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ABSTRACT

Picturebooks are defined by the interaction of words and pictures to convey narrative (Bader, 1976; Kiefer, 1995; Sipe, 2011), referred to in this study as the word-picture relationship. This dissertation study extends on the work of others who investigated young children’s responses to picturebooks (e.g., Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Sipe, 2008a; Sipe & Bauer, 2001) and picturebook productions (e.g., Pantaleo 2017, 2018; Zapata, 2013) by placing word-picture relationships at the forefront of this study. This study employed an embedded, single-case study design to investigate second graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks during interactive read-alouds and their application and discussion of word-picture relationships in their own contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Children participated in nine contemporary realistic fiction and nine fantasy interactive read-alouds, which were further divided into three word-picture relationships taken from Nikolajeva & Scott (2001a): symmetrical, enhancement, and counterpoint. Findings indicated differences in the response patterns of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy. Moreover, children wrestled more frequently with the genre and word-picture relationship in fantasy picturebooks with a counterpoint word-picture relationship. Children were capable of using words and pictures in sophisticated ways in their picturebooks and more so in fantasy. In their fantasy picturebooks, children were flexible in the ways they used words and pictures to convey narrative and demonstrated further understanding of the meaning-making potential of pictures. When children described the word-picture relationships of their picturebooks, they referenced the read-aloud
picturebooks and other texts, peer designers, and the potential reader as influential to their decision-making. Across the study, children conceptualized word-picture relationships as the amount and differences of information being conveyed in the words and pictures, which suggest a developing understanding of the complexity of word-picture relationships. Findings in this study give insight into how second graders navigated different modal resources in texts and relied on this interaction between words and pictures to make sense of the text. Also, the findings inform the field about the ways young children use and make decisions regarding words, pictures, and elements of design in their own picturebook productions.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Reading aloud stories to children is a common practice in primary classrooms with many researchers and practitioners agreeing that it has powerful consequences for young children. *Becoming a Nation of Readers* (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985), a national report concerned with reading instruction, concluded that reading aloud to children is “the single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success” [in reading] (p. 23) with research suggesting positive impacts on comprehension (Morrow, 1985; Wiseman, 2011; Zucker, Justice, Piasta & Kaderavek, 2010), and children’s understanding of literary elements (e.g., plot, setting and character; Sipe, 1998). More specifically, interactive read-alouds provide opportunities to engage children in literary conversation (Barrentine, 1996; Eeds & Wells, 1989) to support co-construction of meaning and interpretations with their classmates and teacher (Hoffman, 2011).

In the context of interactive read-alouds researchers have extensively studied the ways young children respond to narrative picturebooks. (e.g., Kiefer, 1995; Maloch & Beutel, 2010; Pantaleo 2002, 2003; Sipe, 2008a; Walsh, 2003). Their investigations of young children’s responses revealed the sophisticated ways that young children engage with others to make sense of story and attend to meaning-making resources of the picturebook. In their close examination of children’s responses to pictures in picturebooks, several studies suggested that pictures are valuable meaning making resources during children’s reading and engagement with picturebooks (e.g. Pantaleo,
2016; Serafini, 2014; Sipe, 1998, 2008b; Wolfenbarger & Sipe, 2007). However, despite the extensive research on children’s response to picturebooks, research placing word-picture relationships at the forefront when examining young children’s responses is limited. Even fewer studies have focused on the ways young children utilize word-picture relationships in their own picturebooks. As we expect children to engage in an ever increasingly visual world we must prepare them to be both verbally and visually literate, which means that they are capable of making meaning from words and pictures and their relationship in texts, but also use words, pictures, and their relationship to relay meaning in their own text productions.

The New London Group (NLG) (1996), an international group of scholars who addressed issues of literary instruction in the 21st-century, advocated for a *multiliteracies* pedagogy that emphasizes “understanding and competent control of representation forms…such as visual images and their relationship to the written word” (p. 61). Multiliteracies, or multiple literacies, expand the idea of literacy beyond written and spoken language to include other forms of representation and communication. The NLG recognized that as society changed, in large part as a result of developing technologies and global capitalism, literacy instruction was a way of giving children access to this world.

communication extends beyond print-based writing to other *modes* of communication, including sound, gesture, and image. Both NLG and scholars of multimodality have advocated for a more inclusive conceptualization of literacy in the classroom (Jewitt, 2008; NLG, 1996); however, school literacy has been criticized for continued “restrictive print- and language-based notions of literacy” (Jewitt, 2008, p. 248; see also, Gee, 2004; Kachorsky, Moses, Serafini, & Hoelting, 2017; Serafini, 2011). Literacy instruction must extend to other forms of communication that children interact with daily, such as those that use visual language.

Human beings are visual creatures, with the ability to process visual images far more quickly than written text (Friedmann, 2014). However, to efficiently make meaning from and communicate with, visual images instruction needs to occur. The International Reading Association (IRA) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) (1996) noted that “being literate in a contemporary society means being active, critical, and creative users not only of print and spoken language, but also of the visual language…[and that] teaching students how to interpret and create visual texts...is another essential component of the English language arts curriculum” (p. 5). Published jointly by the IRA and NCTE (1996), both organizations advocated for English language arts (ELA) standards that encouraged students’ capabilities of using and understanding spoken, written, and visual language. In 2012, NCTE reaffirmed the relevance of these standards for today’s students; literacy instruction must match the expectations of our society for effectively communicating and interacting with information.
As we increasingly interact with visual images in our society, there is a need for children to become more visually literate (Kiefer, 1995) and understand the ways visual images work with other sources of communication (e.g., spoken and written language). In multimodal texts, visual images are used alongside other sources of communication to relay information to the reader (Jewitt, 2009; Serafini, 2014), and in their interaction the reader must generate meaning (Serafini, 2015); this requires readers to determine the ways color, shape, composition, and other elements of art give meaning to the visual image, but then also determine the ways the meaning of the image interacts with the other sources of communication to generate information. These multimodal texts require interpretation to make sense of the messages relayed, but how do young children understand their production?

Students are not only expected to use multimodal texts, but take on the role of producers, which requires that students make sense of and use multimodal resources to create meaning. In 2005, an NCTE position statement on multimodal literacies declared that from a young age children are expected to produce multimodal work and recognize that other modes are more than “decoration” of written text (NCTE, 2005, para. 1). As they described what this means for teaching, NCTE suggested “it is the interplay of meaning-making systems (alphabetic, oral, visual, etc.) that teachers and students should strive to study and produce” (NCTE, 2005, para. 1). Our children can no longer limit themselves to being writers, but must take on roles as producers of multimodal texts. Production of traditional (print-based) literacies has to be reshaped to reflect the multimodal resources students utilize outside of school and meet the demands of how
students are expected to interact with the world (Jewitt, 2005), which includes using and producing multimodal texts. This present study explores the ways young children use and produce multimodal texts by examining their responses to and use of word-picture relationships in picturebooks, a multimodal text that uses words, pictures, and design elements as modal resources.

**Defining the Problem**

Many texts that we encounter daily, both digital and print-based, are multimodal and require the reader to make sense of individual forms of communication (e.g. text, image, gesture) and the integration of these forms to relay a unified message; that is, to understand the message communicated by the interaction, or relationship, of these representational forms. Despite scholars and literacy educators advocating for a more inclusive conceptualization of literacy education, which includes visual literacy and the integration of visual information with other representational forms (e.g., written text and spoken language), this inclusive approach is seldom found in classroom instruction. Classrooms continue to privilege a more traditional literacy pedagogy that emphasizes the written word (Jewitt, 2008; see also, Gee, 2004; Kachorsky, Moses, Serafini, & Hoelting, 2017; Serafini, 2011); this is not unexpected given the emphasis on understanding and using the written word on standardized tests.

The picturebook, a commonly used form of literature in primary classrooms, affords opportunities for meaning making through discussion of pictures, words, and design elements (Serafini, 2014). Though the written word remains a central source of communication, other sources that relay meaning are used in the text. More specifically,
the relationship that occurs between the pictures and words provide the reader with a complete understanding of the story and this relationship ranges in its complexity across picturebooks (Lewis, 2001a; Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001; Nodelman, 1988; Sipe, 1998). Though the word-picture relationship is a defining characteristic of picturebooks and other texts that children encounter daily, limited research has placed word-picture relationships at the forefront of study and lacked focus on: (a) the ways young children make sense of word-picture relationships in picturebooks, (b) how bringing these relationships to their attention affects their understanding of picturebooks; and (c) the ways young children apply and discuss word-picture relationships to their own picturebook productions. Therefore, this study seeks to fill in these gaps.

**Purpose and Significance of Study**

This study addressed the call of literacy scholars for further investigation of the ways children respond to, interpret, and use words, pictures, and their relationships in picturebooks and added to the growing research in this area (e.g., Pantaleo, 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2017b, 2018; Serafini, 2015; Sipe, 2008b). In 2008b, Sipe, an influential scholar in children’s literature and literacy, called for further research combining “theoretically informed examinations of the visual features and text-picture relationships in specific picturebooks along with analyses of children’s interpretations of the same picturebooks” (p. 387). Since that time scholars have explored children’s attention to and interpretation of pictures in picturebooks (e.g., Martens, Martens, Doyle, Loomis, Aghalarov, 2013; Pantaleo, 2016b, 2017b). However, limited studies placed word-picture relationships at the forefront of their research.
By focusing on word-picture relationships in this study, I sought to build upon the work of Sipe (e.g., 2000a, 2002, 2008a) and others (e.g., Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Pantaleo, 2002; Prior, Wilson, and Martinez 2012; Walsh, 2003) that explored young children’s responses to words, pictures, and their relationship. Also, I included an additional layer to our understandings of children’s interpretations of word-picture relationships by exploring the ways they apply such relationships in their own picturebook productions. As suggested by Arizpe and Styles (2016), contemporary research focused on children’s interpretations of text is expected to go beyond oral response with inclusion of artwork and other activities. In this study, children’s picturebook productions provide further evidence of children’s understandings of word-picture relationships and gives needed insight into how they apply them in their own picturebooks.

The purpose of this study is to describe the ways word-picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks influence second graders’ understanding of the story and to describe the ways these students use and discuss word-picture relationships in their own productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. This study encouraged students to attend and respond to the interactions between pictures and words in the picturebooks that are read-aloud to them. In addition, this study allowed children to apply their understanding of word-picture relationships in their own picturebook productions and examined their decisions regarding word-picture relationships during and after their picturebook making process.
Methodological Approach

For this dissertation study, I sought to describe the ways young children respond to and apply word-picture relationships in their own picturebook productions. I conducted interactive read-alouds to investigate the responses of second graders to quality, contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks classified by one of the following word-picture relationships: symmetrical, enhancement, or counterpoint. Then, I examined the ways these children used and discussed word-picture relationships in their own picturebook productions and described their decision-making related to the use of words, pictures, and their relationship during and after the construction of their picturebooks.

The study was guided by the following researcher questions:

1. What is the nature of second graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres?

2. In what ways do second graders use word-picture relationships in their own contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebook productions?

3. How do second graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks?

To answer the research questions, I used a qualitative, embedded, single-case study design to delve into the nuances of children’s responses to and application of word picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. A case study allowed for in-depth analysis and description of the real-world phenomenon, or rather the case, being studied (Yin, 2014a). A second-grade classroom in a rural school in
a Southeastern state served as the single case for the study with two narrative genres—contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy—serving as the embedded units of analysis. The data collected included semi-structured and informal interviews, video-recordings and transcriptions of whole-group read-alouds sessions, video-recordings of picturebook making sessions, children’s picturebook productions, and observational notes. I analyzed data both at the larger, single-case level and within and across the smaller, embedded units of analysis—the genres—as expected in an embedded case study (Yin, 2014a). Data analysis procedures differed for each research question.

Key Terms and Concepts

Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Genres

*Genres* are categorized by patterns found in the format, structure, and content of the story (Duke & Purcell-Gates, 2003). In this study, two narrative genres serve as the embedded units of analysis: contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy. *Contemporary realistic fiction* is set in contemporary society with characters, events, and settings that are conceivable in the real world (Galda & Cullinan, 2016). *Fantasy*, in contrast to realistic fiction, challenges reality; characters, actions, and settings are free from needing to stay within the realm of possibility (Latrobe, Brodie, & White, 2002).

Interactive Read-Alouds

*Interactive read-alouds* provide opportunities for teachers to share texts with children that allow them to actively participate in the read-aloud event by discussing the text with their teacher and each other (Barrentine, 1996). Through conversation and teacher prompting, children learn how to strategically make sense of the text (Barrentine,
Prompted interactions during the interactive read-aloud event are intended to appear natural and spontaneous despite pre-planning of the read-aloud (Barrentine, 1996). However, students are encouraged to freely engage with peers and respond to the text during the read-aloud without prompting.

**Modes and Multimodality**

*Mode* refers to a system of connected semiotic resources (Jewitt & Kress, 2010; Van Leeuwen, 2005). Van Leeuwan (2005) described semiotic resources as the “actions and artifacts we use to communicate” (p. 3). For example, the visual mode may use color, dimension, and space as semiotic resources (Van Leeuwan, 2005). The New London Group identified five “modes of meaning” (p. 83): linguistic, audio, spatial, visual, and gestural design. *Multimodality* refers to a theory of communication that recognizes the ability of multiple modes to make meaning (Ho, Leong, and Anderson, 2010). Picturebooks, the focus of this study, are *multimodal texts*, which refer to a “cohesive entity” that uses visual image, written text, and design elements to generate meaning (Serafini, 2014, p. 172).

**Picturebooks and Their Parts**

*Picturebooks* are defined by the integration of both words and pictures, and the interaction between the two, to relay meaning (Bader, 1976; Kiefer, 1995; Nodelman, 1988). In this dissertation, the following picturebook terms are used: opening, peritextual features, and design elements, or elements of design. *Openings* refer to the double-page spread, meaning the two pages side-by-side that are intended for reading together (Sipe, 2006). In some instances, you will see the pictures or words spread across the two pages.
of the opening. *Peritextual features, or peritext*, refer to “any part of the picturebook other than the sequence of double-page spreads” (Sipe, 2008a, p. 91) including the front and back cover, dust jack, end pages, half-title and title pages, and dedication page.

*Design elements* include “borders, fonts, spatial arrangements, and graphic designs” that are elements “beyond the visual images and printed text” (Serafini, 2014, p. 170).

**Word-Picture Relationships in Picturebooks**

In picturebooks, *word-picture relationships* are the various ways that words and pictures interact to relay meaning to the reader (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001; Nodelman, 1988; Sipe, 1998). In this study, three categories of word-picture relationships were used: symmetry, enhancement, and counterpoints. *Symmetrical* word-picture relationships are where words and pictures tell the same story (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). Both words and pictures loosely provide the same information. *Enhancement* word-picture relationships are represented when words and pictures extend each other’s meaning (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In this relationship, pictures enhance the meaning of the words or words expand upon the pictures. *Counterpoint* word-picture relationships are represented through words and pictures providing alternative information (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In this counterpoint relationship, neither words nor pictures can tell the same story alone.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I described the advocacy of literacy education scholars and organizations for inclusion of multimodality in literacy instruction and more specifically, instruction to support children’s use and production of multimodal texts through their understandings of word-picture relationships (Jewitt, 2008; NCTE, 2005, NLG, 1996;
Sipe, 2008b). In this study, picturebooks were the multimodal texts for examination, and in this chapter, I provided a rationale for their use. With limited studies placing word-picture relationships at the forefront of their investigations of young children’s interpretations and composing of picturebooks, I addressed this problem through my investigation of second graders’ responses to and application of word-picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. In Chapter 2, I describe the theoretical perspectives and relevant literature that informed the design of this study. Chapter 3 explains the research design and the data collection and analysis procedures, and Chapter 4 provides the results. In Chapter 5, I interpret and explain the results of my study and provide implications of my findings for future research and teaching.
CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I present the theoretical foundations that ground this investigation: (a) the theoretical conceptualization of the picturebook and word-picture relationships, (b) theory of transmediation, (c) reader response theories, and (d) multimodality and design. Together, these theoretical perspectives informed the design of this research study and influenced the data collection and analysis of children’s responses related to word-picture relationships.

I also review the related literature that has examined ways that young children respond to narrative picturebooks, more specifically, the words and pictures in picturebooks. Further, despite the prevalence of research related to young children’s responses, I indicate the need for research that extends our understanding of young children’s responses to word-picture relationships. In addition, I review influences on young children’s composing process of multimodal texts, primarily the picturebook. Finally, I highlight the limited research on young children’s picturebook making and the need for further investigations.

Theoretical Foundations

Theoretical Conceptualization of the Picturebook

Rather than “picture book” this review uses the single term, “picturebook,” as referenced by Bader (1976) and Kiefer (1995) who argued that the picturebook is a “unique art object,” interdependent upon pictures and the written words to tell the story. Conceptually, the term “picturebook” highlights the importance of the interaction of text
and pictures in conveying meaning rather than viewing the picturebook as simply a book with pictures.

Various definitions are used in the literature to conceptualize the picturebook. Barbara Bader, in her book *American Picturebooks: From “Noah’s Ark” to “The Beast Within”* (1976), states:

A picturebook is text, illustrations, total design; an item of manufacture and a commercial product; a social, cultural, historical document; and foremost, an experience for a child. As an art form it hinges on the interdependence of pictures and words, on the simultaneous display of two facing pages, and on the drama of the turning of the page (p. 1).

Others have contributed to the definition of what constitutes a picturebook. Perry Nodelman, who comprehensively explored the picturebook in *Words About Pictures* (1988), simply defined picturebooks as “books intended for young children which communicate information to tell stories through a series of many pictures combined with relatively slight texts or no text at all” (p. vii). Kiefer, in *The Potential of Picturebook* (1995), provided a far more comprehensive definition of the picturebook, referencing illustrator Barbara Cooney’s suggestion that the picturebook is like a string of pearls, where “the pearls represent the illustrations, and the string represents the printed text” to emphasize the “interdependence of pictures and text in the unique art object that is the picturebook” (p. 6). Kiefer goes on to suggest that the picturebook is unlike the illustrated book, “one where the occasional picture is present to add to the words but it is not necessary to our understanding” (p. 6).
Borrowing from Will Eisner (1985), Sipe (2011) referred to picturebooks as “sequential art,” (p. 237) describing the series of pictures presented one after the other to tell the story. He goes on to note that the interaction between the pictures and words produce something “greater than the sum of its parts” (p. 238). Sipe echoed the work of previous scholars (Bader, 1976; Kiefer, 1995) as he stressed that the pictures do not simply provide decoration to the words but provide another layer of meaning.

Critical to defining the picturebook is the dynamic of the words and pictures and the role they play in presenting the story to the reader/listener. Although different researchers highlight either the words or pictures as seemingly taking more control of the narrative, all noted that the picturebook is defined by the interaction of the two in conveying the meaning of the picturebook.

**Theories of the Relationship Between Words and Pictures**

In the conceptual definitions of the picturebook, there is a clear emphasis on the way both the pictures and the words are necessary to tell the story; one would be incomplete without the other. Understanding the interactions between the words and pictures provides insight into the ways meaning is constructed and conveyed through picturebooks.

Agosto (1999) described *parallel storytelling*, in which the pictures and words simultaneously tell the same story, and *interdependent storytelling*, where the reader must “consider both forms of media concurrently in order to comprehend the books’ stories” (p. 267). This interplay between the words and pictures can also be described, as Agosto suggested, using Sipes’ (1998) term “synergy” (p. 98). Synergy, as Sipe (1998)
described, refers to the interactions or transactions between the words and pictures. Parallel storytelling and interdependent storytelling only briefly describe the complex word-picture relationship in picturebooks, providing a starting point for discussion.

Nodelman, in *Words About Pictures* (1988), suggested that interpreting meaning from word-picture relationships is a complex process: “As we respond to words and pictures which tell us about the same events in different ways, we must integrate two different sorts of information about the same events” (p. 200). He suggested that by integrating the two, the meaning of the words and pictures changes, and provides a richer experience for the reader. He further suggested without either the words or pictures, the message is incomplete:

…Words without pictures can be vague and incomplete, incommunicative about important visual information, and second, that pictures without words can be vague and incomplete, lacking the focus, the temporal relationships, and the internal significance so easily communicated by words (Nodelman, 1988, p. 216).

According to Nodelman (1988), there are three ways that words can affect how the reader focuses attention on pictures. First, words support the reader in attending to significant information within the pictures. He suggested that words provide a pathway for the reader to follow when determining the potential significance of details in the pictures that accompany them. More specifically, words determined the significance of the pictures in moving the narrative forward. Secondly, words specify cause-and-effect relationships within and across pictures. Third, words tell the reader what matters in the pictures by focusing the reader’s attention to elements in the pictures that the reader
should notice. According to Nodelman, the pictures in picturebooks are most interesting when we compare their meaning to the words that accompany them.

Golden (1990) described five types of relationships between the words and picture: (a) the words and picture are generally symmetrical, reinforcing the same meaning; (b) the picture is needed to clarify the words; (c) the picture is helpful in enhancing or enriching text; (d) the words carries primary narrative and the picture illustrates selected aspects; and (e) the picture carries primary narrative with words reflecting selected aspects of the picture. Sipe (1998) noted a limitation of Golden’s typology is her focus on how much control the words or pictures have in relaying the meaning instead of considering the way they change the meaning of each other. Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) suggested that Golden developed a starting point for explaining word-picture relationships, but the relationship is more complex and expansive than suggested by her typology.

Golden’s (1990) work influenced further exploration of word-picture relationships, with Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) borrowing her terms in their typology, such as symmetrical and enhancing, for example. Unlike Golden’s typologies of word-picture relationships, Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) focused on the way words and pictures relate to and interact with the meaning conveyed by the other. In *How Picturebooks Work*, Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) asserted that there were at least five ways in which words and pictures relate to each other:

- Symmetrical: the words and pictures are in alignment, reflecting the same story;
• Complementary: words and pictures provide additional information that is not given by the other;
• Counterpoint: word and picture provide different information for the same story;
• Expanding or Enhancing: words and pictures are mostly in alignment; yet a piece of the story is only told through visual information; and
• Sylleptic: two or more stories that do not rely on each other for meaning;

Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) suggested that the majority of picturebooks can be labeled symmetrical or complementary, which they suggest leaves little to the reader’s imagination and forces the reader into a passive role. In contrast, counterpointing is sometimes characterized by extreme contradiction of information provided in the words and pictures; this forces the reader to determine the true meaning and reconcile the opposition between the words and pictures. In counterpointing relationships, the reader must navigate between the conflicting information to draw out interpretations of the story.

*Rosie’s Walk* (Hutchins, 1967; see Figure 1) is referred to as an example of extreme contradiction (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In *Rosie’s Walk* a plump, red hen, Rosie, goes for a walk, unknowingly being stalked by a fox, which can never seem to catch up to Rosie. The entire story is told through a simple, 32-word sentence: “Rosie the hen went for a walk across the yard, around the pond, over the haystack, past the mill, through the fence, under the beehives, and got back in time for dinner.” The illustration provides a counter narrative that is never mentioned within the written text—the story of
the fox. On the heels of Rosie, the fox encounters challenges throughout his and Rosie’s journey across that farm that prevents him from catching the hen. The reader/listener must make sense of the fox’s story and how it relates to Rosie through the images presented on each page.

*Figure 2.1. Openings 1-3 in Rosie’s Walk (Hutchinson, 1967).*

David Lewis (2001b) identified weaknesses in the typology of Nikolajeva and Scott (2001), particularly with the concept of *symmetrical* and *contradiction*. Lewis suggested that we must look at how the interactions between words and pictures change the meaning of each other, rather than looking at words and pictures as separate sources of meaning. Therefore, he said that symmetry and contradiction are an illusion of the interaction. Lewis suggested that words guide and change our understanding of pictures, and therefore gives the appearance of symmetry. Implying that if the reader viewed the pictures in isolation of the words, our interpretations would not mirror the meaning of the
words. He suggested that pictures have limitations in the information they can depict (e.g., physical actions are limited in a stagnant picture) and without words our interpretation would be incomplete. With contradiction, he further suggested that words affect understanding of the pictures, and they only appear to be in opposition due to the way we read them in relation to each other. Therefore, words help us to understand pictures in a particular way, and symmetry and contradiction is an illusion of their interactions. Lewis continued his critique of typologies by suggesting that categorizing picturebooks does not grasp the flexibility of word-picture interactions within picturebooks, and therefore pigeonholes a picturebook into one relationship that may not fully represent the complexity of the word-picture interactions in that book.

According to Lewis (2001a), picturebooks are a miniature ecosystem in which the pictures and words act ecologically. Similar to an ecosystem where organisms sharing an environment both interact with and depend upon each other for survival, Lewis suggested there is a similar relationship between words and pictures. He suggested that ecological interactions within picturebooks can be described in three ways: (1) interanimation, (2) flexibility, and (3) complexity. Described simply, interanimation is the reciprocal nature of both words and pictures, “each one becoming the environment in which the other lives and thrives” (p. 54). He further noted that words guide our understanding of and focus our attention to the significance of the pictures. Flexibility suggests that the word-picture relationship is dynamic, meaning the relationship can change from page to page in the picturebook. He noted there are times when on one page the words will carry the story and on the next page they may step back or work on the same level with pictures to
provide information. Lastly, like an ecosystem, picturebooks are complex. The pictures and words ask different tasks from each other, and the meaning that is constructed from the system can be done on multiple levels.

All scholars investigating the relationship of words and pictures agreed that the dynamics between the two affect how the reader navigates and interprets the story, along with the picturebook as a whole. While there is some consensus and overlap across conceptualizations of the interaction of words and pictures in picturebooks, Lewis’ (2001a) ecological metaphor pushed back against categorizing their relationship. Although Lewis made a strong argument, the relationship in many picturebooks is less ambiguous than he suggested. Sipe (2012) suggested that Lewis’s ecological metaphor, used as an alternative to categorization, failed to recognize the ways that word-picture relationships are unlike the ecosystem (e.g. the ironic nature between words and pictures), and therefore, does not adequately describe the relationship of words and pictures in picturebooks.

The interaction between words and pictures within picturebooks allows for dynamic interpretations of the meaning. In some instances, the reader is asked to use the pictures to extend the meaning of the words, and in others, the reader is asked to recognize the opposition in the information provided by the two and reconcile this contradiction to make sense of the story. Word-picture relationships vary in complexity and children’s responses provide an avenue for researchers to understand how they navigate these relationships to make sense of the story.
A Theory of Transmediation

Sipe (1998) posited that the theory of transmediation is applicable for understanding the way meaning is transformed as we process the interactions of words and pictures in picturebooks. Sipe built upon Peirce’s Sign Theory of semiotics (Peirce, n.d.; Peirce & Hoopes, 1991), which in simplistic terms suggests that the object is made up of signs, or representations of meaning, and an interpretant is a result of making sense of the signs in relation to other signs and the object itself. Groupings of signs that are used in relation to each other for meaning are sign-systems. Peirce suggested that the sign only gains meaning when an interpretant, or the thought, comes to mind as a result of the information provided by the sign (Peirce & Hoopes, 1991). For example, S-T-O-P, the red coloring, and the hexagonal shape of a stop sign, only has meaning when an interpretant gives meaning to them (Peirce & Hoopes, 1991).

In Sipe’s theory of transmediation, picturebooks are the object and the word and pictures each act as a separate sign system (Sipe, 1998). Sipe (1998) suggested that as the reader moves from pictures to words, new meanings result, because each provides additional information that changes the reader’s understanding; interpretations of the picturebook result from the reader using words to make sense of the pictures and pictures to make sense of the words. Adapting from the work of Peirce (n.d.), Sipe (1998) developed two semiotic triads to explain this interaction (see Figure 2.2).
Figure 2.2. A Theory of Transmediation (Taken from Sipe, 1998)

In each triad, the object is the content being presented in the picturebook.

Consider the first triad—New Interpretation of Pictures. Notice that the smaller triangle represents the reader’s interpretation of the words, but when pictures are introduced, and the reader integrates their interpretation of the words with the content of the pictures, the reader develops a new interpretation of the pictures. Then, looking at the second triad—New Interpretation of Words—the interpretation of the pictures is integrated with the words to develop a new interpretation of the words. Essentially, a new interpretation is constructed when considering new information presented by the other source of information; interpretations of words are changed when you consider the information presented in the pictures and vice versa. Sipe (1998) suggested
this transmediation goes back and forth, in a potentially endless process. Each new page opening presents us with a new set of words and new illustrations to factor into our consideration of meaning. Reviewing and rereading will produce ever-new insights as we construct new connections and make modifications of our previous interpretations… (p 106).

Transmediation provides a way of examining the word-picture relationship and makes a case for the equal importance of words and pictures in relaying information (Sipe, 1998). Picturebooks, through transmediation, give new opportunities for meaning with words and pictures affording different interpretations during each read (Sipe, 1998). Understanding children’s interpretations of these word-picture relationships and meaning making of the story as a result can be looked at through their responses.

**Reader Response Theories**

Reader response theorists and researchers (Galda, 2010; Galda & Liang, 2003; Langer, 1990, 1995; Rosenblatt, 1978; Sipe, 1999, 2008a) suggest that readers take up various stances toward texts, which impacts their experience with and responses to the literary work. Reading is a transaction between the reader and the text with comprehending being a product of this transaction (Rosenblatt, 1978). During this reading event, the reader brings with them “personality traits, memories of past events, present needs and preoccupations, a particular mood of the moment, and a particular physical condition” (Rosenblatt, 1938, p. 30-31) that determines their experience with the text and therefore their response to the text in that moment; it is what the reader brings to the reading event and the text itself that influence their stance towards the text.
According to Rosenblatt (1978), readers approach a text with an aesthetic or efferent stance. As the reader experiences the text, their stance, and therefore their responses, change depending on their purpose for engaging with the text. Reading to seek out information places the reader in an efferent stance, while a “lived-through experience” with the text stirs up emotions and feelings and places the reader in an aesthetic stance; this lived-through experience is a personal transaction that stirs up the affective aspects of reading (Rosenblatt, 1995).

Rosenblatt (1982; 1993) stressed that stance occurs along a continuum and can change based on the experience of the reader during the reading event. Any text has aesthetic or efferent potential despite author intentions (Rosenblatt, 1995). However, both Rosenblatt (1938/1976) and Galda (2010) argued that, in order for the child to truly understand a work of fiction, they should enter the text with a primarily aesthetic stance. When children are asked to demonstrate comprehension by identifying the main idea, recalling details or plot events, and make inferences about a character, they must approach the text through an efferent stance (Galda & Liang, 2003, p. 270). The stance of the reader, in some cases influenced by the teacher, determines how children process the text (Galda & Liang, 2003).

