L; 21</td>
<td>M; 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td>N; 23</td>
<td>N/O; 23/24</td>
<td>O; 24</td>
<td>O; 24</td>
<td>O/P; 24/25</td>
<td>P; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td>Q; 26</td>
<td>Q/R; 26/27</td>
<td>R; 27</td>
<td>R; 27</td>
<td>R/S; 27/28</td>
<td>S; 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade</td>
<td>T; 29</td>
<td>T/U; 29/30</td>
<td>T/U; 29/30</td>
<td>U; 30</td>
<td>U/V; 30/31</td>
<td>V; 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table above shows both Fountas & Pinnell letter levels and Reading Recovery/Rigby numeral levels)
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ORR BENCHMARK SCORING DIRECTIONS
Oral Reading Record Benchmark Scoring Directions

1. Accuracy
   - Subtract the number of errors from words read on the ORR recording sheet and calculate the percentage of accuracy by dividing the number of words read correctly by the total number of words read.
   - Write the accuracy percentage at the top of the recording sheet.
   - Tally errors and miscues in the appropriate columns.
   - Make any notes and/or record student behaviors in the Observations section of the scoring form for later analysis.

2. Rate
   - To determine reading rate, count the number of words read during the one minute reading.
   - Calculate the wcpm (words correct per minute) by subtracting the number of errors from the total words read in one minute.
   - Refer to Hasbrouck and Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Scale to determine the reading rate percentile.

3. Fluency
   - Use rubric descriptors to determine the level that best describes the student’s oral reading behaviors.
   - Circle the Fluency Level number found above the fluency rubric.
   - A student’s overall fluency level is determined by means of the fluency rubric score and reading rate. A student reading at or above grade level would receive 3 or 4 points as determined by the fluency rubric, and have a reading rate around the 50th percentile.

4. Retelling
   - Determine number of points in each key area.
   - Add points and record total retelling score on the recording form.

5. Transfer retelling points and fluency level score to the front of the student’s recording form.

6. Record ORR benchmark scores onto the Literacy Progress Record.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Level</th>
<th>90% - 97% Oral Reading Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 pts or more</td>
<td>Retelling/Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Fluency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Oral Reading Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administration Procedures:**

To assess reading rate, the teacher will time the student’s oral reading for one minute. This is a first-time encounter with the text. At the end of one minute the assessor determines the number of words read correctly by the student and compares that number to the *Hasbrouck and Tindal Oral Reading Fluency* scale. The reading scale provides a percentile for grade level and time of year. The student’s score is based on wcpm (words correct per minute). Students at or above grade level are expected to be at the 50th percentile or above.

Determine the student’s *fluency score* by applying the descriptors in the fluency rubric. A student’s *overall fluency level* is determined by the student’s fluency score from the rubric and the student’s reading rate (percentile score). A student who is reading at or above grade level would receive 3 or 4 points as determined by the fluency rubric, and have a reading rate around the 50th percentile.

---
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL
Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

To: David Moore
FAB

From: Mark Roosa, Chair
Sci Gen IRB

Date: 06/02/2010

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 06/02/2010

IRB Protocol #: 1006006102

Study Title: Scaffolded Self-Selecting Reading

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2).

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.