Sipe, building upon his extensive studies of young children’s response to narrative fiction (e.g., Sipe, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2002, 2008a; Sipe & Bauer, 2001; Sipe & Brightman, 2005; Sipe & McGuire, 2006), extended the theoretical work of Rosenblatt with his view of stance, or what he explained as “how readers situate themselves in relation to the text” (2008a, p. 184). His theoretical model for literary understanding
presented five stances that young children take as they respond to the picture storybook: (1) when children analyze the text they situate themselves within the text; (2) as children make connections from one story world to another, they situate themselves across two or more texts; (3) bringing their personal lives to the story and taking experiences from the text to relate to their lives; (4) children live through the text when they enter the story world; and (5) as children remix the text for their own creative purposes they situate themselves on the text. Sipe, unlike Rosenblatt, did not present his work as a continuum, though children may take up different stances during one reading event as demonstrated through their oral responses to the text.

Iser (1978) was concerned with the way readers fill in the “gaps” or “indeterminancies” of the text through strategic processing, such as making predictions and inferences. Iser (1974) insists that the reader will fill in the gaps in their own way and by doing so serve as an “active co-author” of the text (p. 3). Iser (1972) noted that in contrast to more traditional texts, contemporary picturebooks intentionally place the role of co-author on the reader; these texts come with unexpected twists that require the reader to create connections within the text to fill in the gaps. In complex word-picture relationships, the reader would consciously need to fill in these gaps to make sense of the story. Iser (1978) suggested that reading is a dynamic process where the reader is forming and reforming an individual understanding of the text and therefore, “…it is in the reader that the text comes to life” (p. 19).


Multimodality and Design

Both scholars of the New Literacy Studies (e.g., Gee, 1996; Lankshear and Knobel, 2003; Street 1995) and multiliteracies (e.g., Kress 2003; New London Group, 1996) acknowledged and advocated for a perspective of literacy that moves beyond a solely language-dominated view of communication. Multimodality extends the way we view meaning-making resources for communication. Building upon Halliday’s social semiotic theory of communication (Halliday, 1975, 1985), multimodality is a theoretical conceptualization of communication that recognizes the abilities of multiple modes (e.g., visual, audio, gestural, spatial, and linguistic) to make meaning (Ho, Leong, and Anderson, 2010). Social semiotics posits that language, and more specifically, the resources used for representation (e.g., sound in speech), are a “result of people’s constant social and cultural work” (Jewitt, 2006, p. 3), whereas multimodality relies on modes, which are socially-constructed resources for making meaning and are composed of semiotic resources (Bezemer & Kress, 2008). For example, semiotic resources for written text include font type and size, word choice and order, and punctuation (Bezemer & Kress, 2008). Our understanding of these modal resources and their meaning-making potential are shaped by their social use (Jewitt, 2006). Jewitt, Bezemer, and O’Halloran (2016) suggested three key premises of multimodality:

1. Meaning is made with different semiotic resources, each offering distinct potentialities and limitations.

2. Meaning making involves the production of multimodal wholes.
If we want to study meaning we need to attend to all semiotic resources being used to make a complete whole (p. 3).

When considering multimodal texts for learning—textbooks, web-based resources, teacher-created products—written text is no longer the sole nor dominant mode for relaying information, and evidence suggests that image will continue to take a more dominant representational role in these texts (Bezemer & Kress, 2008). According to Bezemer and Kress (2008), the design of these multimodal texts changes the potential for learning and has pedagogical implications for comprehension. Picturebooks, a prominent instructional tool in classrooms, are bimodal; they rely on visual and linguistic modes to provide the narrative (Painter, Martin, & Unsworth, 2013).

Kress (2014) used the term design to refer to the final product that results from the process of using available resources, or modes, to develop a materialized form of an inner idea. According to Kress (2014), the designer considers the audience and purpose for the product, modal preferences (e.g., image over writing), and available resources. The design is a result of a deliberate selection of resources and their arrangement in the composition (Kress, 2014). According to Albers (2006), when “meaning makers” (p. 78) construct multimodal texts, they select media, or materials, that they are comfortable using and meets their needs. Therefore, access and previous experiences with modal resources and the medium used to articulate these resources impact the decision-making process of the design.

Decision-making is a critical component of design. Even with strictly written texts, fonts and layouts can change the meaning and alter the way we think about the text.
(Kress, 2003). Consider the way a **bold**, or *italicized* typeface, changes how you attend to and interpret the text. In picturebooks, the design of the multimodal text—the font, the layout, the use of image, and style of language—all impact the way we interpret the text and are used intentionally by the authors and illustrators to relay a message. Designers develop multimodal texts for their own purposes, interests, and for an intended audience (Bezemer & Kress, 2008); this includes considering the vast ways the different modes express meaning independently and in combination with each other and requires constant decision-making when designing the text (Ray, 2010).

**Young Children’s Responses to Picturebooks**

Theoretical perspectives of the picturebook, word-picture relationships, reader response, transmediation, and multimodality and design ground this investigation. In this section, research related to young children’s responses to and production of picturebooks are reviewed. This research is relevant to and provides foundational knowledge for this study.

**Research on Young Children’s Responses to Picturebooks**

A considerable amount of research has focused on children’s responses to narrative fiction in the classroom (e.g. Hickman, 1981; Kiefer, 1995; Maloch & Beutel, 2010; Pantaleo 2002, 2003; Sipe, 2008; Walsh, 2003). Traditionally, narrative fiction has been conceptualized as works containing “central story elements” (Bauman & Bergeron, 1993, p. 413) of main characters, setting, main character’s problem, major events, and ending. More inclusively for this study, narrative is used to describe “the technique or process or art of narrating” the story (Pantaleo & Sipe, 2012, p. 6), rather than
acknowledging works that strictly present a traditional linear story structure. Recognition of multiple narrative structures allows inclusion of narrative works that encompass nonlinear or multilayered stories, and an overall complexity of the narrative, which are found in a growing number of contemporary picturebooks (Pantaleo & Sipe, 2012; Sipe, 2011).

Typologies of young children’s responses to picturebooks. Hickman (1981), in her ethnographic study of kindergarten through fifth grade children’s responses to literature, much in the form of picturebooks, found seven broad categories of children’s response to literature:

1. listening behaviors (e.g. laughter and applause or joining in refrains)
2. contact with books (e.g. browsing or keeping books at hand)
3. acting on the impulse to share (e.g. reading together or sharing discoveries)
4. oral responses (e.g. retelling or freely commenting)
5. actions and drama (e.g. echoing the action or demonstrating meaning)
6. making things (e.g. pictures and related art work)
7. writing (e.g. restating and summarizing or using literary models deliberately)

Looking at age-related differences in responses, Hickman found that kindergarten and first grade students used their bodies to respond by “frequently echoing the actions of stories read-aloud” (p. 349) more often than the older elementary students. She also noted that when books were read that had similar topics or themes or lent themselves to
comparison in some way, children across grades were able to make connections and see similarities across other texts.

Sipe (2000a, 2008a) investigated first- and second-graders’ responses to narrative picturebooks during interactive read-alouds. Similar to Hickman (1981), he found that children responded through movement and were able to make connections across books; however, he more comprehensively explored children’s oral responses. He categorized these responses into five types of literary understanding that highlighted the diverse ways children interacted with and constructed meaning of picturebooks:

- **Analytical**—responses construct narrative meaning (e.g. structure and meaning of text, relationship between the pictures and text, and traditional elements of narrative—setting, characters, plot, and theme);
- **Intertextual**—responses related the text to other cultural texts and products (e.g. movies, books, videos, T.V. shows, work of other artists and illustrators);
- **Personal**—children connect the text to their own personal lives;
- **Transparent**—responses suggest that the children had entered the narrative world of the story and had become one with it; and
- **Performative**—responses indicate that they are entering the world of the text in order to manipulate or steer it toward their own purposes (Sipe, 2008a, p. 85-86).

Examining 45 transcripts and 4,165 conversational turns, Sipe (2000a) found that the majority (73%) of children’s responses were analytical, followed by intertextual (10%), personal (10%), performative (5%), and transparent (2%). His typology was confirmed
and broadened during subsequent work with kindergarteners (Sipe & Bauer, 2001). Sipe (2008a) suggested that the richest understanding of stories comes from the interaction of all five types of response, which is “best developed in intense social interactions with expert others and peers” (p. 195).

Sipe (2000b, 2001) also examined more deeply the categories of children’s responses from other perspectives. During read-alouds of The Gingerbread Man variants (Sipe, 2000b), children used intertextual connections to analyze the story, generalized about genre and structure, to enter the storyworld, and developed new stories. Sipe (2001) found that during read-alouds of Rapunzel variants, children made intertextual connections between the language of the texts, the story elements, and the illustrations from one variant to another.

Performative and transparent, although a small portion of children’s responses during picturebook read-alouds, gave additional insight into how students’ responses represent their engagement with the story (Sipe, 2002). He found that children used words and physical actions to represent their active, or “expressive, performative engagement” (p. 476) with the story. Building upon his previous studies (Sipe, 2000a, 2000b, Sipe & Bauer, 2001) involving kindergarten, first-, and second-grade children’s responses, Sipe (2002) developed a typology that indicated expressive engagement: (a) dramatizing—“dramatizing the story spontaneously—in nonverbal and verbal ways”; (b) talking back—“talking back to the story or characters”; (c) critiquing/controlling—“children suggest alternatives in plots, characters, or settings”; and (d) inserting—“inserting oneself (or friends) in the story”; (e) taking over—“taking over the text and
manipulating it for one’s own purposes” (p. 477-478). As children engage with stories in these ways, Sipe (2002) posited they are making the stories their own. Though some may see this as disrupting the understanding of the story, he argued that these responses were a sophisticated expression of students’ enjoyment of the text and demonstrated their active engagement with the story world.

According to Arizpe and Styles (2016), Sipe often investigated areas of response that were overlooked by others. Drawing upon his previous studies on response (Sipe, 2000a; Sipe & Bauer, 2001), he worked with McGuire to look at children’s resistance to stories (Sipe & McGuire, 2006). In the same way that children express enjoyment for a story, they can express opposition. Sipe and McGuire identified six categories that explained children’s opposition to elements of or the picturebook as a whole, ranging from conflict with a new story in comparison with a known story to finding fault with the choices made by the author. Sipe and McGuire explain that this resistance can be a powerful response to bridge a deeper understanding of the story.

Maloch and Beutel (2010) identified six types of child-initiated responses demonstrated by second-grade middle- and lower-income children during read-alouds of both fiction and nonfiction picturebooks. Although nonfiction was used in this study, all categories of response were identified during the read-alouds of narrative picturebooks. Initiations included: (a) connections from the book to personal and shared experiences, the world, and other books; (b) predictions; (c) clarifications about information in the story; (d) observations of the text or illustrations, (e) entering the story world by relating to the characters and commenting on changes they would make as author and illustrator.
(taken from Sipe, 2000a); and (f) direct response as demonstrated by the children providing directions to the teacher (taken from Oyler, 1996). Maloch and Beutel noted that, although predictions and entering the story world were evident during nonfiction read-alouds, they were primarily found during fiction read-alouds. Maloch and Beutel’s work shows strong similarity to the categorization framework of Sipe (2000a; 2002; 2008a).

Current literature suggests that young children are capable of sophisticated literary understanding (Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Pantaleo, 2002; Sipe, 2008a), as demonstrated through their responses. When children respond to the story, we have a glimpse into their thinking and the ways they make sense of the picturebook. Children demonstrate their ability to navigate the story world through discussion of narrative elements, relating the story to their lived experiences, remixing the story for their own use, and critiquing the story world (Sipe 2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2008; Sipe & Bauer, 2001; Sipe & Brightman, 2005; Maloch & Beutel, 2006).

**Young children’s responses to pictures in picturebooks.** Reading pictures, or interpreting their meaning, can be as equally complex a process as reading words (Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Walsh, 2003). With pictures, the reader does not have to “decode the words,” but they must “break the visual codes” of line, color, and other elements to interpret the meaning (Walsh, 2006, p. 29). Researchers have investigated children’s responses to pictures in order to determine how young children use them as a resource to understand the story.
Kiefer (1995), interested in how children construct meaning from the art of the picturebook, studied the oral responses of children in combination first- and second-grade classrooms. Adapting four of Halliday’s (1975) functions of language—the informative, heuristic, imaginative, and personal—Kiefer described children’s primary function for their responses. She later expanded her work to other elementary grades (i.e., kindergarten through fifth grade) and found similar functions of language across grade levels. In informative response, children described the content of the story and made comparisons of the picture to the real world. In heuristic response, children made inferences about the illustrator’s intentions, events in the story, and character motives. In imaginative response, children entered into the imaginative world of the story, described their mental images, and used figurative language to describe the pictures. In personal response, children connected their lives to that of the story and gave opinions about the story. Madura (1998), also interested in children’s responses to the illustrations of picturebooks and drawing on Kiefer’s framework of response, identified three patterns in children’s talk: (a) description, (b) interpretation, and (c) identification of thematic trends. Her work was situated in a multiage classroom of first to third graders and focused on four children with similar reading and writing ability. Madura suggested that children were more attentive to pictures and illustrator’s craft than author’s craft.

Sipe (2000a) found that combination first- and second- grader’s responses focused on pictures about one-fourth (23%) of the time. In a follow-up study of kindergarten children, he noted comparable amounts of response (Sipe & Bauer, 2001). The children’s discussion of pictures during the read-aloud sessions demonstrated that they were
attending to how pictures were created and used the pictures as a resource for comprehending the story. In later work, Sipe continued to explore how children use pictures as sources of meaning during read-alouds.

His work with Brightman (2005) investigated the ways that first grade children use pictures during read-alouds of folktale variants (The Three Little Pigs) to interpret the stories. For read-alouds, the stories were sequenced from traditional to highly untraditional. Over one third (35%) of children’s responses were focused on describing, labeling, or making inferences about the setting or background. Additional responses were focused on the character’s appearance (19%), interpretations of the character’s actions (5%), inferences about the character’s thoughts (2%), making and confirming predictions (4%), integrating components of the pictures to make sense of the story (10%), comparison of pictures within and across the stories (15%), and responses focused on characters moving across story boundaries or borders in the Wiesner (2001) version of The Three Little Pigs (10%). Their work highlights the significance of pictures as a resource for children in constructing meaning of the story.

Although not focused on response, Martinez and Harmon (2012) explored 30 picturebooks for younger children and found that illustrations play a dominant role in providing information about literary elements (e.g. setting, character development, and mood); this could at least partially account for younger children attending to illustrations to make sense of the story. Prior, Wilson, and Martinez (2012) looked at how children used pictures to understand characters in picturebooks; they noted that children used elements of art and design (i.e. color, line, breaking the frame) to make inferences about
the character. Their work, along with others (Sipe, 2008a; Sipe & Brightman, 2005), suggested that children use illustrations to understand character development.

Arizpe and Styles (2016) investigated the responses of children, ages 4-11, to word-picture relationships and pictures in picturebooks. When focused on the ways children used pictures, Arizpe and Styles (2016) noted that the younger children in the study were especially fascinated with the pictures. The younger children had some difficulty with picture analysis, responding with less plausible reasoning for illustrator choices; however, they demonstrated that they were able to grasp sophisticated ideas presented in the illustrations. In many instances, children relied on their personal experiences to help them make sense of the story being presented. Arizpe and Styles (2016) found that across their three studies even the youngest of children (4-year-olds) were “very good at analyzing the visual features of the text” (p. 180) and reading ability did not reflect ability to analyze the pictures.

Walsh (2003) examined kindergarten and first-grade children’s oral responses to two narrative picturebooks during one-on-one read-aloud sessions with the children. Walsh noted that children primarily demonstrated responses focused on labelling (“named or identified objects”) and observation (“provided more information to the labelling”; p. 125). Other responses included: (a) textual (comments focused on the plot or narrative), (b) meta-textual (demonstration that children were conscious that the picturebook was a constructed text), (c) intertextual (connections across books), and (d) affective or evaluating comments (opinions of the book). As noted by Walsh, the pictures significantly impacted the children’s interpretations of the story and evoked a range of
oral responses that demonstrated how the children made sense of the story through the pictures. She noted that young children demonstrated different levels of response to the picturebooks, which supports the work of Arizpe and Styles (2016), which suggested the complexity of reading pictures.

Research suggests that younger children may be more attentive to illustrations than older children (Aukerman & Schuldt, 2016; Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Walsh, 2003) indicating that they may rely more heavily on illustrations as a source of meaning. Their responses demonstrate their ability to analyze and navigate pictures to understand the story on various complex levels. Children identified and labeled objects in pictures (Walsh, 2003) but demonstrated the ability to use pictures for more sophisticated reasoning as evidenced by their ability to make inferences about characters (Prior, Wilson, & Martinez, 2012; Sipe & Brightman, 2005).

**Young children’s responses to word-picture relationships.** The relationship between words and pictures are a defining aspect of picturebooks, yet limited research has explored the influence of word-picture relationships on young children’s responses to picturebooks. As more researchers (Arizpe & Styles, 2003; Pantaleo, 2002) explore children’s responses to postmodern picturebooks, we gain insight into how children respond to complex word-picture relationships.

In a two-year study, Arizpe and Styles (2003/2016) investigated the way children responded to and discussed multiple picturebooks with complex word-picture relationships. One picturebook, Satoshi Kitamura’s (1987) *Lily Takes a Walk*, has a counterpoint relationship, through the use of perspective (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In
this story, the words describe the perspective of Lily, the little girl going on a walk with her dog; however, the pictures provide a different perspective, one where the dog is experiencing terrors all along the walk, unnoticed by Lily. Responses indicated that children were far more interested in the pictures than the words. When children were asked if the words and pictures were telling the same story, most of the younger children had a difficult time recognizing the differences between the stories told through words and pictures; this was also the case with Anthony Browne’s (1992) *Zoo*. Younger children demonstrated some difficulty navigating the irony of the word-picture relationship. The researchers explain that “irony makes demands on the reader to use inference to detect contradictions between what is said in the written text and illustrated in the picture” (2003, p. 79), which may indicate why younger children, below age 7, demonstrated difficulty in making sense of the word-picture interaction. Arizpe and Styles (2003) concluded, “analyzing visual text, and the relationship between word and image, makes demands on higher level reading skills and involves deep thinking” (p. 238).

Contrary to the work of Arizpe and Styles (2016), Pantaleo (2002) found that first graders’ responses indicated that they were able to grasp the contradictory relationship between the words and pictures in Wiesner’s (2001) *The Three Little Pigs*, a postmodern picturebook. In *The Three Little Pigs*, the pictures “represent, complement, extend, and contradict” (p. 77) the words. On two pages the text reads, “and [the wolf] ate the pig up,” but the wolf, looking confused, does not eat the pigs because they are no longer
“inside” the original story. The children recognized this irony and were able to explain why the wolf could not eat the pigs despite words in the story stating that he did.

Postmodern picturebooks have impacted the limited research that is available on word-picture relationships in picturebooks. The ironic relationship of words and pictures in these stories are of interest to a growing number of children’s literature and literacy researchers (e.g., Pantaleo, 2005, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2014; Serafini, 2005, 2012; Sipe, 2008b; Sipe & Pantaleo, 2008; Zapata, Sánchez, & Robinson, 2016); however, literature on responses related to the wide range of word-picture relationships is not evident.

Young children’s responses to postmodern picturebooks. As previously noted, the narrative structure of picturebooks are growing increasingly complex and more diverse (Pantaleo & Sipe, 2012) and postmodern picturebooks represent a genre of picturebooks that embrace this complexity. McClay (2000) posited that children are constantly encountering the postmodern on television and in movies, and a growing number of researchers (Pantaleo, 2002, 2003, 2004b, 2005; Sipe 2008b) have been intrigued with the ways children interact with postmodern picturebooks. Sipe (2008b) synthesized the work of postmodern theorists and identified five common qualities of postmodern picturebooks: (1) playfulness—“the text as a playground for readers”; (2) multiplicity of meanings—“multiple pathways through the text world because of nonlinearity of plot and high degree of indeterminacy, nonresolution, and ambiguity”; (3) intertextuality—“multiple types of texts and the juxtaposition of references to many other texts”; (4) subversion—“mocking of literary conventions and a general tone of irony, parody, or sarcasm”; and (5) “blurring distinctions between high and popular culture,
between authors and readers, and distinctions among traditional literary genres” (p. 31). Metafictive devices, which “amplify the fictional status and self-conscious nature of the text” (Pantaleo, 2004, p. 214), are also characteristic of postmodern picturebooks and duplicate some of the elements identified by Sipe. Though postmodern picturebooks represent a small portion of picturebooks (Sipe, 2011), a growing number of picturebooks are noticeably embracing their elements (Sipe, 2008b).

Pantaleo’s (2002, 2003, 2004b, 2005) research on young children’s responses to postmodern picturebooks revealed that students responded to the intertextual connections across texts and the intratextual connections within texts, constructed meaning from visual details, used illustrations to extend, complement, and contradict the text, and responded to peritextual features to make predictions about the storyline. Pantaleo (2005) noted that picturebooks with metafictive devices, such as postmodern picturebooks, “demand a higher level of sophistication and complexity with respect to gap-filling (Iser, 1978) and predicting” and can “teach critical thinking skills, visual literacy skills, and interpretive strategies” (p. 32).

Pantaleo (2004a) found first-grade children attended to the metafictive devices in Anthony Browne’s (1998) *Voices in the Park*. She noted that children responded to the nonlinear structure and intratextual nature of the story—the text-within-same-text connections. Children also responded to intertextual links to cultural allusions, the typography (appearance of font), and the indeterminacies between the relationship of words and pictures—noting how the illustrations “can be ‘read’ and interpreted in multiple ways” (p. 225). Pantaleo posited that the metafictive devices in *Voices in the*
Park, for example, “give agency to readers and required them to become even more involved in the creation of meaning” (p. 227).

Arizpe, Styles, and Wolpert (2008) discussed postgraduate students’ research on children’s responses to postmodern picturebooks. Cowan, a master’s student, found that 5- and 6-year-olds responded to Simon Bartram’s (2004) *Dougal’s Deep-Sea Diary* with performance and playfulness. Children engaged physically with the text and often responded through non-verbal means. The children became immersed in the text, moving closer to the text so they were “only inches away” and “gasped and giggled as if immersed in play” (p. 209). Despite the complexity of the text, children “showed an impressive understanding of perspective and adeptly used the visual along-side the written text to negotiate cohesive meaning” (p. 209). Mallouri, another master’s-level student, explored 7- and 8-year-old’s responses to Lauren Child’s (2002) *Who’s Afraid of the Big Bad Book?* Children responded to the boundaries of fiction and reality, the significance of typography to meaning, and made connections to other texts. Children’s responses also took on a performative and playful nature in which they acted out events in the story.

Sipe (2008b) explored first grade children’s responses to David Wiesner’s (2001) *Three Little Pigs*. Children’s responses reflected a great deal of interpretive work. They attuned to peritextual features for clues for story elements, the pigs traveling into other stories that appeared on the page, interpreted the liminal space “between” stories, and experienced cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance was evident when students had to reconcile the contradictions between the story being told in the pictures and words as
well as the contradictions from this variant of the *Three Little Pigs* and other familiar versions of the story. As noted by Sipe (2008), the children initially tried to make this story fit within their schema before realizing they had to expand their thinking to accommodate postmodern elements. Pantaleo (2002, 2004c) also looked at children’s response to Radical Change characteristics (e.g. multiple perspectives within and between the words and pictures, nonlinear organization, and multiple layers of meaning; Dresang, 1999) within David Wiesner’s *Three Little Pigs*. Similar to the responses in Sipe (2008b), children made a great deal of interpretive responses—focused on intertextual and intratextual connections, inferences, and generated hypotheses. As noted by Pantaleo (2004c), postmodern books require the reader to actively engage with the text to construct understanding more so than picturebooks with linear structures and traditional elements.

**Picturebook Making: Composing Multimodal Texts**

As previously discussed, the essence of the picturebook is found in the way words, pictures, and design elements interact with the other—an interaction that is nuanced and varied in its complexity (Serafini, 2010; Zapata, 2013). Therefore, it would make sense that composing these sophisticated multimodal texts is a complex process; one that requires more than attention to written text. However, in writing instruction the use of mentor texts as textual models is a part of the discussion and they have potential to be model texts for the composing process as well.

**Picturebooks as Mentor Texts**

Using mentor texts as models of writing is a common approach during elementary writing instruction (Farmer & Arrington, 1993; Laminack, 2017; Zapata, 2013). Teachers
use mentor texts to point out writing techniques to students and then support students as they use these techniques in their own writings (MacKay, Ricks, & Young, 2017).

Some suggest that mentor texts should first be enjoyed during reading experiences before they are examined further for writing techniques (Dorfman & Capelli, 2007; MacKay et al., 2017). Students “need to hear and appreciate the story…as well as the rhythms, words, and message. Only then can they return to a well-loved book and examine it through the eyes of a writer” (Dorfman & Cappelli, 2007, p. 8). Building the relationship between the text and reader-writer impacts the child’s deep insight and recognition of nuances in the writing (Laminack, 2017). As the child dives deeper into the writing craft, they begin to not only recognize their techniques, but the why behind those choices (Laminack, 2017).

Several studies suggest that mentor texts influence the writing of young children (Corden, 2007; Eckhoff, 1984). Corden (2007) examined the way explicit instruction of literary features of mentor texts would influence children’s writing. More specifically he wanted to see whether “children could move beyond merely copying ideas to develop conscious awareness of what structural or stylistic choices they were making and why” (p. 270). With teacher support, Corden found that children appropriated and remixed the stylistic choices from mentor texts into their own writing and when taught the language of these techniques, used this language to discuss their own writing. Several studies suggest that when teachers bring literary features to the attention of students and give students the language to discuss them, they are capable of using and discussing them in relation to their own text productions (e.g., Martens, Martens, Doyle, Loomis, &
Aghalarov, 2012; Pantaleo, 2017a; Zapata et al., 2015). Rowe (2003) suggested that what children bring into their own productions from mentor texts are motivated by their understandings, interests, and purposes. However, it should be noted that even without direct, explicit instruction, research suggests young children appropriate features of the texts they encounter.

Several studies suggest that when young children are exposed to bodies of work, they develop understandings that they include in their own writings, such as characteristics of narrative genres (Chapman, 1994; Kamberelis, 1998) and linguistic patterns (e.g., complex sentence structures and verbs; Eckhoff, 1984). Meek (1988) noted “there are many things which successful readers [and writers] learn without ever being taught” (p. 4). Even so, she also suggested that readers need to learn what to pay attention to as they read. Sipe (2008a) echoes this statement by suggesting that children see in picturebooks what they learn to see.

Illustration study, or the use of illustrations as mentor texts, is the topic of several practitioner-oriented texts published in the last decade (e.g., Cleaveland, 2016; Frey & Fisher, 2008; Olshansky, 2008; Serafini, 2014). These texts encourage the use of mentor texts to teach art and design elements of pictures and word-picture relationships so children can attend to them in their own productions. Ray (2010) suggested that “if teachers show children how an illustrator’s decisions about pictures are a lot like a writer’s decisions about words, they form a bridge of understanding that nurtures children as writers” (back cover). This understanding was the basis for her text, *In Pictures and In Words*, where Ray provides 50 ways illustrative study can impact children learning
writer’s craft. She suggests that when children are asked to attend to and interpret elements of words and pictures in picturebooks, they see the potential of these elements to relay meaning in picturebooks and therefore, their own picturebooks.

Research has explored ways young children use mentor texts as models for pictures in their multimodal texts. In their pictures, young designers appropriated elements of art and design (e.g., color, line, and perspective) from mentor picturebooks and mimicked the illustrative style of a particular illustrator (Pantaleo, 2017b; Ranker, 2009; Zapata, 2013). When young children were explicitly taught to attend to these elements during investigation of mentor texts, they appeared in the children’s picturebook productions (Pantaleo, 2017b; Martens et al., 2012). Zapata (2013) found that children referenced the illustrator and illustrator’s work when discussing the pictures of their own picturebook. These studies suggest that not only do young children attend to literary techniques in the written text, but the elements of art and design in pictures as well.

In this study, picturebooks were not used as mentor texts for extensive study of technique. However, to assume that children removed themselves from the picturebooks shared during the interactive read-alouds limits understanding of their composing process. Intertextuality—a term coined by Kristeva in 1966—suggested “texts cannot be separated from the larger cultural or social textuality out of which they are constructed” (as cited in Allen, 2000, p. 36). According to Kristeva (1980), “any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (p. 66) and any work of literature “is not simply the product of a single author, but of its relationship to other texts” (Keep, McLaughlin, &
Recognizing the role of read-aloud picturebooks is important for understanding how young children in this study used them as textual models.

**Composing Picturebooks**

Scholars advocate for a literacy pedagogy that moves beyond a narrow-focus on the written text and includes a designing-focus with multimodal compositions that reflect contemporary ways of communicating and interacting with the world (e.g., Pantaleo, 2009; Serafini, 2014; Siegel, 2006; Zapata & Van Horn, 2017). Researchers are investigating design in classroom literacy practices, which offers insight in ways young children design multimodal compositions and use compositional resources in their productions.

Findings from Dyson’s extensive work on young children’s writing (e.g. 1982, 1992, 2002, 2008) provide insight into the multimodal composing processes of young children. Decades ago, she challenged the notion that young children privilege written text in their composing processes (1982). Instead, Dyson (2002) suggested that children rely on “representative media, among them gesture, play, and drawing” (p. 129) that they already command to meet their needs during composing events. Essentially, children draw upon modes of communication that are familiar to them (Albers, 2006; Dyson, 2012).

Dyson’s work (e.g., 1993, 1997) suggested that children’s compositions cannot be separated from their social world—both immediate and outside the writing experience. Children not only drew upon the social talk occurring around and during the time of their composing process, they drew upon their personal lives. Characters in their stories
included people who played dominate roles in their real life—family and friends—and beloved characters in popular culture entertainment. Pantaleo (2017) extends the discussion of the social environment as influence. She found that young children’s multimodal compositions are shaped by what is valued in the environment. Conversations around model texts and teacher discourse—what teachers commented upon during and around the composing process—were influential to the composing process of the children’s multimodal texts. Other scholars (e.g., Rowe, 2010; Wohlwend, 2009, 2015; Zapata, 2013) suggest that the compositions of young writers cannot be separated from the social world and are influenced by social participation in classroom practices.

Several studies investigated the affordance of pictures in the multimodal compositions of young children (Martens et al., 2012; Mills, 2011; Pantaleo, 2017b; Ranker, 2009, 2012; Zapata, 2013). They found that when children were taught a metalanguage of art and design, they could use these to discuss multimodal texts (Pantaleo, 2014a, 2014b, 2017b). Pantaleo (2017b) found that this metalanguage was not consistently applied in their discussions of their own multimodal productions. For some elements of art and design students could only describe their use rather than provide an explanation for why they utilized them in their work. However, this language gave students a tool to relay their thinking and provide insight to the decisions they made during this process.

Summary

…Literally from cover to cover…the picturebook is an art object, an aesthetic whole; that is, every one of its parts contributes to the total
effect, and therefore every part is worthy of study and interpretation (Sipe, 2006, p. 135).

Reading aloud picturebooks to children provides an avenue for literary discussions to occur that afford diverse interpretive responses. In many instances, these literary discussions are mediated by the social talk during read-alouds that allows for collectively forming new understanding (Mercer, 2000; Pantaleo, 2007). Through children’s responses, we can decipher how they interpret and develop literary understanding (Sipe, 2008a).

Picturebooks are a prominent form of literature in the lives of young children. Scholars have worked to define picturebooks and evaluate the relationship between the words and pictures that create a unifying story; however, children’s responses to this relationship are almost non-existent or a secondary focus in the literature (Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Pantaleo, 2002). Researchers have explored the ways children respond to pictures (e.g., Kiefer, 1995; Sipe & Brightman, 2005; Walsh, 2003) and postmodern picturebooks, which often have complex interactions between words and pictures. Postmodern picturebooks have opened up an avenue for more discussion and research about word-picture relationships (e.g., Pantaleo, 2002; Arizpe & Styles, 2016). Further research is needed to explore the ways that children navigate a diverse range of word-picture relationships across genres of picturebooks.

Ways of communicating are shifting further from the printed page to the screen, and the modal resources young children interact with daily move beyond the written word and image to include sound and movement, for example (Dalton, 2012; Kress,
Screen-based multimodal texts—interactive digital books, video games, social media, and tablet and iPad applications—are not just out-of-school literacies but are used for in-school purposes as well (Dalton, 2012). The prevalence of tablets and iPads in young children’s lives further their interest in digital composing of multimodal texts, even with younger children (Dalton, 2012).

The picturebook—a familiar form of literature and sophisticated multimodal text—offers a pathway for young children to navigate and understand the composing processes of multimodal texts. In picturebooks, not only do they have to use words, pictures, and design elements, they have to use them effectively. Words and pictures are modal resources that “offer certain affordances, and the interaction between [these] modes [are] significant for communication” (Dalton, 2012, p. 334). Young children are no longer expected to be just writers that command the written word, but designers of sophisticated multimodal texts (e.g., the picturebook). This study seeks to further the understanding of young children’s picturebook-making processes to further the discussion around multimodal composition.

In the following chapter, I present the research method of this study, including the research design, participants, data collection and analysis, and synthesis of the data.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

In this chapter, I detail the embedded, single-case study approach used to describe the ways second-graders respond to and apply word-picture relationships in their contemporary realistic and fantasy picturebook productions. After providing a rationale for this methodological approach, I describe the (a) participants and context for this study, (b) roles of the researcher and facilitator, (c) rationale for genre selections, (d) word-picture relationships selected, (e) pilot studies for picturebook selection and interactive read-aloud protocol, (f) data collection procedures, and (g) data analysis procedures. Lastly, the chapter concludes with the trustworthiness measures utilized in this study.

Embedded, Single-Case Study Approach

To address the research questions, an embedded, single-case study design was used to conduct this study. Case studies are considered a feasible research method for education research (Yin, 2014b) and are useful for addressing “how” and “why” research questions (Yin, 2014a). According to Yin (2014a), the strength of the case study method is its ability to investigate a “contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) in depth and within its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident” (p. 16).

Variations exist in case study research methods. First, case studies can be holistic or embedded. In this study, there are embedded units of analysis, or “subcases” (Yin, 2014b), within the larger, single case (Yin, 2014a, 2014b). Embedded designs are
appropriate for investigating cases with smaller units of analysis that provide additional data to represent the case (Yin, 2014a). The units of analysis for this study are two genre-studies: contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy. In an embedded case design, analyses of patterns/themes not only occur holistically at the case level, but within, between, and across the units of analysis. Yin (2014a) noted that with embedded case studies, the researcher must be careful to return to the larger unit of analysis, or the “original phenomenon of interest” (p. 56).

Secondly, there are single- and multiple-case study designs. Single-case studies allow for careful attention of one case (Yin, 2014a). Single-case study designs are justifiable when examining a “common case” (i.e., a single individual or group that reveal insight into an everyday situation) (Yin, 2014a, p. 52). A second-grade classroom, a common case, can reveal insights into how young children respond to and apply word-picture relationships in picturebooks.

Finally, case studies may be exploratory, explanatory, or descriptive (Yin, 2014a). The current study is a descriptive case study, which seeks to “describe a phenomenon (the ‘case’) in its real-world context” (Yin, 2014a, p. 238). In this study, the phenomenon of interest is second-grade children’s oral responses to picturebooks during interactive read-alouds and application of word-picture relationships during picturebook making. See Figure 3.1 for an overview of the embedded, single-case study design.
Participants and Context

In traditional case studies, one person is usually defined as the case (Yin, 2014a); however, in this study, a second-grade classroom served as the larger unit of analysis. Participants in this study are children enrolled in the second-grade classroom being investigated. See Table 3.1 for an overview of the phenomena being studied in the case study of second-grade children and the corresponding research questions.

Studies suggest that in the primary grades, children rely heavily on pictures as a meaning making resource (e.g., Beck & McKeown, 2001; Sipe, 2008a; Walsh, 2003). However, Aukerman and Schuldt (2016) found that second-grade children gradually shifted towards increased references to words and lesser use of pictures over the course of the school year. In this study, I selected a second-grade classroom to extend their work and others (e.g., Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Sipe, 2008a; Walsh, 2003) by investigating ways young children attended to pictures, words, and their relationships when making meaning of the picturebook.

In this study, the second-grade classroom was selected based on the following criteria: (a) use of interactive read-alouds (Barrentine, 1996) during daily literacy instruction, (b) regular opportunities for literary discussions—talk about and around
books, and (c) daily time was dedicated to children’s writing and/or creating texts.

Criteria for classroom selection ensured that children were familiar with interactive read-aloud procedures and discussing books with others. Increased familiarity with book discussions were more likely to lead to children’s engagement in the initial read-alouds of the study. In relation to the picturebook-making component of this study, it was beneficial to have instructional writing time built into the classroom schedule.

Table 3.1

*Phenomena of Study and Corresponding Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon of Study</th>
<th>Corresponding Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The responses of second graders to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across narrative genres (contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy).</td>
<td>What is the nature of second-graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of word-picture relationships in second graders’ picturebook productions for each narrative genre (contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy).</td>
<td>In what ways do second-graders use word-picture relationships in their own contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebook productions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decision-making process (related to word-picture relationships) of second graders’ in designing their own picturebook productions for each narrative genre (contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy).</td>
<td>How do second-graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District, School, and Classroom Context**

Bluebird Elementary (a pseudonym), the setting for this investigation, is in a rural town neighboring the local university. Because of the university’s proximity, Bluebird has more ethnic and linguistic diversity than other elementary schools in South-Eastern
School District (a pseudonym). University faculty living in the area are known to enroll their children in Bluebird.

**The school district.** During the time of the study, the South-Eastern School District served 16,300 students in prekindergarten through twelfth grade in 14 elementary schools, five middle schools, four high schools, one vocational school, and three special schools. Approximately half of the student population (57.6%) lived in poverty as indicated by qualifying for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Medicaid, and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), placement into foster care, and/or homelessness. Approximately one-fifth of students (19.3%) were identified as high performers in academic and/or artistic areas and were served by the gifted and talented program.

South-Eastern School District designed a literacy model for elementary schools that required 90-120 minutes of literacy instruction daily. The model included reading workshop, word study, and writing workshop. The model was designed to provide differentiated learning, rely on research-based best practices, and address the National Reading Panel’s (2000) components: phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle/phonics, comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency. See Figure 3.2 for an overview of the South-Eastern School District Literacy Model for Elementary Schools.
Figure 3.2. Overview of the South-Eastern School District Literacy Model for Elementary Schools

The school. Bluebird Elementary, with an enrollment of approximately 864 prekindergarten through fifth-grade students, was the largest elementary school for this district. Approximately 71% of the students were white, 13% were African American, 10% were Asian, four percent were biracial/multiracial, two percent were Hispanic, and less than one percent was American Indian/Alaska Native. Approximately one-fourth (27.8%) of the student population lived in poverty, which is significantly below the district percentage of 57.6. Bluebird has one four-year-old kindergarten, six five-year-old kindergartens, seven first grades, six second grades, six third grades, six fourth grades, and six fifth grades. The average pupil-teacher ratio was 21:1. Several special services were available for students: English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Gifted and Talented, resource, special education, and speech pathology. One reading coach and one reading interventionist were on site at Bluebird.
Bluebird Elementary received a rating of Excellent from a range of At-Risk, Below Average, Average, Good, and Excellent on their 2015 State Report Card. According to the South Carolina Department of Education, 34% of third through fifth graders at Bluebird Elementary were not meeting readiness standards in English language arts (ELA) on SC READY, South Carolina’s statewide assessment for all students in grades three through eight. More specifically, in the areas of “meaning and context” and “language, craft, and structure,” approximately one-third of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 demonstrated low performance. “Meaning and context” and “language, craft, and structure” correspond to the reading literary texts strand on the South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Standards (SCCCRS), which focuses on making meaning from and understanding the construction of texts.

In the areas of “meaning, context, and craft” under the strand of writing on the SCCCRS, approximately one-fourth of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 demonstrated low performance. “Meaning, context, and craft” focuses on organizing and crafting texts to relay ideas and narratives. Scores indicated that appropriately one-third of children were not meeting expectations, which indicated a need for additional instruction in the reading areas “meaning and context” and “language, craft, and structure.” In addition, one-fourth of children not meeting expectations in “meaning, context, and craft” suggested further instruction is needed to develop literary craft (construction of texts). The categorization of “maintained consistency of low performance in grades 3-5” suggests low performance may be present in grades K-2 as well.
The classroom. Mrs. Bryant described literacy stations (e.g., independent reading and writing), individual reading conferences, writer’s and reader’s response notebooks, word study, and whole group read-alouds as part her daily literacy instruction. Writing, independent reading, and word study approaches were all observed at various times of the school day during the duration of the study. On several mornings I came into the classroom during the final minutes of whole-group word study lessons. Observed word study lessons focused on identifying words with the same spelling pattern as the initial word given by Mrs. Bryant. For example, if the initial word was tail, children came to the white board and added words like *pail, mail*, and *sail*. On several occasions I observed children writing in their reader’s response notebooks to respond to a picturebook read aloud earlier in the day. In these notebooks, children were given one or several writing prompts that corresponded to reading standards and strategies (e.g., visualizing and inferring). Writing prompts were provided on a cut-and-paste worksheet that children glued into their composition notebooks. During observations children’s writing in their reader’s response notebooks relied heavily on words with little no pictures supporting their ideas; this was further confirmed in my reviews of their reader’s response notebook.

Other observations of writing included children at the writing station during the literacy stations block. Children had free choice to write about any topic in their writer’s notebook (composition notebooks). During several observations children were making lists, which included writing the names of children in the class in alphabetical order, making a list of names for invitations for a play date, and listing character names for a play. I reviewed the writer’s notebooks of all 20 children in this study and found the use
of lists prevalent across many children’s notebooks (e.g., “the top six college football teams” and “my favorite water rides at water parks”). Though pictures were limited in children’s writer’s notebooks, they drew face emojis (icons to express emotions and ideas) in connection with their writings. Several children almost exclusively had back and forth conversations with classmates, which mirrored the format of text messages; these conversations were speech bubbles pointed in opposite directions and on different sides of the page depending on the writer. Several children did show a preference for pictures; these were often used within comics they designed. Writing, either as literacy station or response activity was prevalent in this classroom. However, observations indicated less attention was given to visual modes (e.g., pictures) of communication in connection to writing tasks.

Read-alouds were a daily activity in Mrs. Bryant’s classroom and book selections for read-alouds were often connected to the thematic units she planned to address social studies and science standards. She primarily read fictional picturebooks in her classroom in connection to the science and social studies content. In addition, Mrs. Bryant selected one read-aloud as the core book for the week, which meant she referenced the book throughout the week to address different instructional objectives. For example, during a weekly engineering unit, her core read-aloud book was *Rosie Revere, Engineer* (Beaty & Roberts, 2013). Mrs. Bryant also determined read-aloud picturebooks based on the reading units she purchased on online educational marketplaces (e.g., Teachers Pay Teachers); these units were the basis for the reader’s response notebooks. For example, the Halloween reading unit was based around activities for *Crankenstein* (Berger &
In addition to read-alouds, Mrs. Bryant used digital stories (e.g., read-alouds from YouTube) throughout the day; these digital stories were read aloud to the children by a narrator and often connected to the thematic unit and/or English language arts standards for the week. During these observations, children did not stop during the digital stories to discuss the books but discussed them after the read-aloud.

**The teacher.** At the time of this study, Mrs. Bryant was in the fourteenth year of her teaching career. She held a Master of Education degree and was a National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) in Early and Middle Childhood/Literacy: Reading-Language Arts. She described her philosophy of teaching reading and writing as one that included engaging and authentic real-world literacy practices. Mrs. Bryant believed that “children become readers when they are developmentally ready and that can be at different times for all children” (personal communication, September 8, 2017). Mrs. Bryant considered teaching reading and writing one of her strengths and felt that reading was important for every aspect of life. She described her ultimate goals for teaching: “When I first meet parents, I tell them I have two goals: 1) the children enjoy coming to school, and 2) they love books. If I accomplish these two goals, I feel we have had a good year” (interview, May 2, 2018). For Mrs. Bryant, literacy instruction was critical for students’ success and therefore, emphasized in her classroom.

**Students.** Of the 21 children in the class, one child was not given parent permission to participate in the study. No new children entered the class or moved during the study. Therefore, there was a great deal of stability in the class during the period of data collection. In addition, this was the second year that the teacher and children were
together; the students looped from first to second grade with Mrs. Bryant. Of the 20 children participating in this study, 15 were White, two were Black, two were Asian American, and one was Mexican American. One Asian-American student was an emergent bilingual and fluent in Mandarin. There were 9 boys and 11 girls participating in this study. Four children (20% of the class) qualified for the school’s free or reduced lunch program. One child received speech services, one received resource services, and two received reading intervention using Fountas and Pinnell’s Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI).

In this study, four of the children were selected for more in-depth interviews. The four children were selected to ensure variation of interview participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested variation gives the “context its unique flavor” (p. 201) and therefore, generates information that is more inclusive of the diverse participants within the case. Approximately two weeks into the contemporary realistic fiction read-alouds, four students were purposively selected (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) for picturebook interviews. With Mrs. Bryant’s assistance, I selected interviewees to ensure variation in gender, amount of talk/participation during discussions (low participation versus high participation), and motivation/interest in reading (reluctant versus avid readers). All students chosen for interviews were viewed as likely to share in a one-on-one interview setting. Reluctant and avid readers were identified by their likelihood to choose reading as a center or free-choice activity.
Role as Researcher

Participant-observation is a “method in which a researcher takes part in the daily activities, rituals, interactions, and events of a group of people….,” (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2010, p. 12). During this study, I was a complete participant (Jorgensen, 1989) on the continuum of participant-observation, which includes: nonparticipation, passive participation, moderate participation, active participation, and complete participation (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2010). As a complete participant, I took on a role of full membership within the classroom by participating in the activities around the phenomenon being studied. During complete participation, the researcher takes on an analytical stance, “at least partially during the research period and more completely after the period of participation” (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2010, p. 30). During interactive-read alouds and picturebook-making sessions, I remained cognizant of my role as researcher. I noted relevant talk and behaviors during my participation in the study; however, analysis of my notes and data primarily occurred after the research period when I immersed myself in the data.

Role as Teacher/Facilitator

An advantage of complete participation is a more comprehensive perspective of the phenomenon than what occurs with simply observing (Jorgensen, 1989). However, by participating in the study, I recognized the influence of the participants on my actions and my influence on their talk and behaviors—a reciprocal influence (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). By planning and facilitating the 18 interactive read-alouds and ten picturebook-making sessions, my influence was unavoidable. However, as recommended in the
literature, I continually engaged in self-reflection at the end of each read-aloud and picturebook-making session and considered ways I impacted the data (Atkins & Wallace, 2012; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Kolb, 2012). In my self-reflections, I developed a more cognizant awareness of my talk with students and its influence on their responses and discussion.

Interactive read-alouds were designed with open-ended prompts to avoid leading children to specific types of responses; however, prompts were designed to elicit children’s attention to and thinking about word-picture relationships (see Appendix A). Furthermore, after children responded, either prompted or unprompted, I had follow-up prompts that encouraged children to provide explanations and reasoning for their thinking. In my responses to children, I sometimes provided the language they needed to discuss their thoughts. For example, when a child described the gutter in the opening without knowing the term, I responded by using the term in my response. In addition, if I noticed confusions or misunderstandings, I responded in ways that would support their meaning making of the text.

I facilitated picturebook-making sessions and provided support during their picturebook making. In each session, I led brief 5- to 10-minute whole-group discussions for children to ask questions prior to picturebook making and highlight 2-3 features of the interactive read-aloud picturebooks (e.g., peritextual features). Children felt comfortable coming to me to discuss their picturebooks and asked questions during the picturebook making process. I became an insider in this classroom, which meant that my attendance in the classroom and interactions with the children were viewed as normal (Jorgensen,
Children recognized my role as someone to support their understanding and construction of the picturebook as apparent in their talk with me.

I recognized that my role as researcher did not trump my ethical obligation to these children; this resulted in blurred lines of teacher and researcher. Read-alouds and picturebook-making sessions required significant instructional time and therefore I wanted these activities to be valuable learning experiences for these young children. Consequently, despite my intentionality to minimally influence the data, I engaged with and supported children’s construction of narrative meaning during read-alouds and engaged in conversation with children around their picturebooks. It should be noted that at no point in the study did I explicitly teach word-picture relationships, nor did I encourage children to attend to them in their picturebook making.

**Rationale for Narrative Genres**

In order to explore children’s responses within and across genres, the picturebooks selected had to be representative of multiple genres. Genres are categorized by patterns found in the format, structure, and content of the story (Duke & Purcell-Gates, 2003). Realistic fiction and fantasy were selected as the two genres for this study. By definition, realistic fiction and fantasy juxtapose each other. Realistic fiction is set in contemporary society with characters, events, and settings that are conceivable in the real world (Galda & Cullinan, 2016). Fantasy, in contrast, challenges reality; characters, actions, and settings are free from needing to stay within the realm of possibility (Latrobe, Brodie, & White, 2002). Although research is mixed on young children’s genre preference (Duke, Bennett-Armistead, & Roberts, 2003), young children enjoy
contemporary narratives and are capable of separating fantasy from reality (Kiefer, Hickman, & Hepler, 2007).

There is sufficient research to suggest that young children most often encounter narrative genres in their classrooms (Duke, 2000; Moss, 2008; Yopp & Yopp, 2012). Realistic fiction and fantasy are two narrative genres that children likely have frequent exposure to and therefore have some knowledge about the conventions of these two genres. By selecting familiar genres for this study, children could potentially navigate the complexities of word-picture relationships within the familiarity of realistic fiction and fantasy. Aside from genre, picturebooks were selected based on appropriateness for interactive read-alouds for young children; content, developmental level, and interest levels determined picturebooks selected for this study. After perusing over 150 picturebooks, the selection was narrowed down to nine fantasy and nine realistic fiction (see Table 3.2). Picturebooks were confirmed to represent the intended genre during the pilot study of word-picture relationships (see next section).

**Word-Picture Relationships**

To identify word-picture relationships for this study, discussions of Agosto (1999), Golden (1990), and Lewis (2001a) were considered; however, the primary resource for identifying word-picture relationships was Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) due to the range and complexity of interactions within their typology. Using Nikolajeva and Scott’s definitions as a guide, the following word-picture relationships were selected and defined:
• symmetry—words and pictures tell the same story; both loosely provide the same information;
• enhancement—words and pictures extend each other’s meaning; pictures enhance the meaning of the words or words expand upon the pictures; and
• counterpoint—words and pictures provide alternative information; neither words nor pictures can tell the same story alone.

Word-picture relationships are complex; the types chosen for this study (i.e., symmetry, enhancement, and counterpoint) are not intended to fully represent the ways words and pictures interact with each other. Rather, the intent of this study is to investigate these three dominant and diverse relationships.

**Pilot Study of Word-Picture Relationships**

A professor who teaches courses in children’s literature served as a rater to determine agreement of the word-picture relationship of each picturebook. The rater was given a definition of each relationship with an exemplar picturebook to read through that was representative of the word-picture relationship. Without discussion between the rater and myself, the definition and exemplar served to explain the relationship. A form for each genre was created for the rater to mark the word-picture relationship of each picturebook. Books of each genre were presented separately with the word-picture relationship randomly organized to ensure no preconceptions beforehand of the word-picture relationship. The rater read each book to identify the word-picture relationship. Interrater agreement was high at .93. See Table 3.2 for a list of picturebook selections identified by genre and word-picture relationship.
Table 3.2

*Picturebook Selections by Genre and Word-Picture Relationship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word-Picture Relationship</th>
<th>Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symmetrical</td>
<td>• <em>Dear Primo</em></td>
<td>• <em>Leave Me Alone!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>The Snowy Day</em></td>
<td>• <em>A Sick Day for Amos McGee</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Thunder-Boomer!</em></td>
<td>• <em>The Curious Garden</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>• <em>The Sound of Silence</em></td>
<td>• <em>One Cool Friend</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Silly Billy</em></td>
<td>• <em>Mr. Tiger Goes Wild</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>They All Saw a Cat</em></td>
<td>• <em>Sam &amp; Dave Dig a Hole</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>• <em>Rosie’s Walk</em></td>
<td>• <em>Come Away from the Water, Shirley!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Sidewalk Circus</em></td>
<td>• <em>Lily Takes a Walk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Grandpa Green</em></td>
<td>• <em>This is Not My Hat</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pilot Study of Interactive Read-Aloud Protocol**

Interactive read-alouds provided the context for children’s responses to word-picture relationships in this study. I adapted the interactive read-aloud protocol of Fullerton (2017; see Appendix A). The interactive read-aloud protocol is designed to support students’ meaning making of the picturebook and attends to a specified focus for the read-aloud. In this study, the focus was on attending to information in words and pictures and the relationship between the two. The protocol included procedures for before, during, and after reading the story. After adapting the protocol, I designed an interactive read-aloud for the picturebook, *Sam and Dave Dig a Hole* (Barnett & Klassen, 2014). In an elementary school, where I previously taught, I conducted the interactive read-aloud with a second-grade class. The elementary school for the pilot was approximately 45 minutes from the research site and in a different school district.
Prior to the interactive read-aloud, I observed the second-graders during an interactive read-aloud with their teacher. Observations gave me insight into the responses of these second-graders’ and their experiences with examining word-picture relationships. Several weeks after the observation, I conducted the interactive read-aloud of *Sam and Dave Dig a Hole*. By conducting the read-aloud, I determined that the prompts I developed—even those that were open-ended and less specific (e.g. “What are you noticing?”)—gave insight into the ways these children attended to information in words and pictures and the interactions between the two. In several openings, students became deeply engaged in deciphering the meaning of the pictures and how it connected to the words and overall meaning of the story. By using prompts designed to encourage discussion and further thinking (e.g., “Talk more about your thinking” and “What made you think that?”) students were able to converse with their peers and reflect on their own interpretations of the story. Conducting the pilot study gave me insight into the ways my prompts impacted responses. Similar prompts from the pilot study were used when planning the interactive read-alouds in this study.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected from October 9 through December 15, 2017. Over the course of ten weeks, the children participated in two four-week genre studies in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy and one week of interviews. An additional week was needed to account for holidays and other schedule disruptions. Table 3.3 provides an overview of the genre-study procedures for both contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy. The procedures included three weeks of interactive read-alouds and one week of picturebook
making; these are described further in this section. Both genres followed the same procedures.

Table 3.3

*Genre-Study Procedures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1: Symmetry</th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong> Whole-group read-aloud of picturebook A (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2:</strong> Whole-group read-aloud of picturebook B (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3:</strong> Whole group read-aloud of picturebook C (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 2: Enhancement</th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong> Whole-group read-aloud of picturebook A (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2:</strong> Whole-group read-aloud of picturebook B (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3:</strong> Whole group read-aloud of picturebook C (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3: Counterpoint</th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong> Whole-group read-aloud of picturebook A (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2:</strong> Whole-group read-aloud of picturebook B (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3:</strong> Whole group read-aloud of picturebook C (30-45min.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4: Picturebook Making</th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong> Planning the picturebook (45 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days 2-5:</strong> Picturebook-making sessions (~40-50 min. each day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This investigation was conducted in two phases that overlapped at times across the two narrative genre studies. In Phase One, I collected video recordings of children’s responses to the picturebooks during interactive read-alouds. In addition, interviews were conducted with four children regarding their interpretation of words and pictures and the interactions of word and pictures in read-aloud picturebooks. In Phase Two, unstructured interviews and observational notes were taken of children during picturebook-making.
sessions, with particular attention focused on their decision-making. Interviews were conducted with all 20 children to discuss their picturebook productions (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4

Phases of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Cycle</th>
<th>Focusing on</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1:</strong> Data collection during interactive read-alouds and read-aloud picturebook interviews</td>
<td>Conducting and video recording responses to word-picture relationships during whole-group interactive read-alouds of picturebooks</td>
<td>All child participants with permission to participate ( (n = 20) )</td>
<td>Transcriptions of interactive read-aloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Realistic Fiction: Mid-Late October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fantasy: Mid-Late November</td>
<td>Conducting and video recording interviews on word-picture relationships in selected read-aloud picturebooks (after interactive read-alouds)</td>
<td>four children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Data Collection: 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2:</strong> Data collection during picturebook-making sessions and conducting interviews focused on picturebook productions</td>
<td>Observing and video recording unstructured interviews with children during picturebook-making process</td>
<td>All child participants with permission to participate ( (n = 20) )</td>
<td>Observational notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Realistic Fiction: Early November</td>
<td>Conducting and recording semi-structured interviews with individual children about their picturebook productions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fantasy: Early December</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transcriptions of interviews (with all 20 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Data Collection: 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picturebook productions (artifacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours of Data Collection: 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1: Responses to Word-Picture Relationships

The initial phase of data collection addressed the research question: *What is the nature of second-graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres?* Both the contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genre studies followed the same procedures.

**Interactive Read-Alouds**

In the genre studies, the second-graders and I explored word-picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. In each genre study, children participated in nine whole-group interactive read-alouds occurring over three weeks. Each week was dedicated to exploring a different word-picture relationship: symmetry (week 1), enhancement (week 2), and counterpoint (week 3). For each word-picture relationship, I conducted three interactive read-alouds with picturebooks classified by that relationship (see Table 3.2). For this study, interactive read-alouds were conducted in the morning before students went to their related arts class (e.g., physical education, art, and music) and lasted from 30-45 minutes. Due to scheduling issues (i.e., travel and holidays), three interactive read-alouds were conducted in the late afternoon following their recess block; the same amount of time was given for these interactive read-alouds. All interactive read-alouds were video recorded. One video recorder was placed beside me—the reader—and facing the group of children and one was placed to the side of the group of children; two video recorders allowed for different video angles to ensure all children were in at least one video and provided a backup for any recording failures with either video recording device.
The interactive read-alouds (see Appendix A for protocol) were designed to encourage high levels of response and discussion of the picturebook, more specifically the word-picture relationships within each picturebook. I began each interactive read-aloud by introducing the picturebook. Introductions included the title, names of the author and illustrator, a brief introduction of the story, question(s) to activate children’s prior knowledge related to the content of the picturebook, and setting a purpose for reading, which always focused on attending to word-picture relationships. During introductions, children were invited to respond to the peritextual features: the book jacket, front and back covers, end pages, title page, and half-title page.

During reading, I planned several stopping points. Stopping points focused on prompting students to attend to words, pictures, and the interaction between words and picture. During the first interactive read-aloud of each week (Day 1 in Table 3.3), I prompted children to attend more heavily to word-picture relationships (e.g., “What are you noticing about the words and pictures?” and “Are the words and picture telling you the same [or different] information? Why do you think that?”). On the second and third read-alouds of each week (Day 2 and 3 in Table 3.3), I prompted discussion around words and pictures, but used more open-ended prompts (e.g., “What are you thinking?” and “What are you noticing?”). Word-picture relationships were brought to their attention on Day 1 to encourage recognition of ways words and pictures provide information and give the children language to discuss the relationships. Word-picture relationships were brought to their attention on Days 2 and 3, but by providing more open-ended responses,
children responded to what drew their attention to the words and pictures, and more specifically, the interactions between the words and pictures.

After reading, the children were prompted to discuss the overall meaning of the story, reflect on ways words and pictures were used in the story, discuss pages of interest from the picturebook, and give their opinion of the picturebook. Each read-aloud varied slightly due to children’s engagement with and their responses to the picturebooks. In addition, timing impacted the execution of the read-alouds. In some cases, children’s responses focused heavily on particular pages of the picturebook, which left less time after the read-aloud for discussion. However, the protocol for the interactive read-alouds remained consistent throughout the study.

**Picturebook Interviews**

At the end of each genre study, I visited the classroom and conducted interviews in the morning. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with four children (20% of participants); the same children were interviewed for each genre. These interviews focused on their interpretations of word-picture relationships and overall meaning making with pictures, words, and design elements (e.g., layout and typography) of the picturebook. For the contemporary realistic fiction genre and the fantasy genre, three picturebooks were selected with one from each word-picture relationship: symmetry, enhancement, and counterpoint (see Table 3.5). Picturebooks used for interviews were used in the read-aloud portion of the study; this provided additional insight into children’s thinking around those picturebooks. For each picturebook, two or three openings, or double-page spreads, were selected for the semi-structured interviews.
Openings were selected based on their strong representation of a specific word-picture relationship (see Table 3.6 for examples).

Table 3.5

*Picturebooks Selected for Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Picturebook Selections</th>
<th>Word-Picture Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td><em>Dear Primo</em> (2010) Written and Illustrated by Duncan Tonatiuh</td>
<td>Symmetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Grandpa Green</em> (2011) Written and Illustrated by Lane Smith</td>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td><em>Leave Me Alone!</em> (2016) Written and Illustrated by Vera Brosgol</td>
<td>Symmetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mr. Tiger Goes Wild</em> (2013) Written and Illustrated by Peter Brown</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Come Away from the Water Shirley</em> (1977) Written and Illustrated by John Burningham</td>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four children were interviewed individually. Using the interview protocol (see Appendix B), each child was asked to discuss their interpretations of ways the words and pictures interacted on the page and consider the whys behind those interactions (e.g., “How do the words and pictures go together on this page?” and “Why do you think the
author/illustrator did that?”). In a separate space, outside the classroom, each child was interviewed. I began the interview by stating, “Today I am going to ask you some questions about the picturebook we read together. There are no right or wrong answers. I just want to find out what you think about these picturebooks.” Interviews were conducted for each genre separately. The three books for each genre were discussed one at a time (see Table 3.5). I introduced each picturebook by reading the title of the picturebook and asking students to describe what they remembered about the story. I then provided a brief introduction (2-3 sentences) of the story that included the names of main characters, the setting, and the problem and solution in the story. After introducing the picturebook, I began asking questions about the pre-selected openings (see Table 3.6 for examples).

At each opening, I read aloud the words on the page and began by saying, “Tell me what is happening on these pages.” The child’s responses influenced my follow-up questions. In some instances, I asked the child to explain their thinking further by making remarks such as: “Talk to me a bit more about that” or “When you say…., can you tell me what you mean?” “Why do you think that?” I then probed their thinking further by asking questions specific to their interpretations of word-picture relationships. Depending on their previous remarks, I asked several questions such as: “Are the words and picture telling you the same story? Why do you think that?” or “How do the words and picture go together on this page?” “Why do you think the author/illustrator did that?” “Why don’t the words and picture tell the same information on this page?” The number and nature of questions asked depended upon the child’s responses to previous questions and
their engagement in the interview and with the particular picturebook.

Interviews were conducted with three picturebooks per genre for a total of six picturebooks per children. Each interview ranged from 15-20 minutes and occurred across two days of the study. Interviews were video recorded to document children’s talk as well as movement and gestures. Examples of such movements included a child turning back to a page and referencing a different picturebook opening in their discussion or pointing to a particular scene in the pictures as they discuss. Thus, video provided contextual information about the child’s responses during the interview.
Table 3.6

*Example Openings for the Picturebook Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Opening</th>
<th>Selection Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Dear Primo* (2010)  Written and Illustrated by Duncan Tonatiuh* | Relationship: Symmetry  
Genre: Contemporary Realistic Fiction  
At the top of the page the words read,  
“In the morning I ride my bicicleta to school. I ride it past the *perros* and a *nopal.*” The pictures are a direct reflection of these words. The young boy is riding his bicycle with the *perros*—dogs—chasing him. The “*perros*” and “*nopal*” are labeled in the picture.  
On the bottom half of the page the words read, “I ride the subway to school. The subway is like a long metal snake, and it travels through the tunnels underground.” The picture shows the young boy in the subway. The subway is crafted with metallic coloring—silvers and golds—and sitting on the bottom of the page and placed upon a black background, which reflects being underground.  
If children attended solely to the words or the pictures on this page, they would have a strong understanding of this opening without attending to the other (words or pictures). |
| *Mr. Tiger Goes Wild* (2013)  Written and Illustrated by Peter Brown* | Relationship: Enhancement  
Genre: Fantasy  
The words across the bottom half of the page read, “…and he found that things were beginning to change….**” |
Without attending to the pictures, the reader would not know what began to change. The pictures enhance the words by giving additional information to the reader. Some animals are now walking on four legs instead of two and chasing each other. None of this information is relayed in the words.

Additionally, the animals’ emotions have changed. Across their faces the reader sees smiles instead of the flat-lined grimace that were on previous pages.

Come away from the water, Shirley (1977)
Written and Illustrated by John Burningham

Relationship: Counterpoint
Genre: Fantasy

The words on the left page read, “That’s the third and last time I’m asking you whether you want a drink, Shirley.” The reader can assume the words are dialogue from the woman or man in the picture. As they sit on the beach, talking to Shirley, but engaging in other tasks (reading the newspaper and pouring a drink), Shirley on the right page engages in battle with pirates.

Words and pictures do not align. Though the character mentioned in the words is in the opening, the two scenes do not seem to intertwine. On the left page, the words and pictures convey a family’s day at the beach. On the right, the character being spoken to does not appear to be in the same setting/scene as the other characters.

Phase 2: Making and Discussing Their Own Picturebooks

The second phase of data collection addressed the following research questions:

*In what ways do second-graders use word-picture relationships in their own*
contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebook productions? And How do second-graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks?

Picturebook making procedures were consistent across both contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres.

**Picturebook Making**

Following three weeks of interactive read-alouds and several days of interviews focused on discussing several picturebooks from the read-alouds, the children engaged in five days of picturebook making. Children crafted their own picturebooks for each genre. During the first picturebook-making session (Day 1 in Table 3.3), students were introduced to the available materials, including colored and plain paper, markers, crayons, colored pencils, black pens, scissors, adhesives, and staplers. In addition, I discussed the genre of the picturebook they were making that week, and children planned their picturebook by determining the main characters, setting, and the problem and solution in their story. The plan was used to help guide children through the development of story during the picturebook making process. However, children were allowed to modify their plan during picturebook making.

During the four days of picturebook making, the initial 5-10 minutes of each picturebook-making session was a mini-lesson focused on reviewing author, illustrative, or design techniques from several of the picturebooks from the read-alouds. I showed a preplanned opening or peritexual features (e.g., front and back cover, author’s note, and title-page) of the picturebook and asked children, “What is something interesting you
notice about these pages?” I emphasized one or two of their ideas and noted that these were ideas they could include in their own picturebook. For example, the picturebook *Grandpa Green* uses a page flap to hide and reveal additional information to the reader. In *Mr. Tiger Goes Wild*, several openings are in muted sepia tones except for the main character, Mr. Tiger, which has bright orange-striped fur that contrasts the rest of the page. When discussing these techniques, along with other textual features of picturebooks such as end pages and author’s notes, we briefly discussed why these techniques or features might be used in picturebooks. In conjunction with this information, children were continuously reminded that they had autonomy in the choices they made during the crafting of their picturebook. Following the initial discussion around picturebooks at the beginning of each picturebook-making session, children worked on crafting their own picturebooks. Each of the five sessions lasted 40-50 minutes for one session per day over five days.

Mrs. Bryant had previously arranged the children in small-groups at tables. As they crafted their picturebooks, they remained in this arrangement. I walked around the room at this time to support children during their picturebook making, as needed. For example, one child asked for guidance on how to start the first sentence of their picturebook. Another child was unsure about how to solve the problem she created for the characters in her picturebook. During those instances, we referred back to the read-aloud picturebooks as models for support. Children also sought support from fellow classmates both at their tables and at other tables around the room. When questions were asked of me as I visited tables, a child’s tablemates would often chime in with ideas to
answer their question with their own ideas. Children engaged in conversation with their fellow picturebook makers throughout the picturebook-making sessions.

**Unstructured Picturebook Making Interviews**

As I walked around the room, opportunities occurred for unstructured interviews (Patton, 2002) with children about their decision-making regarding their picturebook productions. When a child called me over to share their picturebook, I engaged them in brief conversation to further understand their choices. After the child described the part(s) of their picturebook they wanted to share with me, I prompted them to explain the whys behind their choices by saying “Talk to me about why you chose to….” I attached a video recorder to myself as I walked around the room and interacted with children. The video recorded remained running for the length of the picturebook-making session. Each interaction was brief (2-3 minutes) and was video recorded to provide insight into the decision-making of the child.

**Semi-Structured Picturebook Interviews**

After the five picturebook-making sessions were completed, all 20 children were individually interviewed and videotaped about their finalized picturebook production. Interviews occurred outside the classroom as I sat next to the child. Using the interview protocol as a guide (see Appendix C), I began each interview with an explanation of the interview process: “Today I am going to ask you some questions about the picturebook you made. There are no right or wrong answers. I just want to find out about your picturebook and how you made your picturebook.” After introducing the interview
process, I placed children’s picturebook productions in front of them. I asked children to
tell me what their picturebook was about and where they got the idea for the story. Then,
children read their picturebook to me. As children read their picturebook, I stopped and
asked them to discuss the use of words, pictures, and their interactions in the opening
(double-page spread), and the whys behind their decision-making. Prompts varied for
each opening depending on their previous responses and the design of the opening. I
prompted children to discuss the words and pictures in their stories and how they went
together by saying, “On this page you wrote [words on page]. Why did you make this
picture?” or “Why did you [highlight an area in words or pictures] on this page?” “How
do the words and pictures go together on this page? Why did you do that?” As we read
through their picturebooks together, more time was spent on some openings than others.
Peritextual features (e.g., front and back cover, end page, title page, and half title page)
that children utilized in their picturebooks were also discussed. After reading through
their picturebooks, children were asked to discuss any ideas they appropriated from the
picturebooks we read-aloud in class. I ended the interview by saying, “Thank you for
talking with me about your picturebook and answering my questions. Is there anything
else you’d like to tell me about the picturebook you made?” Interviews varied from 10-20
minutes depending on each child’s level of engagement, the length of their picturebook,
and the information each child wished to provide about their picturebook.

Summary of Data Sources

Multiple sources of data enhance the quality of the case study method (Yin,
2014a). In this study, I used following data sources to address the research questions:
participant-observation, video-recordings, interviews, and artifact collection. See Table 3.7 for an overview of the data sources that were collected.

**Participant-Observation**

Participant-observation meant that I was an active participant within the activities of this study: interactive read-alouds and picturebook-making sessions (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2010; Yin, 2014a). More specifically, I was a complete participant on the participant-observation spectrum (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2010), which meant that I took on full membership within the classroom community. Participant-observation allowed for increased understanding of the classroom context and the ability to engage with participants immediately rather than asking questions at a later time (Yin, 2014a). Immersion within the activities of the study gave me an increased access to participants in the study and opportunities to engage in conversation. However, a limitation to this source of evidence was my reliance on other sources of data to document children’s behaviors (nonverbal communication) and talk.

As noted by Lincoln and Guba (1985), the role of the participant observer is difficult because the “observer must play two roles simultaneously, that of observer and that of a legitimate and committed member of the group” (p. 274). Therefore, observational notes were not taken during interactive read-alouds because my role required complete participation during interactive read-alouds. However, quick and brief observational notes were taken during picturebook-making sessions when time allowed and were relevant to phenomena of study. Limited time resulted in focus during my note taking to the content of children’s talk that was overtly relevant the phenomena of study.
**Video Recordings**

Video recordings were valuable sources of observational data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Video recordings allowed for a more complete record of children’s talk and behaviors. Due to the limited time for note taking, video recordings allowed for more careful observation. As mentioned early in my procedures of data collection, video recordings were used to document all interactive read-alouds and interviews. Approximately 25 hours of video were collected in this study. Video recording data included, approximately 12 hours of interactive read-alouds, six hours of interviews with all 20 children about picturebook productions, two hours of read-aloud picturebook interviews with the four children, and five hours of unstructured interviews. All video recordings from interactive read-alouds and interview data were transcribed using Sipe’s (1996) transcription protocol.

**Interviews**

I interviewed children at several times throughout the study. A total of 48 semi-structured (Glesne, 2011) interviews were conducted in this study. An interview was conducted with the four selected children after each genre study for a total of eight read-aloud picturebook interviews. An interview was conducted with all 20 children after each genre study for a total of 40 interviews focused on children’s discussion of their picturebook productions (20 contemporary realistic fiction and 20 fantasy). Semi-structured interviews followed an interview protocol (Yin, 2011) as a way to guide the conversation (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). See Appendixes B and C for interview protocols.
Unstructured interviews (Patton, 2002) were conducted with children throughout the picturebook-making sessions for additional insight into their decision-making processes. Unstructured interviews were spontaneous and naturally occurring as a result of participant-observation fieldwork (Patton, 2002). All interviews were video recorded and analyzed as described in the data analysis section of this chapter.

Artifact Collection

Each genre study ended with picturebook-making sessions. Children’s finalized picturebook productions were collected and analyzed at the completion of the entire study. Picturebook productions were essential artifacts for analyzing children’s application of word-picture relationships. Picturebook productions were scanned into digital versions and placed into a multimodal transcript (Rogers, 2009) for analysis, as described in the data analysis portion of this chapter. I collected two picturebooks from each of the 20 children for a total of 20 contemporary realistic fiction and 20 fantasy picturebooks. In addition, I collected the planning pages that each child created during the initial day of the picturebook-making week of both genre studies.
### Table 3.7

**Summary of Data Sources to Address Research Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1</strong>: What is the nature of second graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres?</td>
<td>Transcriptions of video recordings of whole-group interactive read-aloud sessions (9 contemporary realistic fiction and 9 fantasy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2</strong>: In what ways do second graders use word-picture relationships in their own contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebook productions?</td>
<td>Picturebook productions (20 contemporary realistic fiction and 20 fantasy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3</strong>: How do second graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks?</td>
<td>Video recordings of unstructured interviews during picture bookmaking process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

In this study, qualitative methods were used to analyze the data collected. Data analysis procedures varied for each research question and were influenced by procedures of previous studies (Martinez & Harmon, 2012; Rogers, 2009; Sipe, 1996; Zapata, 2013). For each research question, the embedded units of analysis—contemporary realistic
fiction and fantasy genres—were analyzed, in addition to the larger unit of analysis, the case.

**Research Question 1: Responses to Word-Picture Relationships in Picturebooks**

In this section, I describe the analysis procedures to address the first research question:  
*What is the nature of second graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres?*  
In this analysis, I aimed to understand ways children responded to words, pictures, and their interactions to construct narrative meaning within contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks.

Transcriptions of the interactive read-alouds and semi-structured interviews video data were analyzed following similar procedures used by Sipe (1996) in his analysis of read-aloud transcriptions. Sipe used a three-phase coding cycle: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Analysis began by reading through the transcriptions of the interactive read-alouds and interviews to gain an understanding of the data by considering “What is this data a study of?” (Glaser, 1978, p. 57), which guided my attention more heavily to children’s interpretations of words, pictures, and their interactions.

After reading through the transcriptions, I used open coding to code each child’s conversational turn: “the utterance that occurred until someone else spoke” (Sipe, 1996, p. 131). When a conversational turn had two distinct units of meaning, which meant it was applicable to more than one code, it was coded twice (Sipe, 1996); this overlap in codes did not occur often in this study. During open coding, I noted the connections and
patterns beginning to emerge, at the same time, considering picturebook theory and research on children’s response to literature (e.g., Kiefer, 1995; Maloch & Beutel, 2010; Sipe, 2008a; Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001).

Through an inductive process of data analysis, the categories of data “emerged through the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis” (Patton, 1980, p. 306). However, when appropriate and at times during coding, coding names used by previous scholars were imposed on my codes. For example, *personal* is a type of response used by Sipe, 2008a; these personal connections emerged in my coding and therefore *personal* was used to label the code. Strauss (1987) described this process as “discovering new theory from previous theory” (p. 306). Maloch and Beutel (2010) followed similar procedures in their constant-comparison analysis of children’s responses; they imposed category names from Sipe (2000, 2002) and Oyler (1996) where appropriate. Though minimal, by referencing other empirical data in my coding process at times, my process suggested deductive reasoning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, my coding did not include only those identified by others; I focused on the data and allowed new ideas to emerge. Moreover, as I moved through the open coding process, I compared data to refine the names of the codes (Saldana, 2009).

After refining the codes, I trained a doctoral candidate in literacy education in the coding procedures, providing codes and a detailed definition (see Appendix D). Independently, we each coded 10 pages of two transcripts (one contemporary realistic fiction and one fantasy), and I then calculated interrater reliability using Miles and
Huberman’s (1984) recommendation. Interrater reliability was .82, within an acceptable
to strong reliability (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pederson, 2013).

Following open coding, I utilized axial coding to establish larger categories by
“making connections between a category and its sub-categories” (Strauss and Corbin,
1990, p. 97). I worked to sort and re-label open codes into conceptual categories
(Saldana, 2009; see Table 3.8), then utilized selective coding to further establish links
between the sources of data and give focus to the ways children responded to word-
picture relationships. In selective coding, “all categories and subcategories now become
systematically linked with the core category” (Saldana, 2009, p. 163). The core category
was the result of emerging themes in the categories of data that focused on the
phenomenon of study: *constructing meaning with word-picture relationships*. Figure 3.3.
demonstrates the process of open coding to axial coding. Figure 3.4 demonstrates the
development of the core category. In both tables, all data and categories are not
described; these are examples of the process.
**Figure 3.3.** Example of the Constant-Comparison Method of Analysis for Research Question Two

**Figure 3.4.** Example of Connecting Categories to the Core Category During Selective Coding
After working through all transcriptions of interactive read-alouds and semi-structured interviews about the read-aloud picturebooks, I noted patterns of responses across the larger case, the second-grade classroom. These patterns of responses were then examined more closely within the embedded units of analysis. As noted by Yin (2014b), embedded units act as “subcases;” therefore, I used an unordered meta-matrix described by Miles and Huberman (1994) for descriptive studies to conduct a cross-case analysis (see Appendix E). Miles and Huberman describe the meta-matrixes as a “master chart assembling descriptive data from each of the several cases in a standard format” (p. 178). In my analysis, I examined patterns of response within each contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres. I then compared these patterns across genres to look for similarities and differences in response.
Table 3.8

Summary of Categories and Sub-Categories of Responses with Representative Examples from Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Picturebook Read-Aloud Picturebook Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Response</th>
<th>Subcategories of Response</th>
<th>Representative Example from Transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Storyworld</td>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Go Away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting to Words and Pictures</td>
<td>World Knowledge/Content Knowledge</td>
<td>And I think elephants aren't too smart to think about their move and tortoises aren't fast enough to win.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Cause I have chickens and they do not walk like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intertextual</td>
<td>I'm noticing that the face, the light, kind of looks like those ghosts in Pac Man game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with Words and Pictures</td>
<td>Analyzing Plot</td>
<td>I think they dug into a different world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing Narrator</td>
<td>It's the little tiny fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing Characters</td>
<td>The reason that I don't think that his name is actually Grandpa Green because he wasn't always a grandpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with the Design</td>
<td>Artistic Craft</td>
<td>I think he took a picture of water, of real water, and then he cut it out, and then he put the fish on it, and then he drew it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary Craft</td>
<td>On the page with the worm, it says &quot;a cat&quot; but on the page with that it says &quot;the cat&quot; and &quot;a cat.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing Layout</td>
<td>Because I just think that was a really good choice to put the Spanish words ... and then put them down here and show them which one was which.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peritextual Analysis</td>
<td>If you look at the end pages, you can see that that's not the boat she used. That's the big boat with the pirates on. That's the boat with the pirates, it's not the boat she's been riding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picturebook as Production</td>
<td></td>
<td>When was the book published?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Analyzing and Making Meaning with the Pictures** | **Referencing Genre** | *If it's just a girl walking around, how is it fiction?*
|---|---|---
| **Defining Vocabulary Using Pictures** | **Describing Pictures** | *Yeah, samovar is a cup like that.*
| **Analyzing Plot Using Pictures** | *Look at the back cover behind the guy. The little thing, the little mouse is holding up the little balloon.*
| **Analyzing Narrator Using Pictures** | *If he was on the train, on the subway, then it would have to be two different pictures because you can't have two of the same people on a bike and a train at the same time.*
| **Analyzing Setting Using Pictures** | *Because they look different so you can figure out who's writing to each.*
| **Analyzing Character Using Pictures** | *Because of the picture, because it looks more like it's in America and that boy lives in America.*
| **Questioning Pictures** | *I think that she's sad actually, because she doesn't look that happy. I think she's sad that there's nobody to help her get up or something or she has no company.*
| **Analyzing the Words** | **Defining Vocabulary Using Words** | *Yeah, so it's like when you're pouting like ... You're sulking about it. She marches through the kitchen straight up to the door. Scooter scrambles after her. They both want out right now.*
| **Analyzing Plot Using Words** | *We don't know if it's a memory. Yes, we do, it said that.*
| **Analyzing Narrator Using Words** | *I think the mom's telling the story because it says "your father might have a good game with you when he's rested."*
| **Analyzing Character Using Words** | *It said "the cat" on the first page and "a cat" on the other page so it might be a different cat but they're the same. "The cat" and "a cat" are different cats.*
| **Questioning Vocabulary** | *What is that [word]?*
| **Contrasting Words and Pictures** | *It did not make sense because "That's the third and last time I'm*
Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship

asking you whether you want a drink, Shirley." But she's over here fighting the pirates. It's so weird and complicated to find out.

Connecting Words and Pictures

And so ... the worried part also goes with the whole page because of its color.

Analyzing the Relationship Across the Picturebook

On the first page, and on some page, it wasn't talking about the picture, but on like the first page it was.

Research Question 2: Use of Word-Picture Relationships in Picturebook Productions

In this section, I describe the analysis procedures to address the second research question: In what ways do second graders use word-picture relationships in their own contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebook productions? In this analysis, I aimed to understand ways children used words, pictures, and their interactions to convey narrative within their contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks.

Using the procedures described by Rebecca Rogers within Beach et al. (2009), I created a multimodal transcript, a breakdown of what and how modes were used within the design of a multimodal text. Rogers developed a multimodal transcript to analyze the patterns of modes, words and pictures, within the picturebook to convey meaning. Rogers’ transcript emphasized the connection of words and pictures within and across openings of the picturebook, which was applicable for the second research question of this study. Zapata (2013) used the multimodal transcript procedures of Rogers within her analysis of young children’s picturebook productions to understand ways children used composition resources and appropriated ideas from whole-group read-alouds and mentor
texts. I also examined the procedures and implementation of Rogers’ multimodal transcript within Zapata’s study for further guidance in my analysis of children’s picturebook productions.

The multimodal transcript allowed me to make sense of the ways the children crafted the words and pictures in their picturebook and explore the ways words and pictures interacted to relay meaning to the reader. I analyzed openings of the picturebook in isolation and returned to the overall use of word-picture relationships in the picturebook. I constructed the multimodal transcript by focusing on the three dimensions established by Rogers: descriptive analysis, grammar of design, and the book in context. Rogers’ dimensions of the multimodal transcript built on Kress’ (2004) idea of “the ‘motivated’ sign, which means that signs—gestures, languages, use of space—are never neutral, but rather reflect ‘the interests of its designer as much as the designer’s imagined sense of those who will see and read the ‘sign’” (p. 2). As I constructed the multimodal transcript, I considered ways these children, as designers, intentionally crafted their picturebook to convey a narrative.

I constructed a multimodal transcript for each child’s picturebook for each genre (see Appendix F). In total, 40 picturebooks were analyzed, 20 contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks and 20 fantasy picturebooks. For each opening, I developed a descriptive analysis, which included a thick description of the pictures and layout of words and pictures in each opening. In the “grammar of design” (p. 137) column, I analyzed the way the child used words and pictures to relay meaning. More specifically, I considered the ways words and pictures were crafted to provide information to the reader.
During my analysis, I asked, “What information is being told in the words?” “What information is being told in the picture?” and “How is this information relayed in the design?”

To better understand how children used words, pictures, and their relationship to convey narrative to the reader, I used a deductive approach and adapted components of Martinez and Harmon’s (2012) procedures for content analysis of word-picture relationships in published picturebooks. More specifically, I examined the ways words and pictures developed literary elements, character, plot, setting, and mood. Literary elements are the building blocks of the narrative and therefore, are an appropriate way to examine the ways children convey narrative within their own picturebooks (Martinez & Harmon, 2012). I considered Martinez and Harmon’s descriptions of the critical facets of each literary element: (a) character—traits and interests, emotions, behavior, and relationships; (b) plot—episodic, problem, and solution; (c) setting—time and place; and (d) mood—feelings evoked. Following their procedures, I conducted an opening-by-opening analysis and examined ways words and pictures conveyed the critical facets of the literary elements within each opening. I continued my deductive approach to the analysis and adapted the language of Golden (1990) and Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) to identify the interaction of words and pictures within the opening. Using Martinez and Harmon’s content analysis procedures for word-picture relationships and the language of Golden as well as Nikolajeva and Scott enabled me to more deeply analyze the grammar of design and understand further how the word-picture relationship contributed to the narrative in children’s picturebook creations.
When examining context, I focused on ways children’s picturebooks were informed by their social world and knowledge. Examining the genre of the picturebook was one aspect of context. I considered Rogers’ (2009) question, “…what textual and visual elements constitute this particular genre?” (p. 138). I noted the specific genre being relayed in the words or pictures of the opening (e.g., realistic fiction and fantasy).

Context was further analyzed by exploring themes and appropriation of ideas from other texts and read-aloud discussions. In addition, I analyzed each opening as an individual meaning-making system but then considered the opening in the context of the entire picturebook.

Once the multimodal transcript was complete, I conducted a global analysis (Martinez & Harmon, 2012) of the entire picturebook to determine the word-picture relationship for each picturebook. I initially used the word-picture relationships in this study—symmetrical, enhancement, and counterpoint—to classify each picturebook. I realized these relationships were not descriptive enough for the children’s picturebooks. For example, when children’s picturebooks relied heavily on words, enhancement did not adequately describe the ways words and pictured interacted within that picturebook. I then used Golden’s (1990) typology of word-picture relationships to categorize each picturebook: (a) words and pictures are symmetrical; (b) words depend on pictures for clarification; (c) pictures enhance, elaborates words, (d) words carry primary narrative, pictures were selective; and (e) pictures carry primary narrative, words are selective. Golden’s typology was more descriptive of the use of words and pictures within children’s picturebooks. In picturebooks, where the relationships of words and pictures
were inconsistent throughout the picturebooks (from one opening to another), the most
dominant relationship within the picturebook was selected and a note was made to
highlight the inconsistency of the relationship.

By conducting an opening-by-opening analysis of each child’s picturebook, I
gained insight into his or her use of words, pictures, and the relationship between the two
to convey meaning within each picturebook of the two genres. After completing the
multimodal transcript for each picturebook, I examined the ways word-picture
relationships were conveyed in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic
fiction genres. I created tables to summarize the use of words and pictures within each
genre (see Appendix G and H). Each table provided the word-picture relationship, brief
description of how words and pictures conveyed the literary elements, and then more
description of the ways plot, character, setting, and mood was conveyed within each
picturebook. Examination of these tables, in combination with the multimodal transcripts,
revealed similarities and differences in the use of words and pictures across contemporary
realistic fiction and fantasy genres.

**Research Question 3: Discussion and Decision-Making of Picturebook Productions**

In this section, I describe the analysis procedures to address the second research
question: *How do second-graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to
word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and
fantasy picturebooks?* In this analysis, I aimed to understand how and why children used
words, pictures, and their interactions within their contemporary realistic fiction and
fantasy picturebooks.
Transcriptions of each child’s semi-structured interview and unstructured video data about their own picturebook productions were analyzed using an inductive approach. I used the constant-comparison method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Analytic procedures were based upon Zapata’s (2013) analysis of children’s talk about and around their own picturebook productions.

Initial analysis of the data began with open coding the semi-structured and unstructured transcriptions, which allowed for “unrestricted coding of the data” (Strauss, 1987, p. 28). As I coded the transcriptions, I observed the interview video data as needed to clarify children’s discussion in the transcriptions. For example, the child’s gestures towards parts of the openings or turning back to previous openings during the interviews provided additional context to the transcriptions. During opening coding, categories began to emerge and I refined during the next step, axial coding (Strauss, 1987).

Essentially, as I moved through the data I compared the initial categories beginning to emerge and then refined the categories to better fit the data. See Appendix I for codes and definitions.

During axial coding, connections between codes were found and led to the development of categories; these categories were refined and identified by the connections emerging between the data. Categories of the data emerged that addressed the research question under study: intentional choices, reader awareness, appropriation, juxtaposing words and pictures, and peer designers (see Table 3.9). Figure 3.5 provides an example of the process that led to the category, intentional choices. Codes used in the figure are not representative of all codes, but instead represent a portion to serve as an
example. In the next analytic step, I engaged in selective coding. Selective coding means that the researcher “delimits coding to only those codes that relate to the core codes” (p. 33); this process involved identifying the ways the categories were connected to each other. The core category, or central phenomenon (Sipe, 1996), that emerged was the use and understanding of word-picture relationships in picturebook design.

Figure 3.5. Example of the Constant-Comparison Method of Analysis for Research Question Three

After analyzing transcription and video data across the contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres, I examined ways children discussed decision-making within and across each genre. I used an unordered meta-matrix (Miles & Huberman, 1994), which was described in the analysis procedures of research question one (see Appendix J). Using the meta-matrix allowed for a clearer comparison within and across the “subcases” (Yin, 2014b), or embedded units of analysis, contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres. I used the categories that emerged in my analysis of the data to guide the cross-case
analysis of the genres. Comparing categories across both genres provided further understanding of the ways genre influenced decision-making and discussion of their own picturebooks.

Table 3.9

*Summary of Categories and Sub-Categories of Responses with Representative Examples from Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Picturebook Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Representative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intentional Choices</td>
<td>Artistic craft</td>
<td><em>These are not the same colors, but I just decided to put blue and purple because I thought that they would blend in together well. Like good color partners</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary craft</td>
<td><em>I do all these different taglines, like the names, and all that, but in this story, I didn't actually mention his name. I just said &quot;the boy.&quot;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturebook design</td>
<td><em>I was going to do Olivia Can Do Baseball but then I noticed that I don't really have enough room. I could make it, but it just sounds like a really long title. And then I noticed that like nobody believes her, so she's the only one believing in her and her mother and her father. So, I just wrote, Olivia Can instead. (discussing peritextual feature)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-Picture relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Well I wanted it to be a smaller picture, and pay a little more attention to the words.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional choices</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I don't know.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Awareness</td>
<td>References awareness</td>
<td><em>Well, it started in an orphanage. So, it doesn't ... it's not in the orphanage for a long time. I wanted to trick the</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>Appropriating from read-aloud discussion</td>
<td>Like you could read this book completely without looking at the pictures, the little plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriating from read-aloud picturebooks</td>
<td>I knew in The Snow Day they went together, so I just wanted to copy a little bit off of it and get the pictures to match the words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriating from other texts</td>
<td>I got if from Stickman Shooter where people and cars and plans are attacking him and he shoots the people and they die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposing Words and Pictures</td>
<td>Juxtaposing words and pictures</td>
<td>The pictures tell a little bit more than the words, because the words can't tell that, well they kind of do equally because the words didn't tell that Mr. Tiger was crying because of that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Designer</td>
<td>Peer designer</td>
<td>Yeah, I didn't want to be paying too much attention to the pictures. I wanted it to be a little add-on like Walton did.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness, in qualitative research, is used to ensure rigor and quality of the study (Yin, 2014a). Establishing trustworthiness means attending to credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004). See Table 3.10 for an overview of the procedures that were used to increase trustworthiness of the study.

Table 3.10
### Procedures to Increase Trustworthiness of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>How Procedure Was Implemented in the Study</th>
<th>Sources Recommending Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Data Triangulation                     | Researcher collected multiple sources of data  
Researcher corroborated evidence from different sources to validate findings (see Table 3.7) | Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1995; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2014a         |
| Rich, Thick Description                | Researcher provided detailed descriptions of the case, data collection and analysis, and findings (in the dissertation) | Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1995; Stake, 2006                   |
| External Audits                        | Researcher documented all decisions and activities of the study (audit trail)                                  | Creswell & Miller, 2000; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Merriam, 1995                              |
| Peer Review                            | Researcher had chair and committee to determine if conclusion drawn is supported by the data  
Researcher had fellow doctoral candidate determine if the conclusions drawn are supported by the coded data | Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1995                                 |
| Case Study Database and Chain of Evidence | Researcher collected, organized, and secured data digitally in three locations (Dropbox, Google Drive, and computer hard drive)  
Researcher scanned or digitally photographed any paper copies of data (e.g., picturebook productions)  
Researcher provided evidence to support interpretations and conclusions drawn from the data (in Chapter 4) | Yin, 2014a                                                                                 |
**Credibility**

Credibility refers to the “confidence in the ‘truth’ of the findings” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290). Credibility is primarily useful for explanatory or causal studies (Yin, 2014a); however, there are ways to address credibility in descriptive case studies. Using multiple data sources enhances data credibility (Yin, 2014a). Guba (1981) suggested that multiple sources of data account for any weaknesses of a singular data source. In the current study, semi-structured and unstructured interviews, physical artifacts, participant-observations, and transcriptions of video recordings were all used to attend to the research questions. However, all sources were not used to address each question. This convergence of data, or data triangulation, strengthens the findings (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Merriam, 1995; Stake, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin, 2014a). For example, semi-structured and unstructured interviews and picturebook artifacts were used to draw conclusions about the decision-making of the second-graders in relation to application of word-picture relationships in their picturebook productions.

Additionally, I attended to my own researcher bias by acknowledging that during interviews my perspectives could potentially influence children’s responses and their responses may influence my questioning; this is referred to as reflexivity (Yin, 2014a). Yin (2014a) suggested that by recognizing this influence between interviewer and interviewee, I improved my case study interviews, and by using other sources of evidence to corroborate information from the interviews, I reduced reflexive influence on the study.
**Transferability**

Transferability refers to the “applicability of findings to other contexts” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290), or generalizability (Yin, 2014a). Yin (2014a) suggested that analytic generalization is helpful for case studies. Analytical generalization can be done by “(a) corroborating, modifying, rejecting, or otherwise advancing theoretical concepts that you referenced in designing your study or (b) new concepts that arose upon the completion of [the] case study” (Yin, 2014a, p. 41). In other words, generalization in case studies may impact theoretical assumptions, and case study designs should build upon theoretical frameworks (Yin, 2014a), which was done in the current study.

Merriam (1995) discussed “reader or user generalizability” (p. 58) when referring to the transferability of a qualitative study; this places responsibility on the reader to make the decision on the extent to which the findings of the study can be applied to another situation. Providing the reader with a rich and detailed description of the setting, participants, and research process supports decision-making about the transferability to their own situation (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Merriam, 1995). A rich and thick description of participants, context, data collection and analysis is provided in this methods chapter.

**Dependability**

Dependability refers to the consistency of and the ability to repeat the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In order to attend to dependability, I developed a case study database (Yin, 2014a) and provided an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1995). The case study database is a way of “organizing and documenting the data” (Yin, 2014a).
Yin (2014a) recommends orderly storing the data and presenting an adequate account of the data in a case report. In this study, the case report is my dissertation. I organized the data digitally in three secure locations (e.g., Dropbox, Google Drive, and my laptop hard drive). In this dissertation, I provided adequate evidence and description of the data to support the findings and conclusions drawn.

An audit trail was established by detailing my decision-making process throughout the study (Creswell & Miller, 2000). I particularly focused on my decisions during the data analysis procedures; this will help attend to any scrutiny from an external audit or peer review (Merriam, 1995). A doctoral candidate in literacy education served as peer reviewer to examine and provide input during the data analysis process and ensured that findings are grounded in the data (Merriam, 1995). In addition, the dissertation chair and committee members conducted a peer review of the dissertation study. According to Creswell and Miller (2000), the peer review also adds credibility to my findings.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability refers to the “neutrality or the extent to which findings of the study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation, and interest” (Lincoln & Guba, p. 290). Yin (2014a) suggested that confirmability is attended to in using multiple sources of evidence and maintaining a chain of evidence. I attended to confirmability by collecting various sources of evidence to make assumptions about the phenomenon being studied and to support the findings. Additionally, I attended to confirmability by maintaining a chain of evidence, established by citing the data sources.
that lead to certain findings (e.g., specific interviews and observations) and by including the evidence for those findings (e.g., phrases from the interviews or read-aloud transcripts; Yin, 2014a). In Chapter 4, I provide a chain of evidence to support the results of the study.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I explained the embedded, single-case study design guiding this dissertation study. I described the context, participants, and case for this study, a second-grade class (20 children). I further described the embedded units of analysis, or subcases, for this study, contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genre. In this study, two genre-studies were conducted and within each genre-study, children participated in three weeks of interactive read-alouds and one week of picturebook making. In total, children engaged in 18 interactive read-alouds and ten picturebook-making sessions. During that time, I collected multiple sources of data to address the three research questions: participant-observation, video-recordings, semi-structured and unstructured interviews, and picturebook artifacts. I then described the different data analysis procedures employed to address each research question, including constant-comparison analysis of response and interview data (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) and developing multimodal transcripts (Rogers, 2009) of children’s picturebook productions. I ended this chapter by describing the measures undertaken to ensure trustworthiness of this study. In the next chapter I present the findings for each research question.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

In this chapter, I report the results of data analyzed during this embedded, single-case study focused on describing the ways second graders responded to and applied word-picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. The results are divided into four sections: (a) categorizations of children’s responses during interactive read-aloud discussions, (b) examples of children’s responses during interactive read-aloud discussions and interviews, (c) examining children’s responses during interactive read-alouds and interviews, (d) children’s use of word-picture relationships in their own picturebook productions, and (e) children’s discussion of their decision-making in their own picturebooks productions. Each section reports the findings across and within the two genre studies, contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy.

Categorizations of Children’s Responses During Interactive Read-Aloud Discussions

In this section and the following two sections, I present my analysis of children’s responses during the interactive read-alouds of nine contemporary realistic fiction and nine fantasy picturebooks. Findings in these sections address the first research question: How do second graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks? In this section, I provide a brief description of each category; I then, in the next two sections, describe each category more extensively using examples from the
interactive read-aloud and interview transcripts and examine genre and word-picture relationships of the picturebooks.

A constant-comparison analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) of the read-alouds and interview data led to seven conceptual categories of children’s responses to the picturebooks:

- Entering the storyworld;
- Connecting to words and pictures;
- Analyzing and making meaning with words and pictures;
- Analyzing and making meaning through the design (i.e., elements beyond the narrative conveyed within the words and pictures in the sequence of openings);
- Analyzing and making meaning with the pictures (i.e., illustrations);
- Analyzing the words (i.e., written language); and
- Analyzing the word-picture relationship.

These conceptual categories represent ways children made sense of the eighteen picturebooks used in this study.

Picturebooks were divided into two genres, contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy, and within those two genres picturebooks were further divided into three word-picture relationships: (a) symmetrical—both pictures and words loosely provide the same information, (b) enhancement—words and pictures extend each other’s meaning, and (c) counterpoint—words and pictures provide alternative (or contrasting) information. Though the categories of response emerged inductively through my analyses of the data, several terms used for categorization are taken from Sipe’s seminal work on young
children’s literary understanding in the classroom (2008a), which I highlight in my description of the categories.

**Description of Response Categories**

*Entering the Storyworld* indicated children had entered the narrative, and as Sipe (2008a) described, “had become one with it” (p. 86). Responses in this category suggested that the child’s world and the world of the narrative were overlapping (Sipe, 2008). This response category made up a small percentage (0.5%) of the overall responses across all eighteen read-alouds.

*Connecting to Words and Pictures* indicated children made connections from the world outside of the picturebook to the picturebook. In this category, children connected their personal lives, knowledge of the world, and other texts to the picturebook. These connections demonstrated ways that children bridged their understandings from outside sources to make sense of the picturebook. This category made up 13.2% of responses across all read-alouds.

*Analyzing and Making Meaning through the Design* included responses that attended to construction of the picturebook and peritextual features. Peritextual features include front and back covers, dust jacket, endpapers, half-title and title pages, author’s note, and dedication page. In this category, children analyzed the artistic and literary craft, peritextual features, other elements of design, including layout and borders, and overall construction of the picturebook. Artistic craft referred to responses focused on crafting the pictures (i.e., illustrations). Literary craft referred to responses focused on crafting the words. In addition, responses in this category included those where children
analyzed the genre. Responses in this category made up 32.6% of responses across read-alouds, the second largest category of responses.

*Analyzing and Making Meaning with Words and Pictures* indicated children analyzed and used information from both the words and pictures to make sense of the narrative. Such analysis included making sense of the narrative’s literary elements (e.g., setting, character, plot). Responses indicated children referenced similar information conveyed through both words and pictures or referenced different information from words and pictures (in the same response) to speculate about the narrative and make a point to the group. This category represented 9.4% of responses across read-alouds.

*Analyzing and Making Meaning with the Pictures* included responses that demonstrated children attended to pictures as a source of meaning when making sense of the narrative. More specifically, children analyzed pictures to further their understanding of literary elements (e.g., setting, character, plot). Responses indicated children referenced information provided in pictures to speculate about the narrative and make a point. In addition to making sense of the narrative, responses included those where children described, highlighted, and questioned specific elements in the pictures. Such responses made up 38.3% of responses across read-alouds, the largest category of responses.

*Analyzing the Words* included responses that demonstrated children’s attention to the words to make sense of the narrative. Specific words or language from the picturebook were used to make sense of literary elements (e.g., setting, character, plot). Children’s responses indicated they attended to the language of the picturebook to
speculate about the narrative and make a point during their group discussions. In these responses, children referenced information solely conveyed through words or used the specific language of the picturebook in their responses. In addition, children’s responses indicated they questioned and analyzed vocabulary as part of their understanding of the narrative. These responses represented 2.7% of responses across read-alouds.

Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship included responses that indicated children attended to the ways words and pictures interacted to convey meaning. In contrast to the category Analyzing and Making Meaning with Word and Pictures, responses in this category demonstrated ways children were aware of the word-picture relationship and responded in ways that indicated they were juxtaposing information conveyed through words and pictures. Children analyzed, connected, and contrasted how information was provided in words and pictures within and across openings of the picturebook. Responses across categories provided insight into the ways children used words, pictures, and their interactions to analyze the narrative. This category made up 3.2% of responses across read-alouds.

The seven response categories described ways children analyzed the narrative through the words, pictures, interactions of words and pictures, picturebook design, and connected their knowledge from outside the picturebook to make sense of the narrative. Children described, critiqued, and questioned words (the language of the text), pictures, and other features of the picturebook, which demonstrated the sophisticated ways children transacted with the picturebook. Table 4.1 provides the frequencies and
percentages for each category of response during the interactive read-alouds. Only read-aloud data are summarized here.

Table 4.1

Frequencies and Percentages of Coding Categories for Responses in Read-Aloud Data
(Ordered from Smallest to Largest Percentage of Response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory of Response</th>
<th>n (n%)</th>
<th>n (n%)</th>
<th>n (n%)</th>
<th>n (n%)</th>
<th>n (n%)</th>
<th>n (n%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Storyworld</td>
<td>16 (0.5%)</td>
<td>85 (2.7%)</td>
<td>100 (3.2%)</td>
<td>298 (9.4%)</td>
<td>418 (13.2%)</td>
<td>1,028 (32.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Children’s Responses During Interactive Read-Alouds and Interviews:

Subcategories of Response

In this section, I discuss each category of response by providing examples of the ways children’s responses indicated their meaning making, or how they made sense of the picturebook. I describe the types of responses in each category, or more specifically, the subcategories that make up each category of response. In this section, I provide examples from the interactive read-alouds and picturebook interviews. Responses during picturebook interviews were not included in the percentages of responses; however, interview responses, as examples, are included in this section to provide additional insight into children’s interpretations of word-picture relationships. In the examples, bold print indicates that I, as the reader, read aloud the words from the picturebooks.
As previously mentioned, entering the story world made up a small percentage of total responses across the read-alouds. In Sipe’s (2008a) research, the term used for this response subcategory was transparent. According to Sipe, transparent responses indicated the child had entered the storyworld and talked as if they were engaging with the characters or story. For example, a child might yell at Little Red Riding Hood and say, “watch out for the wolf” as she enters Grandma’s house. These responses are spontaneous reactions that are not directed to an audience, but rather the “verbalized inner speech” of the child (Sipe, 2008a, p.170).

In this study, transparent responses occurred when a child seemed to speak to a character, or more often, reacted with an emotional response, in both cases, seemingly engaged in the storyworld and unaware of the classroom context. During the read-aloud of Rosie’s Walk (Hutchins, 1967), Ben spoke to the fox:

```
Hubbard:   [Opening 1] **Rosie the hen went for a walk.** [Rosie is walking away from the henhouse and the fox is underneath the henhouse watching Rosie.]

Ben:    The fox is looking at that hen. Go away from it!

Hubbard:  You want the fox to go away from it?

Ben:    The fox is going to eat the little chicken.
```

*(Rosie’s Walk, October 24, 2017)*

In the read-aloud, Ben began by speaking seemingly to the group (“The fox is looking at the hen.”), but then turned his attention to the picturebook and directed his words to the
fox: “Go away from it!” Later in the read-aloud, Ben demonstrated another instance of
speaking, or in this case yelling, to the character, Rosie:

Hubbard: [Opening 12. Rosie is walking under the beehives as they are falling over and bees are flying out of the beehives. She seems unaware that the beehives are falling. The fox, looking distressed, has knocked into the beehives with a wagon.] under the beehives

Ben: (pointing and yelling) The bees are flying out!

Hubbard: … The bees are flying out?

Ben: Yeah, they might be.

(Rosie’s Walk, October 24, 2017)

In both examples, Ben spoke to the character. In the first example, he commanded the fox to get away from Rosie, and in the other, he warned Rosie about the bees. In other instances of transparent talk, the children seemed to be emotionally responding to what occurred in the story. For example, in several excerpts from Lily Takes A Walk (November 21, 2017; Kitamura, 1987), children responded with a spontaneous and emotional reaction to the picturebook. Ava immediately shouted “Oh!” when she noticed the “tree looked like it had a face” and Reagan gasped and said “What?!” when she noticed the guy was “popping out of the window” in the pictures. In both examples from Lily Takes A Walk, the responses are simple. As suggested by Sipe (2008a) and confirmed in this study, transparent/entering the storyworld responses occurred in dramatic moments of the story and demonstrated children’s engagement with the characters and story unfolding; these responses almost exclusively occurred in response to pictures.
Connecting to Words and Pictures

Children’s connections to the narrative were demonstrated in three ways: *world knowledge/content knowledge, personal, and intertextual.* These responses indicated that children were using experiences and knowledge beyond the picturebook to make sense of the narrative.

*World knowledge/content knowledge* was demonstrated when children connected their knowledge of the world (i.e., academic and content area knowledge) to the text for interpretive purposes. During the reading of *A Sick Day for Amos McGee* (Stead & Stead, 2010), Tripp responded to Amos McGee “playing chess with the elephant, who thought and thought before making a move” and who “ran races with the tortoises, who never, ever, lost” (opening 4) by commenting, “I think elephants aren’t too smart to think of their move and tortoises aren’t fast enough to win” (read-aloud, November 8, 2017). His comments were based on the information he knew about elephants and tortoises. In other read-alouds, children’s connections to the world supported interpretations of the narrative. For example, Alejandro and Tripp described Día de los Muertos (Day of the Dead) during the read-aloud of *Dear Primo* (Tonatiuh, 2010). Día de los Muertos was mentioned but not described in the words of the picturebook. Though pictures would give readers insight, the children’s knowledge gave further context and understanding to the discussion (read-aloud, October 11, 2017). Responses focused on world knowledge accounted for 16.2% of responses within the larger category, *connecting to words and pictures.*
*Personal,* a term taken from Sipe (2008a), are responses that occurred when children connected their lives to the narrative. Personal responses accounted for 70.6% of responses within the larger category of *connecting to words and pictures* and were the largest subcategory or responses. Some of these responses occurred before the read-aloud when I activated background knowledge or experiences; these attempts resulted in more personal responses across interactive read-alouds. Before reading *The Snowy Day* (Keats, 1962), children were asked, “What are some fun things you like to do when you play in the snow?” In this discussion, children stated they “build a snowman” and “have snowball fights” with their families (read-aloud, October 10, 2017). Personal responses frequently occurred during the read-aloud as well. Later, in the fifth opening of *The Snowy Day,* children, unprompted, contributed their personal connections:

Hubbard: *It was a stick. A stick that was just right for smacking a snow-covered tree.*

...  
  
Peyton: Oh, I love the snow.

Derrick: I like to climb trees when it's snowing.

Hubbard: You like to climb trees when it's snowing?

Ben: Why?

Derrick: Sometimes I might sit on the snow like a chair or something.

Peyton: But it's wet.

Derrick: And I sometimes pull icicles off of cars.

...
Chloe: I went on this hike, and there were huge icicles, and I like pulled them off and stepped on them.

(The Snowy Day, October 10, 2017)

In the example above, Derrick’s connection prompted Chloe to share her own. Children’s personal connections led others to reflect on their own experiences and share them aloud. Thus, children’s initial personal responses during read-alouds opened a pathway for others to connect the picturebook through their own personal experiences.

Connections also occurred between texts, which in this study are defined as “any other cultural product involving language and/or visual art” (Sipe, 2008, p. 131). Adopting Sipe’s term, these were referred to as intertextual connections. In some instances, the children commented on the intentional intertextual connections incorporated by the illustrator or author. For example, during the read-aloud of Grandpa Green (Smith, 2011), Ava commented on the way the pictures (opening 5) depicted bushes shaped to form a train and characters in the Wizard of Oz (Baum, 1900; LeRoy, Freed, & Fleming, 1939), were “the Wizard of Oz and The Little Engine that Could” (read-aloud, October 25, 2017). Her connections also built upon the words of the opening “…he read stories about secret gardens and wizards and a little engine that could.” Ava’s knowledge of these texts—The Little Engine That Could and Wizard of Oz—were shared with the group and supported their co-construction of understanding.

Other intertextual connections highlighted similarities among characters, settings, and plot events between texts. During the read-aloud of One Cool Friend (Buzzeeo & Small, 2012), Kennedy commented on the way the main character Elliot, described as “a very proper young man” (first opening), is “kind of like Mr. Tiger Goes Wild because he
was proper” (read-aloud, November 16, 2017). Kennedy’s response was one among several that demonstrated the ways children noted characters’ similarities across texts. During the read-aloud of *Rosie’s Walk*, Alejandro sparked a discussion on the first opening of *Rosie’s Walk* when he predicted that this narrative was going to be similar to other books that have “someone walking,” and “there’s obstacles and they do it. And the other enemy is trying to catch it, but he bumps on the obstacles” (read-aloud, October 24, 2017). His comment sparked others to agree with his prediction and make connections to other texts with similar plot development. Derrick noted that the narrative of the fox chasing after the little hen (opening 2), reminded him of *Tom and Jerry* (Hanna & Barbera, 1940), a cartoon about the rivalry of a cat and mouse. Intertextual connections, like the ones made by Alejandra, influenced Derrick and other children’s speculations and predictions about the narrative. Intertextual connections, the smallest subcategory of response, made up 13.2% of responses within the larger category, *connecting to words and pictures*.

**Analyzing and Making Meaning through the Design**

Children’s responses indicated that they were attending to features beyond the narrative provided in the words and pictures to make sense of the picturebook. Children worked to analyze the craft of the picturebook, including the ways pictures and words were designed/developed; the meaning-making features of the peritext (i.e., features of the picturebook beyond the sequence of openings); and considered elements of genre.

*Artistic craft* responses referred to the technique and creation of pictures; these responses included those that discussed the medium and tools for creation of the pictures.
and evaluative remarks. Responses within this subcategory demonstrated ways children worked to determine the intentions behind illustrator choices.

Children demonstrated a particular focus on color in their responses. In *Silly Billy* (Browne, 2006), colors are used to indicate a change in Billy’s emotion and a change of scene to his nighttime worries. In the second opening, Walton mentioned that Billy “is imagining” flying hats, and he knows because of the use of “black and white” in the pictures; he continued to suggest the picture was black and white, because “hats are black” (read-aloud, October 17, 2017). In the next opening, Olivia seemed to build upon Walton’s thinking; she noticed “in the [opening] with the water” that “everything [was] a light blue.” Olivia referenced the monochromatic (i.e., variations of one color) blue and suggested later, the blue was used to connect to Billy’s worry about water. Children’s analysis of artistic craft demonstrated ways they were working to break the code of pictures (Arizpe & Styles, 2001a) and recognize the meaning-making potential in elements of art (e.g., color, line, and space; Sipe, 2008a); this was evident in Walton and Olivia’s responses. Also evident was the way discussion of artistic craft in one opening led children to consider the artistic craft later in the picturebook; this was especially evident when children noticed a change in style or technique.

During the read-aloud of *They All Saw a Cat* (Wenzel, 2016), children made evaluative remarks and grappled with the ways the style and technique of pictures changed in each opening. On the fourth opening, Tripp suggested that “the illustrator messed up a little bit…on the last page and the page before that” because the cat looked different in each opening; sometimes skinny and long and other times large and fluffy
depending on which animal “saw the cat” (opening 4; read-aloud, October 19, 2017). Later in the read-aloud, Chloe praised the illustrator and the differences in artistic style on each page, “I think it took a lot of time for the illustrator to do that. That’s really hard to do.” Towards the end of the read-aloud, Tripp changed his opinion about the difference in artistic style across openings and noted, “it would be kind of boring if they kept making the same page over and over again.” Children worked to determine the whys behind illustrator decisions throughout this interactive read-aloud. Responses focused on artistic craft composed 25.6% of responses in the larger category, analyzing and making meaning through the design; this is the second largest subcategory.

*Literary craft* responses referred to the technique involved in writing the words of the picturebook; these responses included those that noted punctuation, typography, font size, and evaluated the language used by the author. For instance, in the read-aloud of*They All Saw a Cat*, children were curious about the way capitalization was used in the phrase “and *the dog* saw A CAT.” Evan brought this to the group’s attention by saying “‘A CAT’ is bigger. ‘A CAT’ is in all capital letters” (read-aloud, October 19, 2017). Chloe responded to Evan’s observation, “I think where it’s capitalized it’s going to be something important like ‘A’ stands for one.” Later in the read-aloud in the fourteenth opening, the words read, “YES, THEY ALL SAW A CAT!” Peyton, once again, brought our attention to the use of capitalization, “They’re all capital letters.” Evan offered his reasoning, “It’s all capitalized because it has an exclamation point on it. It’s very excited.” In addition to capitalization, children worked to determine why the author used “A CAT” and “the cat” across openings of the picturebook and what that meant for the
narrative. Though children’s analysis of the literary craft may appear inconsequential to analysis of the narrative, discussion of “A CAT” in comparison to “the cat” proved important for children as they worked to determine if the cat, though different in appearance in each opening, was the same cat across the picturebook, an essential component for understanding the narrative. Responses focused on literary craft were only 3.8% of responses in the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning through the design*; this is significantly less than the 25.6% of responses focused on artistic craft.

*Analyzing layout* included responses that referenced the physical arrangement of words and/or pictures in the opening. In some responses, children simply brought the physical arrangement to the attention of the class. In the tenth opening of *Sam & Dave Dig a Hole* (Barnett & Klassen, 2014), children recognized the way the arrangement of words and pictures changed across openings. Collin noted that “usually the words on” the left side, “but now they’re on” the right side (read-aloud, November 14, 2017). Beth continued to bring this to our attention: “Every single time, like when the treasure changes, the pictures keep being on this side, but now it’s on that side, because the treasures change, and the side changes.” In the picturebook, the gutter, the space where the book is bound and divides the left and right pages, has separated the words and the pictures and children recognized that this arrangement flipped on this opening. Beth suggested that a plot event, a change of buried treasure from diamond to bone, is a possible reason for this change in arrangement.

In the second opening of *One Cool Friend*, dialogue within the paragraph was connected to the speaker using a speech bubble. Ava brings this to our attention: “the
speech bubbles point to the dad;” but also, it is “in the sentence” (read-aloud, November 16, 2017). Later in the discussion of the opening, Chloe continued discussing this unique layout when she recognized the use of thought bubbles within the paragraph, “The thought bubble and the saying bubble are connected because it’s masses of noisy kids.” She went on to explain why she thought the layout was arranged this way, “That’s what he’s thinking, but then it connects to what he’s saying to be proper.” She noted that the thought bubble was coming off of the speech bubble; this is important because each was presenting contrasting information to the reader—what the main character, Elliot, thought versus said. Analyzing layout made up 7.3% of responses within the larger category, analyzing and making meaning with design.

Peritextual analysis, a phrase taken from Sipe (2008a), refers to the ways children referenced the peritextual features as a source of meaning. Peritextual analysis was the largest subcategory of response within the larger category, analyzing and making meaning with design, with 49.7% of responses focused on analyzing the peritextual features. In addition, peritextual analysis is the second largest subcategory of response across all categories, which comprised 16.2% of all read-aloud responses. Across all read-alouds, peritextual analysis, focused primarily on the dust jacket and front cover, led children to describe their observations and make predictions about the narrative. Children’s discussion about the dust jacket of A Sick Day for Amos McGee illustrated their analysis:

[Dust Jacket: On the front of the dust jacket the older man is sitting on a blanket on the floor playing cards with a penguin and elephant. On the back of the dust jacket, a bed is unmade with a teddy bear sitting on top. On the floor, a tiny mouse is holding a pocket watch.]
Chloe: They’ll comfort him.

Hubbard: They comfort him?

Chloe: Mhm (yes). Because on the front cover, it looks like they're taking care of him.

Beth: They’ll play cards, because there's cards.

Sydney: After they do that, I think someone's going to find out and take them back every time and they're just going to keep coming to him.

Hubbard: Oh, so you think someone's going to try to come and get the animals and take them back to the zoo? Oh, why do you think that?

Sydney: Because there's the penguin holding the elephant's trunk and trying to take him back to the zoo. And it looks like someone is holding the rhinoceros, or I don't know what it is.

Hubbard: Oh, the rhino? Yeah. I think that is a rhino. So, the back is giving you some ideas, too? What are you thinking, Evan?

Evan: They're going to be in a tent.

Hubbard: They're going to be in a tent? Oh, what makes you think that?

Evan: Because there's stripes on the thing on the bottom.

…

Collin: I'm thinking in the circus tent, once they come, they're going to give him presents and stuff.

Hubbard: Okay. Oh, so they're going to bring him gifts on his sick day? What are you thinking sweet girl?

Olivia: I think it's going to be about all the animals, getting to his house riding the bus or something.

Derrick: I'm thinking that they will come to his house and comfort him and play cards and all that with him.

(A Sick Day for Amos McGee, November 8, 2017)
In this excerpt, children made predictions and speculated about the setting, plot events, and characters, with much accuracy in their thinking. Only a portion of the peritextual analysis is demonstrated in this excerpt; children continued to discuss the dust jacket, and they examined the other peritextual features in the picturebook. Such responses demonstrated that the analysis of the narrative began before the picturebook was opened.

*Picturebook as production* included responses that noted the construction of the picturebook, including references to publication, sequence of pages, format of the picturebook, and how the picturebook, as a whole, was crafted. Responses in this category also focused on children considering the motivations of the author and illustrator for publishing the picturebook. For example, Miles suggested that Smith (2011) created *Grandpa Green* “because they wanted to tell his past, and he might be a real person, so they want to tell about him. Or he’s like writing the book or something” (interview, October 30, 2017). His response challenged the genre of realistic fiction but demonstrated that Miles wrestled with why this picturebook was created. These types of comments were few but gave insight into the ways children recognized the picturebook as a produced object. Responses in this subcategory made up 8.6% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with design.*

*Referencing genre* responses highlighted children’s analysis of genre, aspects of genre, and ways children identified the narrative as a particular genre. In an interview with Tripp (October 30, 2017), he suggested that *Grandpa Green* tells the story of Grandpa Green’s life, “but it’s fiction, and it's not true, because this can’t happen. It tells the story of someone's life, but it's telling something in a different way.” He went on to
talk about events that could happen, such as he “**had to stay home from school, so he** read stories about secret gardens and wizards,” and he probably did that,” but some of these events “never happened.” His response indicated that he was wrestling with the plausibility of events but also ways the events were told to the reader. He was confused that the words told the life story of Grandpa Green, but the pictures depicted a garden where shrubbery illustrated these life events. Interestingly, *Grandpa Green* demonstrated a contrasting relationship in words and pictures, which are found in counterpoint narratives. Tripp wrestled to make sense of the ways the pictures told the story “in a different way” than the words, which influenced his confusion about the genre.

Responses focused on referencing genre made up 5.0% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with design.*

**Analyzing and Making Meaning with Words and Pictures**

In this category, children’s responses indicated they used both words and pictures to analyze the narrative. In these responses there was no direct reference to words or pictures, but their analyses showed a clear connection to the information provided in both words and pictures of the picturebook. In this category, subcategories of children’s responses demonstrated ways children used words and pictures for: (a) *analyzing plot,* (b) *analyzing narrator,* (c) and *analyzing characters.*

*Analyzing plot* indicated children described, evaluated, inferred, questioned, and made predictions about plot events with information conveyed through both words and pictures. For example, during the read-aloud of *The Curious Garden* (Brown, 2009), several children responded to the cliffhanger left by the second opening, which said,
“...And since Liam had always wanted to explore the tracks, there was only one thing for the curious boy do to.” In the picture, Liam is running under the tracks and then standing in front of an opening of the dark stairwell leading to the railway. This discussion shows how the words and pictures of this opening sparked predictions of what could happen:

Ben: I think that boy's maybe not going home.

Hubbard: You don't think he's going to get home?

...

Hubbard: What are you thinking Chloe?

Chloe: I think that he's going to go into the tracks, and it's going to be like this beautiful, kind of magical garden.

Hubbard: Yeah, we'll have to see if you're right. What are you thinking Olivia?

Olivia: I'm thinking he's going to go to the tracks and there's going to be a little bit of grass there and he's going to plant more and more and more in grass. And then some trees are going to pop up and he's going to cut the trees to make them magical and stuff.

...

Reagan: I think that there might be a train up there and he's going to ride it to someplace else that has more grass.

(The Curious Garden, November 9, 2017)

In addition to predictions, children questioned what the words and pictures conveyed and wrestled to make sense of the narrative. In the fifth and sixth openings of This is Not My Hat (Klassen, 2012), the words, narrated by a tiny fish that stole the hat of a big fish,
suggested that the big fish will not realize his hat is gone and if he does, he will not know that it was the tiny fish who took the hat or where the tiny fish is going. In the pictures, the big fish seems to recognize the hat is gone and gives the impression he is going to catch the culprit. In this picturebook, words and pictures conveyed a counterpoint narrative; thus, attending to both words and pictures was essential in understanding the plot development and irony in the picturebook. Words and pictures in the following two openings sparked questions and predictions:

Hubbard: Mm-hmm (yes), let's see. [Opening 5: The big fish is centered on the page and taking up most of the opening. His eyes are squinted and looking forward. The little fish is talking, ostensibly to the reader.] And even if he does notice that it's gone, he probably won't know it was me who took it.

Tripp: Well on that page right there, how would the big fish know? It would have to be if the tiny fish always takes things that isn't his because how would the big fish know that, because there's tons of different fish in the world, and how would the big fish know which one it is unless the tiny fish takes a lot of stuff?

Beth: I think he notices, because the fish is wearing the hat and he's going to notice that it's his hat, not the little fish's hat.

…

Hubbard: [Opening 6: The tail of the big fish is positioned on the right side of the page. His body and head are not shown. Bubbles are behind him, indicating he is swimming.] And even if he does guess it was me, he won't know where I'm going. What are you thinking Collin?

Collin: I think everything he says, the big fish is going to go look for him, and I think it makes him really sad. It's like the opposite--he knows that the small fish took it, and he's going to get him and say at the end like, "it's okay if you borrow it sometimes."

Hubbard: So, it's going to be a happy ending, you think? Maybe.
Kennedy: On the last page, if you turn back a page, I did get that right, that he was going to say that.

Hubbard: You did get that right.

(This is Not My Hat, November 20, 2017)

The discussion continued in the next several openings with children making predictions as they worked to analyze the plot conveyed in both the words and pictures. Children worked to make sense of the way the narrative presented contrasting information in words and pictures; their predictions and questions about plot events were sparked by this counterpoint relationship, which several children recognized early in the read-aloud. Analyzing plot made up 87.6% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with words and pictures*.

*Analyzing narrator* responses indicated children were doing work to identify and speculate about who the narrator was within the picturebook. During the read-aloud of *Grandpa Green* (Smith, 2011), Derrick, Ava, and Collin worked to identify the narrator in the first opening of the picturebook. Though Derrick suggested the narrator was the character, Grandpa Green, Ava noted “we do not know that; we think that.” In the second opening, additional information in the pictures and words helped Beth to note “that one little boy” narrated the story. Comments focused on identifying the narrator using information provided by both words and pictures were rare and only occurred during three interactive read-alouds. Analyzing narrator made up on 2.3% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with words and pictures*; this is the smallest subcategory of response.
Analyzing characters focused on responses that analyzed the behaviors, emotions, traits, motivations, and thoughts of the characters. In the fifth opening of Thunder-Boomer! (Crum & Thompson, 2009), children worked to determine why Maisy, the chicken in the story, acted out of character as she “bocks and pecks” the dad, who “scoops her up.” In their discussion, children commented on possible motivations and emotions of Maisy. Several children suggested Maisy was “hurt,” “scared of the storm,” “laying an egg,” and “afraid the cat might eat her” (read-aloud, October 12, 2017). Such analysis of Maisy supported insight into a plot event later in the narrative, Maisy’s desire to shelter a kitten from the storm. Analyzing characters made up 7.7% of responses within the larger category, analyzing and making meaning with words and pictures.

Analyzing and Making Meaning with the Pictures of the Picturebook

Children’s responses indicated they were using pictures alone to analyze the narrative and specifically attend to literary elements. In this category, I describe ways children attended to pictures to respond to and make sense of the picturebooks. Responses indicated children were using pictures to: (a) define vocabulary, (b) describe, (c) analyze plot, (d) analyze narrator, (e) analyze setting, and (f) analyze character.

Defining vocabulary using pictures indicated children determined the meaning of an unknown word used in the written text by using pictures. During the tenth opening of Dear Primo, children worked to continue their understanding of tuna, a prickly fruit, by using the pictures, which shows a small, round, cactus-looking fruit with spikes. Ava told the group that tunas are “like a fruit” (read-aloud, October 11, 2017). Another child noted that “it’s basically a cactus fruit,” and Alejandro continued by describing “a fruit that’s
spiky.” When an unknown word was presented, children worked to find the associated picture to support their understanding. Responses in this subcategory made up 1.2% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with pictures of the picturebook*.

*Describing pictures* focused on children’s description of the appearance of pictures and labeling of objects in the pictures; this subcategory composed 46% of responses in the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with the pictures of the picturebook*, which made it the largest subcategory. Children’s responses highlighted picture elements that intrigued them or gave insight into the narrative. During the read-aloud of *Silly Billy* (Browne, 2006), children described elements of the picture in the second opening. Children described “the hanging thing” in one frame and how there was “no hanging thing” in the other (read-aloud, October 17, 2017). In addition, they described the “hat connected” to the “hanging thing” and the “shadows of the hat on the wall.” In this opening, one frame showed a colorful image of Ben laid in bed on one page and on the other frame his worries about hats presented in a sepia-toned image. In this excerpt, children’s description of the pictures showed ways that they contrasted the two pictures on each page in the opening through description. Across read-alouds, children described the pictures and pointed out elements to share with the group.

*Analyzing plot using pictures* was categorized by responses that indicated children described, evaluated, inferred, questioned, and made predictions about plot events using pictures. In *Sam & Dave Dig a Hole* (Barnett & Klassen, 2014), the main characters Sam and Dave dug a hole in the ground but continued to miss the buried jewels. The dog,
never mentioned in the words, looked or faced in the direction of the jewels in several openings. In the fifth opening, Collin noticed that “it looks like they’re probably going to dig another way, but the dog’s trying to get them to keep going down, because the jewel is going like that (makes hand gesture), and he’s trying to dig up and get that jewel (point to picture), or that jewel (pointing to picture)” (read-aloud, November 14, 2017). As the read-aloud continued, children continued to comment on the development of plot through the pictures. In Sam & Dave Dig a Hole, the words conveyed parts of the plot, but certain events were only conveyed in the pictures. Children’s responses demonstrated the ways they used pictures to interpret plot and bring attention to events not presented in the words. Responses in this subcategory comprised 31.3% of responses and was the second largest subcategory in the larger category, analyzing and making meaning with pictures.

Analyzing narrator using pictures indicated children worked to identify and speculate about the narrator of the picturebook by using pictures as a resource. Pictures influenced the analysis of narrator twice in read-alouds. One occurred during Dear Primo. In the fifth opening of Dear Primo, children worked to clarify when the words, in the form of letter correspondences between Charlie and Carlitos, were written by which character. Ava pointed out “because they look different, you can figure out who’s writing to each” (read-aloud, October 11, 2017). Responses in this category were minimal (0.2% of responses) and made up the smallest subcategory within the larger category, analyzing and making meaning with pictures.

Analyzing setting using pictures indicated children used pictures to describe, speculate, evaluate, question, or infer about the setting, or more specifically the time and
place the narrative took place. In the sixteenth opening of *Sam & Dave Dig a Hole*, the characters, Sam and Dave, returned to a place that resembled the setting in the first opening of the book with slight changes: a pear tree instead of an apple tree, a duck wind vane instead of a rooster wind vane, a blue flower instead of a pink tulip on the porch, and the cat sitting on the front porch wearing a blue color instead of a pink color. Children grappled with the setting and worked to determine whether the place Sam and Dave ended up, after falling through the hole, was the place and time from the beginning of the story. Tripp suggested it was a different time, and the seasons had changed, which Olivia agreed with and then suggested, “They spent so much time under the ground and in the hole that it changed seasons” (read-aloud, November 14, 2017). In contrast, Ava suggested they “dug into a different world,” with Evan following up with “I think it’s the same world, but reversed.” Children worked to interpret setting when words did not convey the information. The conversation continued, as children demonstrated frustration by the lack of information in words, to clarify their interpretations. Analyzing setting using pictures made up 6.5% of responses in the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with pictures*.

*Analyzing character using pictures* focused on responses that analyzed the behaviors, emotions, traits, motivations, and thoughts of the characters by using pictures as a resource. In the first opening of *Leave Me Alone*, readers/listeners are introduced to the main character, “[Opening 1] Once there was an old woman. She lived in a small village in a small house…. ” Children used the small picture on the page—the old woman in the rocking chair knitting with a pile of yarn beside her on top of white space—to
analyze the character. Children described the emotions and behaviors of the old woman by noting that she was “happy,” “sewing with a bunch of yarn,” and questioned why “no one else was around” (read-aloud, November 7, 2017). Miles suggested “she was sad, because she was all alone.” Her isolation from others and facial expression contributed to their thinking. Responses in this subcategory made up 14.8% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with pictures*.

**Analyzing the Words of the Picturebook**

Words were used in similar ways as pictures. Children analyzed literary elements by referencing the specific language of the text or the information solely conveyed to the reader through words. In addition, children questioned and defined vocabulary that was unfamiliar and hindered their understanding of the narrative.

*Questioning vocabulary* responses were those where children questioned the meaning of words used in written text. *Defining vocabulary* responses occurred when children worked to determine the meaning of an unknown word used in the written text. During the read-aloud (November 7, 2017) of *Leave Me Alone*, the old woman traveled through a wormhole. Upon hearing the word, *wormhole*, Derrick, Kennedy, and Beth asked simultaneously “what is that [word]?” Beth then suggested that the wormhole is an underground hole where worms live, which prompted Alejandro to clarify the meaning and suggest it was an outer space portal. Children questioned and worked to define meaning of words and phrases when presented with language that disrupted their meaning of the narrative. Questioning vocabulary made up 4.7% of responses and
defining vocabulary with words made up 29.4% of responses in the larger category, *analyzing and making meaning with words*.

*Analyzing plot using words* were responses that indicated children described, evaluated, inferred, questioned, and made predictions about plot events using words. For example, in *Grandpa Green*, the “garden remembers for” Grandpa Green, with bushes shaped into memories of his past. In the eighth opening, the pictures, through shrubbery in the garden, depicted a woman holding a cup with the image of the Eiffel Tower behind her (“He met his future wife in a little café.”) and a tall wedding cake with a bridge and groom on top (“When the war was over, they were married.”). In this opening I used specific language from the words and commented, “So here we have ‘his memories,’ right?” Tripp responded that “we don’t know if it’s a memory,” but then Ava quickly followed up, “yes we do; it said that.” Ava then quickly referenced the words to clarify this element of the narrative. Essential to the plot is understanding that the garden is designed to capture the memories of Grandpa Green. Direct references to words, such as Ava’s response, demonstrated that children used specific words from the picturebook to make sense of plot development and correct misunderstandings of events. Responses in this subcategory comprised 44.7% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing the words*.

*Analyzing narrator using words* responses indicated children were doing interpretive work to identify and speculate about the narrator of the picturebook by using words as a resource; these responses were rare. One of the few examples occurred in the read-aloud of *Dear Primo*, which conveys the written narrative through letter writing
between two cousins. When children grappled with identifying the two narrators in the story, Carlitos and Charlie, Tripp responded, “it says Dear Carlitos, and that Carlitos is the one that lives in Mexico. So, without the pictures you can kind of tell.” Though some children referenced pictures, he used the words to clarify when each character acted as narrator of the story. Responses in this subcategory comprised 4.7% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing the words*.

*Analyzing setting using words* indicated that children used the words to identify and speculate about the setting. One response was identified in this category, which occurred when Evan identified Tokyo as the setting during *The Sound of Silence* (read-aloud, October 18, 2017); this subcategory is the smallest subcategory (1.1%) in the larger category, *analyzing the words*.

*Analyzing character using words* focused on responses that analyzed the behaviors, emotions, traits, motivations, and thoughts of the characters by using words as a meaning-making resource. In the second opening of *One Cool Friend*, Kennedy considered the words in the opening, “*Elliot thought, kids? Masses of noisy kids,*” and determined that it “doesn’t sound like he wants to go” (read-aloud, November 16, 2017). Chloe continued by commenting on the next line of the words, “Of course. Thank you for inviting me,” and suggested that Elliot’s thinking does not match what he is saying, and he’s “saying it to be proper.” “Proper” was used to describe Elliot in words on the previous opening. Her words furthered the understanding of Elliot’s behaviors and traits that were introduced to the reader/listener in the first opening of the picturebook.
Responses in this subcategory comprised 15.3% of responses within the larger category, analyzing the words.

Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship

*Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship* highlighted ways children attended to the interactions of word and pictures in their interpretations of the narrative. Children did interpretive work to explicitly contrast and connect words and pictures within the picturebooks. Previous categories and subcategories highlighted ways children attended to the words and pictures to understand narrative, in contrast, this category focuses on ways children intentionally recognized the relationship. *Contrasting words and pictures* were those responses where children analyzed and evaluated disconnecting information between the words and pictures in an opening. Responses in this subcategory made up 75% of responses in the category, analyzing the word-picture relationships, demonstrating that children more frequently commented on differences in words and pictures as opposed to similarities conveyed in both. For example, during the read-aloud of *Mr. Tiger Goes Wild*, the text in the first opening states, "Everyone was perfectly fine with the way things were. Everyone, but Mr. Tiger," prompting Walton to assert that the pictures “give me more information, because in the words it doesn’t tell what the animals are doing” (read-aloud, November 15, 2017). In the picture he is referring to, animals are clothed, standing, eyes-closed, facing away from, and surrounding Mr. Tiger, who appears bothered. Walton recognized that the words did not provide the behaviors or reactions of the animals in the picture. Another example occurred in *One Cool Friend*. 
Kennedy recognized that the words and pictures conveyed different, but essential information, for understanding the narrative:

Kennedy:  [The words] doesn't tell us that he's going to the penguin exhibit. And I think the pictures are telling us a little bit more than the words cause it's not telling you that he's thinking about getting a play penguin. And it's not telling you that he's going to the exhibit. And so, I think the pictures are telling more.

Teacher: You think the pictures are ...

Kennedy: And it doesn't say that ... You could see the $20 bill that Elliot has, but the picture never ... Never told us that [his father] gave it to Elliot. Because what if Elliot just had a $20 bill.

(One Cool Friend, November 16, 2017)

Her comment suggested, that though the pictures conveyed “more information,” it does not show some of the information conveyed in words—the action of Elliot’s father giving him the $20 bill. Without words, the reader/listener would not understand essential elements of plot development. Chloe commented on the disconnect of information conveyed in Mr. Tiger Goes Wild. The words stated, “His friends did not know what to think and then Mr. Tiger went a little too far.” In the picture, Mr. Tiger went into the fountain and took off his clothes. Chloe noted:

The words and the pictures don't really connect. It never says he's in the middle of the town; he's diving in there. To me it feels like there's really nothing that they connect. It's like, you could ... Well, kind of. This book's really hard to explain. But you could completely cover up the words and just be like, "Oh my gosh, he really went too far" without having the words. But in some ways, you kind of need the words "Mr. Tiger went a little too far.” …You can't really have no words
and just the pictures, but you can't really have no pictures and just the words. But it seems like they're telling such a different story. It's kind of weird. (interview, December 4, 2017)

In this excerpt, Chloe wrestled with the way words and pictures did not provide information that “connected.” Her responses suggested that without either the words or picture, the story would be incomplete. During the read-aloud of This is Not My Hat, the children suggested ways the information in the words and pictures were different and predicted consistency of the relationship throughout the picturebook:

[Opening 4: Across the opening is a large fish swimming and looking up to the top of his head. The words read: And even if he does wake up, he probably won't notice that it’s gone.]

Chloe: It's only from the [little] fish's point of view, and he doesn't know about the [big] fish, so we don't know about the [big] fish.

…

Kennedy: It's kind of like what you said, like that's what the [little] fish is saying (the words), and that's what the [big fish] is thinking (the pictures), but I think the pictures are going to tell more every time because [the words] are not telling you that he's looking up. But it's not going to tell you that because [the little fish] doesn't know that [the big fish] is going to think that, and so the next page is probably going to be like that.

(This Is Not My Hat, November 20, 2017)

Chloe and Kennedy referenced ways the words and pictures conveyed information that appeared to disconnect with the other. Chloe suggested the words only presented the point of view of the little fish, and therefore, the words only told information the little fish knew. Kennedy continued this discussion and suggested the pictures conveyed more information than the words and predicted that this word-picture relationship would
continue throughout the picturebook. Though children more often noted ways words and pictures conveyed different information, responses also indicated they attended to the ways words and pictures conveyed similar information.

*Connecting words and pictures* responses were those where children analyzed and evaluated connectedness or similarities of information between words and pictures in an opening. For example, in the fourth opening of *Leave Me Alone*, the old woman’s grandchildren are curious and playing with the yarn. Words read, “*Were you supposed to hit the ball with a stick,*” and in pictures, several boys were hitting the ball of yarn with a stick. Each sentence on the page is paired with a corresponding picture, which convey similar information to the reader. During the read-aloud of *Leave Me Alone*, Kennedy noticed the connectedness of the words and pictures:

> It says they were curious, and they were hitting sticks. And it said, "*Are you supposed to hit the ball with a stick?*" He was eating it when he said, "*Could you eat it?*" And she was making her brother eat it and it said, "*Could you make your brother eat it?*" “*Why did the ball get smaller and smaller as you chased it?*” And they're chasing it.

Later in the same read-aloud, Emmie noticed a similar pattern as Kennedy and said, “There’s a bunch of different pictures to go with the words.” Children were aware that the words and pictures were designed in a way that conveyed similar information to the reader. In other read-alouds and during picturebook interviews, children noticed when the words “matched” (e.g., read-aloud, November 8, 2017; read-aloud, October 17, 2017; read-aloud, November 9, 2017) or were the “same” (e.g., read-aloud, October 25, 2017;
interview, October 30, 2017), but unlike the subcategory, *contrasting words and pictures*, they did not discuss comparisons as often or with as much detail. Children’s responses acknowledged the similarities of information, but less often provided insight on the ways this relationship impacted their meaning making of the narrative; this analysis of ways word-picture relationships impacted narrative occurred more often in responses focused on contrasting words and pictures. Responses in this subcategory comprised 23% of responses within the larger category, *analyzing the word-picture relationship*.

*Analyzing the relationship across the picturebook* responses were those where children described the differences and similarities in the relationship of words and pictures across the sequence of openings of the picturebooks. In an interview with Tripp about *Mr. Tiger Goes Wild*, he noted the words and picture were “pretty much” telling the same story, but by the end of his conversation recognized that the words and pictures conveyed different information:

Tripp: Because ... well another thing is it's hard to do it when it's "And he found that things" and then you see this. "Beginning to change" and I see if you turn back to this page, it's hard because it doesn't tell anything. "And then Mr. Tiger went a little too far." But it doesn't say anything. It doesn't help you a lot. "And then he found that things were beginning to change." Still, he can't... it doesn't really help you.

Hubbard: It doesn't really help you?

Tripp: No.

Hubbard: Oh, so how are you figuring out what's going on?

Tripp: Pictures.

Hubbard: The pictures?
Tripp: One word, pictures. (holds up hands for emphasis)

(Mr. Tiger Goes Wild, November 17, 2017)

Tripp turned pages through the openings of Mr. Tiger Goes Wild and shared ways that the words and pictures interacted across the picturebook. His response indicated that the words were not “telling anything,” or not conveying all of the information that the pictures conveyed. His response was indicative of similar responses from other children. Responses in this category suggested that children recognized differences in information conveyed, limitations in the words and pictures, and they did interpretive work to understand ways words and pictures worked with each other to convey information to the reader. Responses in this category were rare and made up 2% of responses within the larger category, analyzing the word-picture relationship.

Examining Children’s Responses During Interactive Read-Alouds:

Within and Across Genres and Word-Picture Relationship

In this section, I examine ways that children’s responses indicated similarities and differences within and across genres and word-picture relationships. I begin this section by exploring ways words, pictures, and both words and pictures were referenced in children’s responses to literary elements; I then describe the similarities and differences of responses within genres and word-picture relationships. Lastly, I conclude my findings for the first research question by highlighting ways children’s responses were unique within counterpoint narratives, particularly within fantasy picturebooks.
Examining Children’s Responses to Literary Elements

Children’s responses indicated ways that words, pictures, and their relationship impacted their meaning making of the narrative. Subcategories revealed ways children attended to specific literary elements (e.g., plot, setting, and character) by using words, pictures, and both words and pictures (see Table 4.2). A review of the responses indicated that children most often referenced elements of pictures as a resource when making sense of plot events, setting, and character. Responses analyzing setting and character were almost exclusively related to pictures. Though information conveyed through words was least referenced across all literary elements, words used in connection with pictures were most often used when children analyzed plot development. Table 4.2 summarizes the frequencies of responses to the literary elements by using words, pictures, and both words and pictures in relation to each other as a meaning-making resource. Percentages presented in the table

Table 4.2

*Frequencies of Responses to Literary Elements in Words, Pictures, and Both Words and Pictures in Read-Aloud Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary Element</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Pictures</th>
<th>Both Words and Pictures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conversational Turns</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 gives representative samples that demonstrate the ways words, pictures, and both words and pictures were used as resources in children’s responses to plot, setting, and character. In each column, responses were chosen that demonstrate ways children directly appropriated language or referenced information from the meaning-making resource of words, pictures, and both words and pictures. I will discuss this finding further in Chapter 5.
Table 4.3

Representative Examples from Read-Aloud Responses Analyzing Literary Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary Element</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Pictures</th>
<th>Both Words and Pictures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plot</strong></td>
<td>“They're going to keep digging until the ground gets deeper.”</td>
<td>“It looks like they're probably going to dig another way, but the dog's trying to get them to keep going down, because the jewel is going like (hand gesture) and he's trying to dig up and get that jewel (pointing to page), or that jewel (pointing to picture). I think that it's a too big of a hole, so they can't see the cat anymore.”</td>
<td>“I think the garden's going to get bigger and bigger until it's one of the biggest gardens, and he's going to keep going to the garden every day. Keep on helping it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sam &amp; Dave Dig a Hole, November 14, 2017)</em></td>
<td><em>(The Curious Garden, November 8, 2017)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td>“Oh. It’s Tokyo.”</td>
<td>“Stars! It's probably really midnight now.”</td>
<td>No responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(The Sound of Silence, October 18, 2017)</em></td>
<td><em>(Leave Me Alone, November 7, 2017)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character</strong></td>
<td>“He’s excited about something.”</td>
<td>“It looks like he has the stuff like he's a worker. I think he's a worker because he has worker stuff on, and I think he's just balancing because he has the buckets and there's like rocks and stuff.”</td>
<td>“Because when he purrs it sounds like thunder. And they found him in a thunder storm.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(The Sound of Silence, October 18, 2017)</em></td>
<td><em>(Thunder-Boomer!, October 12, 2017)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sidewalk Circus, October 26, 2017)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children’s Responses Within and Across Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Genres

Data indicated the amount of talk for each genre, contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy, was fairly comparable, but interesting differences were found when examining the frequencies and percentages of categories (see Table 4.4). Children’s responses within the categories connecting to words and pictures; analyzing and making meaning with words and pictures; and analyzing the words were more frequent during interactive read-alouds of contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks. In contrast, children responded more frequently within the categories entering the storyworld; analyzing and making meaning through the design; analyzing and making meaning with the pictures; and analyzing the word-picture relationship during interactive read-alouds of fantasy picturebooks. Though a small number, responses to entering the storyworld almost exclusively occurred during interactive read-alouds of fantasy picturebooks.

Unlike the comparison of other categories, responses within Connecting to Words and Pictures during contemporary realistic fiction interactive read-alouds were more than double the amount of responses during fantasy interactive read-alouds (see Table 4.5). Responses were high in contemporary realistic fiction due to the amount of personal connections children made during those read-alouds in comparison to fantasy, which had significantly fewer personal responses. Responses within the subcategory intertextual were high within fantasy in comparison to contemporary realistic fiction.
Table 4.4

Summary of Frequencies and Percentages of Read-Aloud Responses Within Genres by Categories of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Storyworld</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting to Words and Pictures</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with Words and Pictures</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning through the Design</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with the Pictures</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Words</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Conversation Turns**  
1,488  
1,677

Intertextual responses within fantasy read-alouds most often referenced other read-aloud picturebooks (in the study) and were made in relation to children’s analysis of word-picture relationships. For example, during the read-aloud *Lily Takes a Walk*, children referenced *This is Not My Hat*, *Sam and Dave Dig a Hole*, and *Rosie’s Walk* as employing a similar interaction of words and pictures (read-aloud, November 21, 2017). During the read-aloud of *Lily Takes a Walk*, children engaged in the following discussion:
Chloe: I think that it's going to be, kind of like *I Want My Hat Back*?

Hubbard: Oh, *This is Not My Hat*.

Chloe: Yes, *This is Not My Hat*. I think it's going to be kind of like that. It's telling it in Lily's story, but really, they kind of wanted to make it fun, and kind of make it like the dog's having this kind of ... like they're both telling different stories.

Hubbard: The words and the pictures?

Chloe: Mhm (yes).

Hubbard: Are telling different stories?

Chloe: / No, Lily-

Hubbard: Or the characters? /

Chloe: The characters.

Hubbard: The characters have different stories. Okay. Beth?

Beth: It's kind of like when - what was the book when those two boys dug the hole?

Hubbard: *Sam and Dave Dig a Hole*?

Beth: Yeah, that one. It's kind of like the people were not noticing something, but the dog was, and it's the same.

Hubbard: Mhm (yes), yeah. I can see that. Emmie?

Emma: I'm kind of basing off of what Chloe said. It's kind of like *This is Not My Hat* because it says that Lily's not scared because Nicky's with her, but Nicky's scared.

Olivia: I think it's kind of going to be like *This is Not My Hat*, because she's not going to notice that there are things, like the big fish was following the little fish even though he didn't know it. She's not going to notice different stuff, I mean like weird or like the face on a tree.
Kennedy: There's a lot of different ways that people think that it's like *This is Not My Hat.*

*(Lily Takes a Walk, November 21, 2017)*

Children suggested that *Lily Takes a Walk* had similar interactions of words and pictures as two other read-aloud picturebooks, *Sam and Dave Dig a Hole* and *This is Not My Hat.* More specifically, without using the language, children suggested that the picturebook would have a counterpoint in perspective, where words and pictures convey different characters’ perspectives or a character is not mentioned in either words or pictures (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). Similar to personal responses, when children made intertextual connections during fantasy others built off of their responses.

Table 4.5
### Summary of Subcategories of Response Within Connecting to Words and Pictures Within Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Genres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Knowledge/Content Knowledge</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextual</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Conversational Turns</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between genres were also apparent when examining responses within the category, *analyzing the word-picture relationship*. Children’s responses to word-picture relationships were more frequent within fantasy picturebooks (Table 4.6). Data revealed that children made more responses in the subcategory, *contrasting words and pictures* in fantasy picturebooks. Responses to *contrasting words and pictures* occurred most often in *This is Not My Hat*, *Come Away from the Water Shirley*, *Lily Goes for a Walk*, and *Rosie’s Walk*; all these books present counterpoint narratives, with three identified as fantasy genre. Responses in these picturebooks revealed that children analyzed ways words neglected to mention characters: the fox in *Rosie’s Walk*, the dog in *Come Away from the Water Shirley*, several characters in *Lily Goes for a Walk*, and the big fish in *This is Not My Hat*. In addition, responses suggest they attended to the different perspectives represented in the words and pictures; this was particularly relevant in their discussion of *This is Not My Hat*. For example, Chloe noted that the “words
Chloe’s remarks indicated she evaluated the relationship, which was evident in the other three read-alouds as well.

Table 4.6

Summary of Subcategories of Response Within Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrasting Words and Pictures</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Words and Pictures</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Relationship Across the Picturebook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Conversational Turns | 34 | 66 |

Another finding in my examination of responses across genres indicated that responses within the subcategory, referencing genre, were higher in read-alouds of fantasy than contemporary realistic fiction. In fantasy read-alouds, children more often questioned or suggested ways the picturebook was fiction and highlighted elements of fantasy; these discussions also sparked children to suggest ways the picturebooks challenged their understandings of the read-world (subcategory, world knowledge/content knowledge). For example, during the read-aloud of The Curious Garden, Kate explained that “plants don't have feelings, so it’s definitely a fantasy story” (read-aloud, November
Children’s comments revealed several differences between genre, including referencing genre and contrasting words and pictures; these are discussed later in this section when I describe children’s responses to counterpoint narratives.

**Children’s Responses Within and Across Word-Picture Relationships**

Examination of the responses within and across word-picture relationships revealed several differences in the ways children responded during read-alouds of picturebooks within the three word-picture relationships: symmetry, enhancement, and counterpoint (see Table 4.7). Children’s responses within picturebooks identified with a symmetrical word-picture relationship were higher within the category, analyzing and making meaning with words and pictures, in comparison to picturebooks identified with enhancement or counterpoint relationship. In addition, responses in the category, analyzing and making meaning with words of the picturebook, were more frequent in symmetrical relationships than in picturebooks identified with enhancement or counterpoint relationships. In turn, responses in picturebooks with symmetrical picturebooks were less frequent in the category, analyzing and making meaning with the pictures of the picturebook, than in enhancement and counterpoint relationships.

Table 4.7
**Summary of Read-Aloud Responses Across Word-Picture Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Symmetry</th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Counterpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Storyworld</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections Related to Words and Pictures</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the Specific Picturebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with Words</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning through the</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with the</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Words</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Conversation Turns</strong></td>
<td><strong>938</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,054</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s responses within picturebooks identified with a symmetrical word-picture relationship had higher responses in the subcategory, connecting *words and*
pictures, than in picturebooks identified with enhancement or counterpoint relationships (see Table 4.8). In addition, children had higher responses in the subcategory, contrasting words and pictures, in picturebooks identified with enhancement of counterpoint relationships. Across all word-picture relationships, children rarely responded in ways that suggested they were analyzing the relationship across the picturebook.

Table 4.8

Summary of Subcategories of Response Within Analyzing Word-Picture Relationships Within Word-Picture Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Symmetry</th>
<th></th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th></th>
<th>Counterpoint</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrasting Words and Pictures</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Words and Pictures</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across the Picturebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conversational Turns</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another notable difference was the way children’s responses within the subcategory personal decreased significantly within picturebooks with counterpoint relationships in comparison to those with symmetrical or enhancement relationships (see Table 4.9). In Come Away from the Water, Shirley, a picturebook with a counterpoint relationship, only one child during the read-aloud connected their personal lives to the
narrative conveyed in the picturebook; this occurred where Shirley and her family take a trip to the beach, and Shirley gets into many adventures as her parents lounge in beach chairs on the shore. Personal responses made by one child often prompted others to share their personal connections to the picturebook during read-alouds; however, when Collin shared his personal experience about going to the beach and boogie boarding on the waves, other children immediately returned to discussing the nuances of the narrative provided through pictures. Lack of personal responses was apparent across all counterpoint narratives, and in the rare instances when a child shared personal connections, others rarely continued to share their own and instead, returned to analyzing the complex narrative presented in the picturebooks.

Table 4.9

Summary of Subcategories of Response Within Connecting to Words and Pictures Within Word-Picture Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Symmetry</th>
<th></th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th></th>
<th>Counterpoint</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Knowledge/</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Conversational</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Counterpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several differences were apparent in ways children responded in picturebooks with counterpoint relationships in comparison to those with symmetrical or enhancement relationships. Children’s responses indicated more references to genre and world knowledge/content knowledge and wrestling with the interaction of words and pictures; this was particularly highlighted within *Come Away from the Water, Shirley* and *Lily Takes A Walk*.

**Wrestling with the word-picture relationship.** In *Come Away from the Water, Shirley* (Burningham, 1977), the words and pictures are seemingly two disconnected stories. In each opening, the left-hand and right-hand page presented a narrative that juxtaposed the other. In one page, Shirley’s mother and father are pictured on the beach and talking to Shirley, who in the other page of the opening, is off on adventures (e.g., sailing, fighting pirates, and finding buried treasure). In this picturebook, the words and pictures on the left-hand page convey a realistic fiction narrative and in contrast, pictures on the right-hand page convey fantasy; this contrast between pages presented the reader with a contradictory narrative in most openings of the picturebook. During the read-aloud (November 28, 2017), children wrestled with this relationship and on several occasions seemed frustrated by the picturebook.

Initially, the responses to the word-picture relationship of the picturebook were similar to other picturebooks, “I think the words are showing a little bit more than the pictures because it never said that, in the pictures, that there's children and there's a boat right there” (opening 2) and Chloe brought to our attention the ways she thought the words-picture relationship was similar to *This Is Not My Hat*:  

156
I think throughout the book, one page is kind of like the last book we read. I think it's going to be kind of like that, one page is telling a different story than the other, so there's one page about her that doesn't have any words. You could separate the two into different books.

Her thinking highlighted the ways words and pictures provided alternative information to the reader. Her connection to *This is Not My Hat* gave her expectations for the narrative in this picturebook.

Several openings into the read-aloud, children realized that the word-picture relationship was consistent throughout the picturebook, and her parent’s dialogue did not reflect the behaviors of Shirley; children became critical of Shirley’s parents:

[Opening 3: The mother and father are smiling and sitting in chairs on the beach. The words read: *Why don’t you go and play with those children* (left page)? Shirley and a dog are paddling in a boat in the ocean. A ship is positioned in further back in the water (right page).]

Tripp: I think they're just ignoring everything. They're just saying...

Alejandro: They're like lazy.

Tripp: Like lazy, just like don't do it. I think they think she's still [there] like she's looking at them, but I think this whole thing is a story.

Hubbard: This is a story? So, you think they're lazy? What do you mean when you say you think they're lazy?

Tripp: Because all they're doing is like, she's looking for a new magazine and he's reading a newspaper.

Due to their confusion of narrative as a result of complex word-picture relationship, children’s responses demonstrated they were analyzing the characters to make sense of this disconnect. Because the dialogue did not connect to Shirley’s behavior, the parents
must be lazy, or rather inattentive. In the same opening, Evan responded: “They’re just
telling her random things!” His response hinted at some confusion and frustration to the
disconnect between word and pictures.

Later in the read-aloud, several children commented on the “weirdness” of the
relationship:

[Opening 6: The mother is pouring a drink and the father is reading the
newspaper. Both are sitting on the beach. The words read: That’s the third and
last time I’m asking you whether you want a drink, Shirley (left page). Shirley
is onboard a pirate ship, sword in hand, fighting pirates (right page).]

Tripp: They're telling it like it's mysterious, like weird.

Hubbard: / It's weird?

Emma: It's not Shirley. //

Tripp: And they're talking like...

Evan: Random things.

Tripp: They're talking random things and it's like the book's skipping
pages, because it seems like if there was a whole other page, it
would say "mom, can I have a drink?" Or something and then them
saying, "I’m asking you..." so it's really weird.

Tripp’s response indicated that there were gaps in the narrative, between words and
pictures, that children had to work to fill. He struggled to understand why the parents
would say, “that’s the third and last time” when the picturebook never conveyed the
parent asking Shirley for a drink the first and second time. In an interview with Tripp, he
further suggested that Shirley’s parents neglecting to notice her behavior was “weird” and
added that the picturebook “just doesn't make sense” (interview, December 4, 2017). In
the fifth opening of the picturebook he explained his thinking further:
Tripp: Yeah, it ... I don't ... it's like this is a story (pointing to left page) and this is a story (pointing to right page) and it's like ... well ... it's hard ... I don't know. They are not paying attention, which is the most thing that it's confusing because when we read this book everybody was shaking their head because they were wondering why [the parents] were not paying attention.

... Hubbard: Let's look at one more. [Opening 6] That's the third and last time I'm going to ask you ... I'm asking you whether you want a drink, Shirley.

Tripp: That does not make sense.

Hubbard: No?

Tripp: No. This does not make sense at all.

Hubbard: What doesn't make sense?

Tripp: It did not make sense because "That's the third and last time I'm asking you whether you want a drink, Shirley." But she's over here fighting the pirates. It's so weird and complicated to find out.

Tripp’s responses demonstrated the confusion shared by other children in the class during the read-aloud. Children responded in ways that demonstrated they were unsure of how the narrative was conveyed and had to work to make sense of what they perceived were missing parts of the story.

Children’s responses indicated that they were questioning the narrative presented in the words when compared to the pictures. As we read, children pointed out ways the words did not include elements of the pictures (i.e. “it never mentioned the pirates”). Through each opening of the read-aloud, children worked to grasp the interactions of words and pictures:
Evan: / She's not even throwing any stones.

?: But she's not throwing stones. //

Hubbard: Reagan?

Reagan: She's basing all the words off what she hears.

Hubbard: Tell me a little bit more about what you mean?

Reagan: Like, whenever she falls into the water, it sounds like she's throwing something.

Hubbard: Oh, so they're saying things based on what they're hearing?

Reagan: Yeah.

Miles in an interview, echoed Reagan’s response and suggested the words in the opening were the parents' response to what “sounded like was happening,” or rather, what Shirley was doing (interview, December 4, 2017). Reagan and Miles’s responses were examples of the many ways children worked to make sense of the complex narrative.

Towards the end of the read-aloud, Beth offered insight into the ways the words and pictures were working in contrast to the other: “on one page, nonfiction and one page is fiction, because that page could not happen” (opening 8). Beth seemingly used nonfiction in place of realistic fiction and fiction in place of fantasy. Her point was that one page could happen in the real world, but the other page was unrealistic and could not. Chloe (interview, December 4, 2017) explained a similar understanding of the narrative:
I feel like that they're really telling a whole different story. I feel like one page is a picturebook of a girl and pirates, and then another page is like a normal book, like *Leave Me Alone* and all that stuff. But they're basically two different books, but in some ways they kind of connect. Like they know that she's been around a dog and--. But what they don't know is basically this whole story. But what Shirley doesn't know is that her parents are calling her like that. So, they're really just two whole different stories, but they kind of connect in a couple ways that makes it one book.

Chloe’s response demonstrated ways she found the words working in contrast to the other but also ways in which the words and pictures had some connections working toward the same narrative.

Children’s responses throughout the narrative indicated ways that *Come Away from the Water, Shirley* challenged what they knew about picturebooks and ways the narrative was relayed through words and pictures. Some suggested that Shirley was “using her imagination” (Emma), and others did not make sense of the interaction between the words and pictures. In an interview, Allison, after working to make sense of the narrative, simply referenced Burningham (the author and illustrator) and said, “I don’t really get why they did that, but they do make some choices in their books” and shrugged (December 4, 2017). Her words echoed what I mentioned in several read-alouds across the study: authors and illustrators are intentional in the ways they design their picturebooks.
**Referencing genre.** As previously mentioned, picturebooks with counterpoint relationships had more responses focused on referencing genre, which were frequently connected with ways they referenced the real-world (subcategory, *world knowledge/content knowledge*) to make sense of the genre. Even more apparent was the increased frequency of these responses within fantasy picturebooks. I use *Lily Takes A Walk*, another picturebook with a counterpoint in genre, to highlight the ways children referenced genre and world knowledge within fantasy picturebooks with counterpoint narratives.

In *Lily Takes A Walk*, we read about a young girl walking around the neighborhood. In this picturebook, the words present a relatively uninteresting narrative (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). However, the pictures bring in characters and events not mentioned in the words and take the reader on an eventful journey. Pictures in *Lily Takes A Walk* tell the story of Lily’s frightened dog, Nicky, as he sees dangers lurking around the neighborhood, a dinosaur and an open-mouthed mailbox with teeth, for example. The words present a realistic fiction narrative, and in contrast, the pictures convey a fantasy narrative. Thus, in this study, *Lily Takes A Walk* was classified as fantasy.

In *Lily Takes A Walk*, during each opening, children worked to make sense of ways genre was conveyed in the picturebook and how this corresponded to their understanding of the real world. Children were aware that we were reading a fantasy picturebook during the read-aloud of *Lily Takes A Walk*. However, upon viewing the front cover and reading the title, Chloe questioned how this book was fantasy if it was just about a girl walking. Prior to reading, children worked to answer her question. Some
reasoned that it was “impossible” for a little girl to go walking by herself. During the read-aloud their discussions about genre and world knowledge heavily influenced their responses during the read-aloud.

In this excerpt, I present a representative sample of similar discussions that occurred within each opening of *Lily Takes A Walk* focused on analyzing whether pictures were presenting elements of fantasy or realism:

[Opening 7. Lily, carrying a bag of flowers, walks down the street with her dog, Nicky, looking behind her. Nicky sees what appears to be a man dressed in a suit breaking out of a window surrounded by tomatoes and smiling at Nicky. He’s holding a glass with red liquid and on the ground appears to be a jug of tomato juice. Bats are flying around the sky.]

Reagan: (gasping) Uhh. What?!

Hubbard: What are you thinking, Reagan?

Reagan: There's like some guy popping out of the window. He's kind of big.

?: It's a vampire.

Peyton: It’s big.

Walton: / It's like Dracula.

Hubbard: What do you think? // It's Dracula, maybe? What are you thinking, Tripp?

Tripp: I think they just painted it on the wall. I think they just painted-

Ava: / No, because he's floating in the sky.

Tripp: Yeah, but they've put the- //

?: No, he's not.

Ava: Yes, he is, his hat is in the sky.
Tripp: Yeah, I think they just painted that on the wall.

Walton: It doesn't look like he's stealing money because those are tomatoes.

Aubrey: That is apple juice.

Hubbard: Looks like some sort of juice?

Tripp: No, it's tomato juice. That's not blood. That's tomato juice.

Emma: That’s tomato juice.

Hubbard: Okay, so it does look like tomatoes. Okay. What are you thinking? Olivia?

Olivia: I think most people are saying how could he be painted on the wall, because his hat's sticking up. I think it could, maybe-

Walton: He is painted on the wall.

Olivia: Maybe there could be a wooden board that they maybe hammered to the place so it looks like it's just popping out. Then like painted it.

Hubbard: Chick-fil-A does that with their cow billboards. The cow extends out from the billboard a little bit further than the rest of the billboard. I know what you're talking about; I have seen that before. Alejandro, you want to say something?

Alejandro: I was going to say what Olivia already said.

Hubbard: You were thinking that too, that maybe it just extends out from the billboard, cardboard or wood?

Emma: I think that just might be a blow up, because they could make it a blow up, because at night the store is not open.

Hubbard: Yeah?

Emma: I'm pretty sure that sign behind him is just tomatoes.
Olivia: Oh, yeah. The pictures are telling a little bit more than the words because the words are not telling that there’s a vampire on the loose.

Derrick: That’s no vampire!

Children wrestled with what they viewed in the pictures. Notice the ways Tripp, Olivia, Alejandro, and Emmie analyzed the giant figure coming out of the window (or billboard) and worked to make the picture fit into their understanding of the real-world; their comments suggested the picture conveyed realism rather than fantasy, which challenges the identified genre of the picturebook.

When Kate responded in the sixth opening of the read-aloud that perhaps the dangers lurking in the pictures “could be in the dog’s imagination,” children reiterated her thinking but nevertheless, continued to suggest ways the pictures conveyed realism. For example, the conversation continued to focus on whether the dangers, such as the lamppost and tree with mouth and eyes, were sculptures or just an illusion caused by lighting. Several children’s comments that the pictures were man-made objects or illusions in the initial openings of read-aloud, sparked others to echo their thinking in their responses throughout the read-aloud. However, some children pushed back against their responses and consistently suggested the pictures conveyed creatures of fantasy.

As demonstrated, references to the real-world and genre were apparent within picturebooks with counterpoint narratives, more so in fantasy. However, within realistic fiction children wrestled with genre as well. For example, Tripp analyzed the differences of ways the narrative was conveyed in Grandpa Green and suggested the words were
“true” and the pictures were “fake” (interview, October 30, 2017). He wrestled to understand how the words, which told the life story of Grandpa Green, connected with the pictures, which conveyed a garden. Counterpoint narratives presented unique opportunities for children to discuss genre and their understanding of the real-world.

Children’s Use of Word-Picture Relationships in Their Own Picturebook Productions

In this section, I present my analysis of the ways second-grade children used words, pictures, and their relationship in their own picturebook production. Findings in this section address the second research question: How do second graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks? Each child created two picturebooks, first, contemporary realistic fiction and then, fantasy. The picturebooks were analyzed using a multimodal transcript, which examined opening-by-opening, ways children conveyed genre and narrative meaning through literary elements using words, pictures, and their interactions, along with considerations of the overall word-picture relationship of the picturebooks. In this section, I describe ways children conveyed narrative meaning through literary elements using the interaction of words and pictures, used peritextual features, incorporated unique features into fantasy pictures, used the interactions of words and pictures flexibly in their picturebooks, and shifted word-picture relationships from contemporary realistic fiction to fantasy picturebooks.

I adapted language from Nikolajeva and Scott (2001), which served as the foundation of word-picture relationships in this study, along with considerations of
Golden’s (1990) categorization of word-picture relationships, to describe the interactions of words and pictures in the children’s creation of a picturebook. In this section, the following phrases will be used to describe ways children used words and pictures to convey and develop the story, or more specifically, literary elements:

- Words and pictures provide similar information—words and pictures provide the same story; the reader could make sense of the narrative without the words or pictures;
- Words and pictures expand on each other—words and pictures provide essential information to the reader; words and pictures fill in each other’s gaps;
- Pictures support the words—words primarily convey essential information to the reader; pictures support understanding; and
- Words depend on pictures—pictures primarily convey essential information to the reader; words support understanding.

Language used to describe the relationship of words and pictures is not intended to suggest the importance of one over the other, but to simply describe their interactions within children’s picturebooks to develop story.

**Plot Development Through Words and Pictures**

In this study, plot development was analyzed by examining the “universal features” of plot structure (Temple, Martinez, Yokoto, 2007, p. 45) found in published picturebooks; those that further the problem, or conflict, and the solution. Essentially, I asked, “How do the words, pictures, and their interactions develop plot?” In children’s picturebooks, plot development occurred in several ways: (a) words and pictures provide
similar information; (b) pictures support the words; and (c) words depends on pictures. Plot development was rarely developed through the interaction of words and pictures expanding on each other and therefore, it was not described in this section.

**Words and picture provide similar information.** Within picturebooks across the study, many openings reflected a symmetrical relationship, one where similar information was provided in both words and pictures; this relationship was found in Derrick’s picturebook, *Alien King*. *Alien King* tells the story of an alien invasion and the rivalry between the alien king, who is described as “the meanest alien,” and Agent 8, the hero of the story, and character Derrick intends for us to cheer on the defeat of the alien king. Crafted with simple sentences and pictures, the reader could make sense of the story by viewing either the words or pictures. In the opening in Figure 4.1, the words read, “Jake tried to blast the alien king.” The accompanying picture shows Agent 8 blasting his gun and barely missing the leg of the alien king. Agent 8 is smiling, which leads us to believe he is happy about his blast; this provides additional details that the reader must consider when interpreting the picture. Does Agent 8 not realize that he missed the alien king? However, despite this detail, the words loosely tell the reader the same story we can read in the pictures.
Figure 4.1. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information for Plot Development in *Alien King*

Figures 4.2 and 4.3 provide two other examples of ways children designed openings of their picturebooks that provide the reader with similar information in words and pictures. In the sixth opening of Chloe’s *The Little Plant* (see Figure 4.2), the words read, “and it started to grow,” providing us with the same information in the pictures. In pictures, there are several panels showing the growth of the plant. Few details are presented within pictures that are not presented in words. We find the same relationship in Walton’s picturebook, *Xander’s Dream*. 
**Figure 4.2.** Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information for Plot Development in *The Little Plant*

*Xander’s Dream* tells the brief story of Xander, a young boy who goes to bed and dreams of fun things. Figure 4.3 is an opening from the picturebook, which conveys Xander visiting the playground in his dream. Words on the page read, “Then, he started dreaming. He dreamed of a playground with many fun things.” Words guide us to seek out the fun things Xander does on the playground in pictures, but both words and pictures give the reader similar information towards understanding the plot.
Children’s picturebooks contained many openings that provided duplicate information in both words and pictures that developed the plot. With this relationship, the reader neither needed to rely on words or pictures to provide additional information needed to make sense of plot events. However, only a few of the children’s picturebooks were identified as having a symmetrical word-picture relationship in regards to plot development throughout each opening of an entire picturebook.

**Pictures support the words.** In many openings throughout children’s picturebooks, children relied on pictures to provide the development of plot. In some picturebooks, pictures provided limited information towards plot development. Essentially, pictures were “more decorative than narrative” (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001); this does not diminish the quality of the pictures, but simply acknowledges that they contributed little to plot development and left little to interpret. An example of this relationship occurred in Olivia’s picturebook, *The Tiger with No Friends.*
In *The Tiger with No Friends*, Mr. Tiger is lonely and wants to find friends. He befriends Mr. Dog early in the story, but has little luck befriending Mr. Elephant, who hosts a party without inviting him. Mr. Tiger never befriends Mr. Elephant, but in the end he and Mr. Dog find other friends. Interesting to Olivia’s pictures is the way the written story is primarily provided through dialogue without other narration; this can be seen in Figure 4.4. Several other children developed plot in a similar way. In these openings, the words read, “[Opening 6] ‘Can we be friends together?’ ‘No,’ said Mr. Elephant. ‘Ok,’ said Mr. Dog. [Opening 7] ‘Let’s be friends together without Mr. Elephant.’ ‘Ok.’”

Words tell us that Mr. Elephant chose not to befriend Mr. Dog and Mr. Tiger and they chose to be friends without him. Pictures show Mr. Elephant facing then turning away from the other characters, which is open to interpretation and supports the words but do not convey this plot event and without the words, we would not make sense of the story.

![Figure 4.4. Pictures Support the Words for Plot Development in *The Tiger with No Friends*](image)

**Figure 4.4. Pictures Support the Words for Plot Development in *The Tiger with No Friends***

Similar decoration of words through pictures occurred in Beth’s picturebook, *The Legend of the Dragon*. Figure 4.5 shows the first opening from her picturebook. Upon
first glance of the opening, words clearly dominant the physical space of the page and are
the primary element in the opening. When reading the words, we understand that Neora
grew adventuring and caught a dragon. She paired up with this dragon and they practiced
flying each day. Pictures selectively show a full-bodied version of Neora’s dragon, which
support the words, but did little to develop plot. Without the pictures, the reader would
have a strong understanding of the plot unfolding in this opening through the words.

Figure 4.5. Pictures Support the Words for Plot Development in *The Legend of the
Dragon*

In these openings, pictures were used to selectively provide information to the
reader and though contributing to understanding, did little to contribute to plot
development. Many children designed openings of their picturebooks with dominance of
words in plot development with several children crafting this relationship across their
entire picturebook. Those few, like Beth, used a word-dominant relationship across both their contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks.

**Words depends on pictures.** Children’s use of pictures as the primary means of plot development was rare, but occurred in several openings across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Chloe’s *The Little Plant* demonstrated ways this interaction of words and pictures were crafted in children’s picturebooks (see Figure 4.6). In *The Little Plant*, a lonely boy plants a seed, which grows into a large plant that becomes the boy’s friend. In opening 7 the words read, “intil [until]…,” which leaves the words depending on pictures to convey the plot event to the reader—the plant that has grown quite large and came to life. Words guide the reader to pictures to interpret them and rely heavily on pictures to develop the plot in this opening. In Evan’s *The Dark Moon*, words’ dependence on pictures is taken even further.

*Figure 4.6. Words Depending on Pictures for Plot Development in The Little Plant*
In *The Dark Moon*, Evan tells the story of a werewolf who ventures away from his friends. Bat comes after and catches him and wants to bring him home, but werewolf does not want to go. In Evan’s picturebook, a story is told in the pictures that is never mentioned in the words. Evan tells the story of a cat, who throughout the picturebook does not seem to fit into the story world. His story conveys a duality of narratives (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001), one being told through the words and pictures and another occurring, an alternative story of the cat (see Figure 4.7). Hidden behind flaps of the picturebook, the cat is lurking around the other characters but never participating in their events. The cat is not acknowledged through words, nor do characters acknowledge the cat exists; he and his story seem to exist independently from the other story. Evan’s picturebook demonstrated a relationship where the pictures extend our understanding of the story and words, are selective in the information they provide (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001); and interestingly, the pictures provide a side story, which peaks curiosity and opens additional avenues for interpretation.

*Figure 4.7. Words Depending on Pictures for Plot Development in The Dark Moon*
Character Development Through Words and Pictures

In children’s picturebooks, I looked for ways character development was attended to in words, pictures, and their interaction. More specifically, I focused on the ways characters’ actions, appearance, and dialogue conveyed their traits and interests, emotions, and relationships with other characters (Martinez & Harmon, 2012). In addition, I examined ways the pictures explored characterization, such as developing a character to appear “cute” or “threatening” (Temple, Martinez, & Yokota, 2014).

Character was developed in children’s picturebooks in several ways: (a) words and pictures provide similar information, (b) both words and pictures expand on the other, and (c) pictures support the words.

Words and pictures provide similar information. In Olivia’s picturebook, Olivia Can, the reader encounters a feminist perspective (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001), one that tells the story of a girl who loves to play baseball, but has to push back against the coach and boys to get on the team. As we come to understand Olivia, we discover her desires to join the boy’s baseball team and witness ways she pushes back against her brother, boys on the baseball team, and the baseball coach, along with how these interactions impact the character, Olivia’s emotional state (see Figure 4.8). In opening 3, we gain insight into her relationships with her parents, the ways she relies on them and finds comfort in them. Words state, “they tried to cheer Olivia up” with pictures showing Olivia’s father reaching out towards Olivia as she appears distraught. In opening 4, Olivia says, “I’m silly. I cannot play baseball. I’m a girl.” With these words, the reader may interpret that Olivia doubts herself, and in the pictures, we confirm her unhappiness.
Reading through Olivia’s picturebook, words and pictures convey a similar sense of Olivia’s emotions, her motivations, the ways her parents support her, and the changes in her relationship with her brother. Essentially, words and pictures provide an overlap in the development of character in each opening.

*Figure 4.8. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information for Character Development in *Eva Can*

**Words and pictures expand on the other.** My analysis of characterization across picturebooks revealed the ways children used words and pictures to expand on the information provided by the other. Pictures often expand the reader’s understanding of characters’ emotional state and appearance, which gave insight on how we, as readers, should feel about the characters. Characterization of traits (e.g. brave, honest, clever) is hard to communicate through pictures; however, pictures can convey emotions and attitudes, which further our understanding of the character (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001).

In Figure 4.9, three characters are taken from different openings in three separate picturebooks. Each character is crafted in a way that gives us a sense of their emotional state. Mouths are open-wide and hands are lifted in excitement as one character is
jumping in the air. Another character is smiling with thumbs up, which conveys to the reader he is happy and doing well in the story. Interesting, is the way Walton appropriated graphics (!!!) from comics to convey the excitement of his character. Pictures across picturebooks took on a dominant role in conveying the emotional state of characters.

![Figure 4.9. Pictures Expand on Character’s Emotional State of Happiness and Excitement](image)

Analysis of character appearance revealed ways children changed a character’s appearance to communicate a dynamic change within the character. In the first image in Figure 4.10, the cat was originally more rounded with a curvature line of the mouth and now the cat is shown with red eyes, fangs, and pointed ears. With no mention in words, the character changed from a non-threatening character to one conveying a potential danger with a threatening appearance. Appearance of character also communicated ways of perceiving a character as good or bad and safe or threatening. In the second image, the fairy cat is small and round, eyes are proportionally large and round, wings have rounded tips, and there are hints of shine/reflection in the eyes. The author conveys what we
perceive as cute and innocent; as the good guy, she is the character we root for. The last image in the figure presents a villainous character. His eyes are slanted into points, his size is more dominant in the opening and larger than his opponent, the red on his head is alarming, and he portrays what the reader perceives as a threat or danger. Ways children crafted characters’ appearance conveyed the role of the character in the story.

Figure 4.10. Pictures Expand on Understanding of Character through Appearance

Words expanded upon pictures most often by providing insight into character relationships and motivations. In Figure 4.11, words are provided from openings across four picturebooks. In the words, children provided information about ways relationships developed throughout the story. When we read, “…everybody felt differently about her” and “she found her treasure—a best friend,” the reader interprets the characters’ forming of positive emotional relationships with other characters. In contrast, “Then, Allison and Olivia came over and asked what was wrong. Reagan just sat there though,” conveys Reagan’s frustration and sadness about her friendship with Allison and Olivia. Words reading, “…and she was loving it. Now she wanted to play softball,” conveys ways the
character’s desires and motivations changed from watching TV to wanting to play softball. These words are only snippets from the picturebook, but offers insight into ways children crafted words that developed understanding of characters’ relationships and motivations.

Figure 4.11. Words Expand Understanding of Character Relationships and Desires
Words also expanded understanding of gender identity. Gender identity was an interesting element across picturebooks. Several females in the classroom took on a feminist perspective, which meant gender identity of female characters was essential to the development of their stories and influenced character development. However, in other picturebooks, gender identity was not relevant to the issues being conveyed in picturebooks; problems in the story were not specifically relevant to males or females. Nonetheless, words were essential to determine gender identity of female characters in several picturebooks.

In Figure 4.12, the first opening from Beth’s picture demonstrates ways the words were needed to expand understanding of characters’ gender identity. Beth, in words, describes Ash as “a girl with reddish-orange hair.” In pictures, gender construction is less direct and pushes back against traditional ways of identifying gender through physical appearance. Ash is presented with short, reddish-orange hair. In the left-hand page of the opening, Ash appears to wear a dress, but little else conveys gender to the reader. Words were needed to extend and confirm our understanding of Ash’s gender identity.
Figure 4.12. Words Expand on Understanding of Gender Identity of Human Characters from *White Stars in a Field of Blue*

**Pictures support the words.** In several picturebooks, characterization was primarily conveyed through words with pictures offering little support. In Emmie’s picturebook, *The Fairy Land Adventures* (see Figure 4.13), the words provide information about characters’ emotion and vulnerability—“the fairies were frightened. They didn’t know what to do!” Kitten, the main character of the story, shows up and is the only hope—“…kitten shows up. She was the only one who could stop it;” yet, pictures do little to enhance our understanding of either. In pictures, we see small fairies and exclamation marks, which convey a sense of alarm; however, words take on the primary role of providing insight into the emotions and behaviors of characters.
In the first opening of Derrick’s picturebook (see Figure 4.14), *The Lost Boys*, characterization is provided through words with pictures providing little support. Words convey the fear and behaviors of the three main characters—“…they all ran into the forest and got lost, but they got scared” and “wanted to go home”—who, in pictures, are minimally developed as characters. Pictures show the young boys with brown skin tones, possibly suggesting they are three boys of color, but little additional information about characters can be deciphered. Moving through the openings of the picturebooks, Derrick continued to develop character through words—“they were so so so scared”—though the reader interprets limited information beyond emotional stance. Pictures in subsequent openings remain stagnant with no further development of characterization.
Figure 4.14. Pictures Provide Little Support in Characterization in *The Lost Boys*

**Setting Development Through Words and Pictures**

Setting was examined through the ways words, pictures, and their interactions furthered understanding of time and place (Martinez & Harmon, 2012). In picturebooks, the setting can produce challenges and be an influential factor to story development (Temple, Martinez, & Yokota, 2014). In the children’s picturebooks, setting was sometimes minimal or did nothing to impact plot development or choices of character. Few picturebooks designed settings that influenced character’s behaviors and relationships.

Word and pictures have affordances and limitations when conveying setting to the reader. Words can only provide a sense of the setting with pictures actually showing the reader (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In picturebooks, words are selective in the information they convey and tend to guide readers to attend to elements of setting in pictures (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). I analyzed setting in children’s picturebooks by
identifying ways setting was presented in each opening, as well as how it was conveyed across the entire picturebook. In the children’s picturebooks, setting was developed in several ways: (a) words and pictures provide similar information, (b) pictures support words, (c) words depends on pictures, (d) peritextual features, and (e) limited development.

Words and pictures provide similar information. Rarely do words and pictures provide an entirely redundant setting, which requires the words to describe all physical aspects (e.g. shape and size of buildings; Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). However, words and pictures can describe and show a similar setting with either doing little to enhance the reader’s understanding. In the children’s picturebooks, setting was conveyed across words and pictures, providing similar information to the reader in each. Kennedy’s picturebook (see Figure 4.15) conveys a similar setting in words—“to the city and went to Pet Smart”—as in pictures. Pictures show the city Kennedy created, with the building labeled “Pet Smart,” a dominant image on the page. Pictures conveyed additional information to the reader. In Kennedy’s picturebook, the reader sees that Missy and Allison walk into the city on a clear, sunny day as shown by blue skies and a bright yellow sun. Though children’s pictures and words provided similar information, the settings described in words and shown in pictures were never truly symmetrical.
Figure 4.15. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information About Setting in Missy

In Sydney’s picturebook, Emma Loves to Swim, words tell that “one day Emma was at her house, in her bed,” and in pictures Sydney selectively shows Emma lying in her bed (see Figure 4.16). However, by reading the pictures we can assume that Emma is in her house, the place we often sleep. Words, despite indicating that Emma is in the house, do not expand our understanding of setting and therefore, words and pictures provide the reader with similar understanding of setting. Though not truly redundant, setting development is presented through a symmetrical relationship.
Figure 4.16. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information About Setting in *Emma Loves to Swim.*

**Pictures support the words.** Children developed setting through words with support from the pictures; in some instances, support was little to none. Katie’s picturebook, *Where Are My Mittens,* describes a young girl, Ellie, who wakes up and cannot find her mittens. After looking for them, she becomes tired and goes to sleep. When she awakes, her sister has found them for her. Figure 4.17 demonstrates the way Kate developed setting in words with no attention in pictures; this opening demonstrates setting development throughout Kate’s picturebook. Through words, the reader understands that “one morning Ellie woke up, got out of bed, and put on her winter clothes,” “looks in her drawer,” and later “runs down the stairs.” Readers can interpret that Ellie is in a double-story house, in her room, and it is winter. “Winter” indicates why Ellie would look for her gloves. In pictures, our understanding of setting is not developed with characters removed from time and space (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). Despite the
reliance on words to determine setting, similar to Kate’s picturebook, children provided limited description. In many openings, children conveyed setting solely through a limited description using words, which required the reader to fill in information not provided in words and pictures.

*Figure 4.17. Pictures Provide Little to No Support to Setting in Where Are My Mittens?*

**Words depend on pictures.** What words can describe, pictures can show (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001), and in openings across children’s picturebooks and even in entire picturebooks, setting was conveyed almost entirely through pictures. Figure 4.18 shows two openings from separate picturebooks, *Emily Goes to the Forest* and *The Safari*
Run Down, where setting is developed through pictures. In both picturebooks, titles convey some indication of setting, and in the first opening of each we are told that the settings of each picturebook are the “forest” and “jungle”. However, further development of setting is exclusively conveyed through pictures. In both openings represented below, readers are shown a natural environment that gives context to the simple description of setting in words. Shown in pictures are daytime and a flat landscape with trees, bushes, and open space, which conveys a safe space for the characters. In both pictures, setting is not framed, but rather, covers a large portion of each opening, which invites the reader in (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In pictures, the reader can see the setting the designer wanted to convey, with words providing limited support to the development; the term designer is used to replace writers to be more inclusive of ways children crafted pictures and words.

Figure 4.18. Words Depend on Pictures for Setting Development

In Miles’ picturebook, Boys Win, Girls Smack Down, Barcelona wants to be on the girl’s wrestling team. He makes the team by defeating the girls and Kane, his adversary. In the first opening (see Figure 4.19), words read that Barcelona “lived in a
“good house,” but not until we read the pictures do we understand what Miles envisions as the “good house.” Pictures enhance our understanding; they convey the circular shape of the house with the pointed roof, two slides coming down each side, and what appears to be a circular cage surrounding the structure of the home. Without pictures, interpretations of a “good house” would be different across readers and perhaps more ordinary or extravagant than Miles intended.

![Image](image.png)

*Figure 4.19. Words Depend on Pictures for Setting Development in Boys Win, Girls Smack Down*

Words and pictures expand on each other. In several openings across pictures, reading both words and pictures conveyed a more developed understanding of setting. In Evan’s picturebook, *The Beautiful Moon*, through dialogue words indicate time to the reader—“it’s Halloween”—and pictures convey place and aspects of time to the reader (see Figure 4.20). Halloween was essential information for plot development moving forward in the story and pictures gave no indication of this event. Pictures conveyed the
place and time of day, which is not conveyed in words. Across openings of picturebooks time was often developed through words and place enhanced through pictures.

*Figure 4.20. Words and Pictures Expand Understanding of Setting in The Beautiful Moon*

**Mood Development Through Words and Pictures**

Mood, the ways the emotional feeling was conveyed through the picturebook as a whole (Temple, Martinez, & Yokota, 2014), was explored by examining ways words, pictures, and their interactions impacted the tone or emotional atmosphere of the picturebook. Tones (i.e., darkness or lightness) of colors convey an emotional response and are significant for indicating mood in picturebooks. In addition, setting can impact emotional response to the picturebook. Dense, dark forests may suggest worry or fear in comparison to a bright, open countryside where the reader may sense safety or joy. Character development can impact the mood of the picturebook through dialogue or emotional state. In my analysis of mood, I examined each opening for ways mood was conveyed, but ultimately focused on how mood was conveyed across the entire picturebook. Mood was conveyed in several ways: (a) both words and pictures provide similar information, and (b) picture support words.
Words and pictures provide similar information. Word and pictures worked in unison to convey mood across several picturebooks. In Xander’s Dream, the story is lighthearted, happy, and tells of the frivolous adventures of Xander; this atmosphere is conveyed in words and pictures (see Figure 4.21). In contrast, Emmie’s The Fairy Land Adventures told a heroic story of a fairy cat rescuing frightened fairies from the powerful thunderstorm (see Figure 4.21). Reading the story, the reader may feel excitement, tension, and contentment as we follow the story of fairy cat. In the opening, the reader immediately becomes alert and perhaps experiences tension viewing the pictures. Lightning is zagged across the left-hand page; the reader observes the action and rapid movements. Exclamation marks surrounding the fairies on the right-hand page further indicate alarm. Words convey the worry and tension of this page: “…the thunder was worse and the fairies were frightened. They didn’t know what to do!” Both words and pictures immerse the reader in the mood of this opening.

Figure 4.21. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information for Mood Development in Xander’s Dream and The Fairy Land Adventures
Pictures support the words. In the children’s picturebooks, where pictures selectively convey few elements of character, plot, and setting across openings, mood was developed minimally in pictures as well. In their picturebooks, mood was developed more thoroughly through words, in the form of dialogue and descriptions of characterization. Readers could not exclusively view pictures and feel a sense of the mood in the picturebook; words were needed to sense the emotional atmosphere of the story. In Peyton’s *The Lonely Children*, the reader is reliant on words to sense mood (see Figure 4.22). The reader learns that three siblings “lost their parents” and had to “survive theirselves.” In the final sentence of the first opening it reads, “It was hard for them, but they never ever gave up on their lives,” indicating determination and giving a sense of hope for these characters.

![Figure 4.22. Pictures Support Words of Mood Development in *The Lonely Children*](image)

**Figure 4.22. Pictures Support Words of Mood Development in *The Lonely Children***

### Peritextual Features

Children incorporated peritextual features, including front covers, titles pages, about the author notes, and information on the back cover to summarize the book, and analysis of these features provided insight into the plot of the picturebook. Pictures on
front covers and titles are designed to entice readers and in published picturebooks, provide insight into plot and conflict of the story (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). Endpapers can introduce elements of story to the reader before the first opening by showing minor plot events, characters, and themes. However, only after reading the picturebook can the significance of the endpapers be fully understood.

In *The Big Move*, Allison tells the story of a young girl moving away from home. Her front cover and endpapers (see Figure 4.23) informs readers of a significant plot event, the character’s family is moving. The endpapers show the red car traveling on the road. Though the reader does not know where the car is going or coming from, when considering the endpapers with the title, readers get a sense of what may come in the openings of the picturebook.

![The Big Move](image)

*Figure 4.23. Front Cover and Endpapers Develop Plot in *The Big Move*

Children used front covers and endpapers to convey information about setting and characters of their picturebooks. Peyton’s forest-scene in her front cover and endpapers for *The Lonely Children* instantly conveys the setting to the reader (see Figure 4.24). Significant to Peyton’s plot is the way the three main characters, young siblings, live and
get lost in the forest. In the front cover, the three lonely children are conveyed to the reader. Each character has dialogue that helps the reader to evaluate traits of that character. For example, the young girl is giving her older brother a flower, which leads us to interpret this character as helpful or kind in the story. In the story, the character development of this young girl indicates both traits.

Figure 4.24. Front Cover and Endpapers Conveying Character and Setting in *The Lonely Children*

Kennedy develops setting and character in the front cover and endpapers of her picturebook (see Figure 4.25). On the front cover, the title, *Missy*, is emphasized in red lettering across the blue sky. The cover displays a nature scene, which the reader could interpret as the setting of her picturebook. Kennedy displays a dog in a cage, which she has labeled Missy. With this the reader can infer that picturebook will be about this dog, Missy. A young girl is smiling on the front cover and labeled, Allison. The reader could interpret that this young girl is the owner of the dog or assume she catches the dog in the cage. In the endpapers, Kennedy has created a full bleed, where the picture extends to all four edges of the page, featuring a green background with smiling dogs, PetSmart, and
either rain or tears scattered across the page. The reader can begin to interpret PetSmart as a potential setting of the picturebook, and the tears could be interpreted as sadness or perhaps rain will play a part in the story. Later in the picturebook, rain presents conflict for the characters. In the bottom right-hand corner of the endpaper is Missy.

**Figure 4.25. Peritextual Features Develop Understanding of Story in Missy**

In picturebooks, the story can begin on the cover and continue until the back cover (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In children’s picturebooks, meaning was conveyed to the reader upon first viewing the front cover. Peritextual features were important to introducing literary elements that further story. Settings, characters, and in some instances, plot events were beginning to develop in these features of the picturebook, offering the reader opportunities to make predictions and speculate about story.

**Fantasy**

Analysis of fantasy picturebooks revealed several ways children attended to words, pictures, and their interactions unique to genre. Characters as animals were frequently used in the children’s animal fantasy picturebooks. Children applied human traits and behaviors to animals in their stories, “And Dogman got a pair of ninja things
and then he killed the darkness and ghost buster.” Words indicated to the reader the type of animal through names of character—Mr. Tiger, Dogman, and Mr. Elephant—and often in the first opening, described characters as the animal; this is interesting, because children determined that words were needed to emphasize the character as an animal, rather than allowing pictures to convey this obvious character development to the reader, which is common in published picturebooks (see Figure 4.26). Only Peyton chose to place clothing on her animal characters in Dogman. Others applied human traits, but characters primarily appeared in pictures as ordinary animals, which in many openings developed contrast of realism in pictures to fantasy in words. In many picturebooks, if the reader strictly read the pictures, the animal characters would appear as ordinary animals with only words conveying the fantastical elements of the animals.

![Figure 4.26. Animals Used as Characters in Fantasy Picturebooks](image)

Pictures supported our understanding of fantastical characters, but words carried the development of characters in children’s fantasy stories (see Figure 4.27). Emmie, in
words, described the character of her story as a kitten that turns into a fairy cat, but in the pictures, we are presented with an ordinary cat. In the rest of the picturebook, only words describe our character and she is not shown in pictures until the last opening. In words, our understanding of fairy cat is supported—“moves to fairy land,” “she was the only one who could stop” the storm, and she uses her “wings” to save the fairies.

Peyton conveys character development with a similar relationship; pictures support words, but words primarily convey character development. More specifically, words provide information for the reader to interpret and analyze behaviors, traits, and emotional development of characters—“it is spreading all over town and out popped dog man. ‘Don’t worry my fellow citizens. I’m here!’”—with pictures conveying character appearance and emotional development. Peyton uses dialogue and descriptions of behaviors to convey Dogman as brave, heroic, and playful. In pictures, Dogman appears to be in a police officer’s uniform, which the reader could interpret to mean he saves people, but only through pictures do we understand those behaviors of Dogman.

![Figure 4.27. Animals Described through Words in Fantasy Picturebooks](image-url)
Interesting, was the way children chose to develop ordinary settings, or realistic settings, in fantasy picturebooks (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). Fantasy breaks free from the ties of realism, and in words, several children included no fantastical elements in plot events and setting. When words included the element of fantasy, their usage was brief and did not carry on throughout the story. Emmie was the only child to describe and show a setting freed of the real world—Fairy Land. Derrick was the only child to show, displayed on his back cover, a setting of fantasy—alien spaceships flying in outer space. Others used words and/or pictures to develop ordinary settings, primarily homes and natural environments (see Figure 4.28). In the children’s picturebooks, elements of fantasy were most often developed through characters and plot.

Figure 4.28. Ordinary Settings in Fantasy Picturebooks

Examining Word-Picture Relationships Within a Picturebook

Fantasy picturebooks presented a unique opportunity for counterpoint in genre (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001) relationships. Chloe crafted a story where words were
realistic and pictures suggested fantasy, a relationship found in Tripp’s picturebook as well. Chloe’s story is also representative of the ways children’s interactions of words and pictures were inconsistent across openings of picturebooks. Chloe’s book, *The Little Plant*, conveys a contrasting relationship of title and picture on the front cover (see Figure 4.29). The plant is shown covering the entire cover of the picturebook, which contrasts “little” in her title. Endpapers further show the large plant protruding towards the edge of the page (see Figure 4.29). Words and pictures reflect an ironic relationship in the peritextual features.

*Figure 4.29. Front Cover and Endpaper from The Little Plant*

Chloe’s opening 1 and 2 conveys ways she selectively crafted pictures to support the words, but words primarily developed story. The “lonely boy, who lived in a lonely town…” is not pictured in the opening. Instead the reader is shown a small house with one window. The one small house, with one window, does convey loneliness and isolation, but the lonely boy is not introduced in pictures. Only through suggestion of the words does the reader interpret the lone house as demonstrating loneliness. Moving to
opening 2, Chloe describes that he “lived with his grandparents…he did not like.”

Pictures show characters that the reader may interpret as the grandmother and grandfather. However, once again, only through words does the reader understand these characters as grandparents. The “grumf” in their speech bubbles suggest that these characters could have a bad attitude, and interpreting the “grumf” with the story presented in words, suggests that their attitude could be why the lonely boy does not like them. In both openings, words are essential for making sense of the story with pictures supporting them.

Figure 4.30. Pictures Support the Words in Opening 1 and 2 from *The Little Plant*

Chloe’s picturebook transitions into a different interaction of words and pictures in opening 6 (see Figure 4.31). Her words—“and it started to grow”—conveys similar information to the reader that is shown in the picture. In the pictures, five panels are used to show the growth of the plant. In each panel, the plant grows a bit more from seed to a full-grown plant. Not entirely redundant, pictures provide additional details about the
appearance and growth of the plant, but neither provides essential information that the
other does not describe or show.

Figure 4.31. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information in Opening 6 from The Little Plant

Once again, the interaction of words and pictures transition to one where the
words are dependent on pictures or the story is solely conveyed through pictures (see Figure 4.32). In opening 7 the words read, “intill [until]….” with the ellipses indicating there is more the reader needs to attend to in the opening. Pictures show a plant covering the opening, almost touching the edges. Without another object on the page to compare to, the reader is unsure of whether the plant is a normal size and zoomed in on the page, or if the plant is as gigantic as the picture makes it seem. Interestingly, where the element of fantasy comes into the story, are the eyes and mouth on the plant. On two leaves, we see eyes and connecting the leaves is a squiggle for the mouth. Until this point the story has remained realistic, and now the pictures suggest fantasy. In opening 8, the reader
gains new information. The lonely boy positioned beside the plant conveys the vast size of the plant in comparison to the child. The boy appears to be frowning and facing away from the plant and without words to guide understanding, the pictures are open to interpretation.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 4.32. Words Depend on Pictures in Opening 7 and 8 from The Little Plant**

Chloe’s fantasy picturebook demonstrated dynamic ways that children used word-picture relationships inconsistently across their picturebooks, relying more heavily on words or pictures at times to describe or show more of the story. In the children’s picturebooks, fantasy demonstrated more use of inconsistency in the word-picture relationships across openings in comparison to realistic fiction picturebooks. However, this inconsistency was apparent within two children’s contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks, Tripp and Peyton.

In Tripp’s realistic fiction picturebook, *The Safari Run Down*, he describes and shows the story of four young boys who go to the jungle and experience what he refers to
in words as a “miracle.” Tripp designed his front cover to convey information to the reader about the plot and setting (see Figure 4.33). The title, centered and spanning the space of the cover, draws the reader’s attention. The title reads “safari” with two small trees shown on top of the title, indicating that perhaps characters in the story will go on a journey or expedition into a natural environment. Safaris are associated with Africa, which indicates that perhaps this will be the setting of our narrative. In the circular shapes of the first “a” in safari and “d” in down, Tripp has drawn a pattern, which may be interpreted as animal print. “Run down” in the title could indicate something in poor condition or he may be using the slang definition, which suggests he may provide a gist or description of an event. His endpapers show a checkered pattern with colors that do not appear to convey a particular meaning and may not have a strong connection to the story. Prior to the first opening, the reader may interpret several ideas from peritext, which would begin to support their understanding of plot and setting.

Figure 4.33. Front Cover and Endpaper from The Safari Run Down
Tripp describes a setting, “one day in summer,” within the first opening (see Figure 4.34). Pictures show a sunny day with green grass and blue skies. Words introduce our characters, “four boys” named Bob, Jack, Bobby, and Tripp, while pictures show these characters. In speech bubbles, three of the boys convey excitement, as pictures show them smiling. One boy says “aw man” as he is shown frowning; both could indicate sadness or disappointment. Both words and pictures are conveying similar information; without the other, the reader could have similar interpretations about the setting and characters. However, not often is a picturebook completely redundant across the story in words and pictures (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In this opening, pictures show details of the settings not described in words. In addition, appearance of character is only conveyed through pictures. Words confirm gender identity and provide the names of our characters.

Figure 4.34. Words and Pictures Provide Similar Information in Opening 1 *The Safari Run Down*
In opening 2 (see Figure 4.35), interactions of words and pictures changes to one where pictures support words and words primarily convey story. Upon viewing the pictures, the setting seems relatively unchanged except for the texture and coloring of grass, but not until reading the words, “they got on a plane” and went to the “jungle,”—do we understand the change in setting and development of plot. Words convey that the boys were going to build a “shelter,” which is not shown in pictures. In speech bubbles, and as demonstrated by their facial expressions, the boys continue to convey excitement, except for the one; he is frowning and saying, “creepy.” The pictures selectively convey some of the information in words, but the words extend and primarily convey our understanding of story.

![Figure 4.35. Pictures Support Words in Opening 2 of The Safari Run Down.](image)

Interactions of words and pictures convey a different relationship in opening 4 (see Figure 4.36); they expand on the other. Words tell that the children “saw a miracle”
and “what a sight” it was. Words guide the reader’s attention to pictures to interpret the miracle. Pictures show a giraffe, the tiger from the previous opening, and what readers may interpret as a wild, big cat or as a baby giraffe; these new animals are the miracle Tripp conveys to the reader. Words and pictures are both critical to the development of story in this opening. Without words, readers would view the animals in the natural environment without understanding their impact on the story. The pictures in the opening exclusively develop setting without conveying character development. Character development is provided in words as the reader comes to learn about their emotional state and Bob’s transition as a character.

![Figure 4.36. Words and Pictures Expand on Each Other in Opening 4 of The Safari Run Down](image)

Both Tripp and Chloe’s picturebooks included openings identified as symmetrical (i.e., word and pictures provide similar information); however, across each of their
picturebooks, words and pictures were interacting in ways that extended understanding of
the story. Chloe and Tripp’s picturebooks demonstrated ways the relationship of words
and pictures were inconsistent across children’s picturebooks; this inconsistency occurred
in two contemporary realistic fiction and ten fantasy picturebooks.

**Word-Picture Relationships Across Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy**

Word-picture relationships were identified for each child’s picturebook using
Golden’s (1990) typology of word-picture relationships. In the opening-by-opening
analysis, it was apparent that children, across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy
genres, relied heavily on words to convey essential information to develop narrative.
However, in the global analysis of the entire picturebook, there were shifts in ways
children attended to words and pictures within their picturebooks across contemporary
realistic fiction and fantasy genres.

Children remained consistent with their use of symmetrical relationships across
contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy. However, in the picturebook making of
contemporary realistic fiction, there was a shift in ways children attended to pictures as a
meaning making resource. In contemporary realistic fiction children relied more heavily
on words to carry the narrative as suggested by the number of picturebooks identified
with the relationship, *words carry primary narrative, pictures are selective* (*n* = 9); this
number decreases in children’s fantasy picturebooks (*n* = 4), which indicated children
used pictures for more narrative purposes in the fantasy genre. Increased use of pictures
for narrative purposes within fantasy is also indicated by the increase in the categories,
*pictures carry primary narrative, words are selective; pictures enhance, elaborates*
words; and words depend on pictures for clarification. Table 4.10 shows the word-picture relationships within each genre and therefore, demonstrates the shifts across genres. Each of these categories suggests that children used pictures in ways that would demand attention from the reader to make sense of the narrative. Reagan, Derrick, and Kate are three children who demonstrated ways they made shifts in their picturebook and more deliberately used pictures for meaning.

Table 4.10

*Word-Picture Relationships Within Children’s Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Picturebooks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word-Picture Relationship</th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words and pictures are symmetrical</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words depend on pictures for clarification</td>
<td>5 25</td>
<td>7 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures enhance, elaborates words</td>
<td>2 10</td>
<td>4 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words carry primary narrative, pictures are selective</td>
<td>9 45</td>
<td>4 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures carry primary narrative, words are selective</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>3 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Picturebooks</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reagan’s realistic fiction picturebook. Reagan’s picturebook, *The Horse Show*, conveyed a narrative where pictures supported words, but words carried the weight of the narrative; essentially, pictures were selective and a little more than decoration in the opening. For example, in openings 3 and 4 of the picturebook (see Figure 4.36), Reagan
selected one element conveyed in words to illustrate on the opening. In opening 3, the words read, “They even brought it to the football games. It learned to jump in the air (left page). When they grew up the horse needed a name. So, they named it Summer. So, they rode it to the horse show (right page).” In pictures, Reagan illustrated the fence that horses jump over (left page) and in thick lettering wrote “Summer,” the name of the horse (right page). Pictures in this opening were inconsequential to the narrative; this use of pictures was found in opening 4 as well. In opening 4, the words read, “So they thought it was a show (left page). And a cat said to the horse, ‘you will be a good horse’ and will make a horse show (right page).” Reagan illustrated the right page with a small cat placed above the words. The picture neither extended understanding of the narrative nor conveyed similar information as the words.

![Figure 4.37. Selective Use of Pictures in Openings 3 and 4 of The Horse Show](image)

**Reagan’s fantasy picturebook.** In Reagan’s fantasy picturebook, *Puppy Squad and the Evil Cat*, there was a shift in the ways pictures were used. Reagan continued to design the openings of her picturebooks in a similar style as *The Horse Show* with black and white line-drawings arranged above the words; however, the ways she used pictures
became more complex. In openings 2 (see Figure 4.37), the words read “The people said there is something new in the museum (right page).” Reagan illustrated a member of the puppy squad looking at a display case inside of the museum. Pictures on this page extended understanding and showcased the “something new” noted in words. Reagan illustrated pictures to fill in gaps she had in the words (i.e., What was the “something new?”). In opening 3 (see Figure 4.37), the words read, “Then an evil cat said, ‘ha ha ha. I got the diamond.’ And there were lasers (left page).” In contrast to the selective use of pictures in The Horse Show, this picture conveyed more narrative and information.

Across Reagan’s two picturebooks, the interactions of words and pictures became slightly more complex. Reagan’s picturebooks shifted from a word-dominant narrative with selective use of pictures in her contemporary realistic fiction picturebook to more intentional use of pictures as a meaning-making resource in her fantasy picturebook.

**Figure 4.38. Pictures as a Meaning-Making Resource in Openings 2 and 3 of Puppy Squad**

**Derrick’s shift in word-picture relationship.** Similar to Reagan, Derrick did not change his style from the contemporary realistic fiction to the fantasy picturebook (see Figure 4.38). Derrick continued to write on the left and right pages within the openings
and included pictures on the left page; however, Derrick’s fantasy picturebook suggested a more intentional use of pictures to convey narrative. In his contemporary realistic picturebooks, illustrations depicted characters with minimal features. In contrast, in his fantasy picturebook Derrick more fully formed his character’s physical appearance and conveyed some elements of plot events. Derrick exhibited a shift, which included further development of character and plot, where Kate’s shift included further development of setting and plot events.

**Figure 4.39.** Comparing Word-Picture Relationships Across Derrick’s Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Picturebooks
**Kate’s shift in word-picture relationship.** Like Reagan and Derrick, Kate’s contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks suggested a shift in ways words and pictures interacted in her picturebook (see Figure 4.38). Both of Kate’s picturebooks suggested a reliance on words to carry the narrative; however, in Kate’s fantasy picturebook, pictures take a more active role in conveying setting, which was undeveloped and nonexistent in pictures within Kate’s contemporary realistic fiction picturebook. Interesting, in Kate’s fantasy picturebook, is the way setting was developed through a more dominant use of pictures in the physical arrangement (layout) in the opening and characterization of behaviors and traits were less developed. Across the contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks, Reagan, Derrick, and Kate’s picturebooks indicated a shift in ways pictures were used and interacted with words to convey narrative.
In this section, I present my analysis of the ways children discussed and described their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their picturebook productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Findings in this
section address the third research question: *How do second graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks?* Children’s semi-structured and unstructured interviews regarding their own picturebook productions (see Appendix C for protocol) and observational notes were used for analysis and provided insight into the ways children made decisions during and reflected upon their picturebook-making process. In my analysis, several themes emerged that revealed ways children attended to the interaction and meaning making potential of words and pictures in their picturebooks: (a) intentional choices, (b) reader awareness, (c), appropriation, (d) juxtaposing words and pictures, and (e) influence of peer designers.

**Intentional Choices**

In children’s discussion of words and pictures in their picturebooks, analysis revealed that children were intentional about the ways they crafted words and pictures and considered the interactions of words and pictures within their picturebooks. More specifically, they were aware of the ways they crafted words and pictures to convey information. As children responded to my questions about the whys behind their picturebook-making decisions (see Appendix C), their responses demonstrated that they were thoughtful and capable of reflecting on their decision-making during the picturebook making process. Children’s discussions of their picturebooks revealed ways they were intentional within artistic craft, literary craft, picturebook design, and word-picture relationships. Also revealed, were ways children demonstrated some difficulty describing the whys behind their choices.
**Artistic craft.** Children’s remarks during picturebook making and in their interviews about their picturebooks indicated that they were attending to the artistic craft—the meaning making features of the pictures. In their discussion, both after and during picturebook making, children demonstrated ways they intentionally crafted the pictures in their picturebooks for aesthetic appeal and to convey information.

When asked to talk about their pictures, children frequently acknowledged the ways color was used in their picturebooks. According to children, the main uses of color were to draw attention to elements of the picture and to make it appealing for the reader. Use of color in their pictures was particularly important to some children. For instance, Derrick appeared distraught when he discovered Jamal had taken the red marker he was using, because his Agent 8, the protagonist of his narrative, “had to be red” (observation, December 5, 2017). Sydney chose to use red and purple as prominent colors for her endpapers because “red is the first color of the rainbow,” and she “normally thinks about rainbows a lot” and “purple because it’s [her] favorite color” (interview, December 11, 2017). Throughout her interview, she continued her remarks, indicating ways she integrated colors she enjoyed. Children noted “my favorite” and “liked” as a motivation for selection throughout their interviews and picturebook making process, including their discussion about other components of artistic craft (e.g., materials selected) and other elements of the picturebook (e.g., words and peritextual features). Children’s color preferences did not indicate attention to meaning-making potential. However, it was influential during their decision-making process and children demonstrated other ways of being intentional about color use in their picturebooks.
When children discussed color, they mentioned ways they wanted elements of the picture to “stand out” and be “noticed” (interviews, November 14, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 14, 2017). Chloe discussed ways she used color to bring attention to the main character in her story, a girl wanting to play football, in her realistic fiction picturebook:

Chloe: I also only put her in color. She was in color in the first page but then in the football practice Jacob, Sam, and Alex weren't.

Hubbard: Oh, was there a reason you did that?

Chloe: Well I just really wanted people to notice her. Like she was standing out because— The book, there's only really one sentence about Alex, Sam, and Jacob but the whole entire book is just about football and her.

(interview, November 14, 2017)

Chloe commented, that not only did she want the character to “stand out,” she took the idea from one of our read-aloud picturebooks, Sidewalk Circus (Fleischman, 2004). She described her interest in how Sidewalk Circus, a read-aloud picturebook, used color: “I thought it was cool that they only put her in color so you would notice her.” Others, like Chloe, used color to bring attention to characters. For instance, Olivia highlighted that the main character in her fantasy picturebook, the tiger, was the only character in color because she “wanted the people that read it to focus on the tiger” (interview, December 11, 2017). Several children remarked that they used color to bring attention to elements of the picture and this was indicated in their openings (see Figure 4.37).
Figure 4.41. Intentional Use of Color to Bring Attention to Elements of Pictures

Children indicated they used color in meaningful ways for character and plot development. Evan described how the main character of his fantasy picturebook, the cat, changed colors when he encountered a problem: “The peach stuff means something’s going to happen. The cat is peach because he’s going to fall. When people are peach in this book, that means something bad is going to happen” (interview, December 12, 2017). Evan intentionally used color to convey danger or conflict in the story. Derrick used color in a similar way. In his picturebook, Alien Invasion, he indicated that the alien king, the adversary of his story, changed color depending on his situation: “When people blast him or hit him, he turns white. He turns blue when he’s about to attack his enemy” (interview, December 12, 2017). Figure 4.38 shows samples of Evan and Derrick’s use of color.
Both Evan and Derrick chose not to mention this character development in their picturebook’s words. Therefore, the pictures solely conveyed this information to the reader. Appearance of character, as mentioned in Evan and Derrick’s remarks, were apparent throughout children’s discussion of their pictures and did not solely focus on use of color. In addition to color, children discussed other ways the appearance of characters in pictures furthered understanding of their main characters.

*Figure 4.42. Intentional Use of Color for Character Development*

According to children, character appearance in pictures conveyed information to the reader, which was not conveyed through words. Children primarily focused on ways appearance indicated emotion, interests, and traits of the character. For example, Chloe discussed the ways she crafted her character: “I wanted it to look like she was having fun playing football. And I also wanted to make Kennedy look like she was very girly. Like with a pink tutu and cute little black tank top” (interview, November 14, 2017). In words the “girly” traits of her character were not conveyed, which meant Chloe’s push back against traditional gender norms, a “girly” girl playing football, was developed solely through her intentional craft of the pictures.
Children showed concern with ways colors were aesthetically appealing. Kennedy described her intentional selection of colors for the unicorn in her fantasy picturebook *Cali Finds a Unicorn*: “See this unicorn? …I decided to put blue and purple because I thought that they would blend in together well. Like good color partners” (interview, December 11, 2017). Kennedy’s selection of color highlighted her concern for ways color worked together in an appealing way. Tripp noted that he designed Rascal, the cat and main character in his story, with orange and blue coloring because he wanted to his character to look good and represent the fantastical element of his picturebook (interview, December 13, 2017). In addition to character, children described ways they intentionally used color to develop setting. Kate indicated that appearance of colors impacted her selection of setting. In her picturebook she described shades of reds and oranges as “pretty colors;” hence, she decided to make the time of year fall (interview, December 13, 2017), which she solely conveyed through pictures. Children’s remarks highlighted ways they used color to convey meaning.

When children chose not to use color throughout their picturebook, they justified their decisions. When I inquired further about Walton’s lack of color throughout his picturebooks, he said he “wanted to make this sort of like a chapter book and many chapter books don’t have color” (interview, November 13, 2017). Chloe referenced Walton’s picturebook as she justified why she chose not to add much color in her picturebook: “I didn’t want to be paying too much attention the pictures. I wanted [the pictures] to be a little add on like Walton did” (November 14, 2017). Some children like Walton and Chloe seemed confident in their decisions to not include color in their
designs. However, other’s body language and tone of voice seemed to indicate hesitance or embarrassment when they discussed the lack of color in their picturebooks (observations, December 12, 2017, December 13, 2017). I responded in ways that indicated, as the designer, they were able to make those choices and probed a bit further for their reasoning. Despite some hesitance, children, like Walton and Chloe, provided rationales for their choices.

Aside from color, few other comments in interviews and during picturebook making referenced attention to elements of art (e.g., line, space, shape, and texture) and selective use of media (e.g., crayons, markers, construction paper). Chloe commented on the use of space, or illusion of depth, in her picturebook to make the football appear closer to the reader the stadium further away in the picture:

Well I thought it would be like somebody threw it so if I would make this really big, it would be like the football stadium was down here but the football got thrown all the way up there. So, you can see it a little bit closer.

(interview, November 14, 2017)

Several children acknowledged their selection of media, or materials, for their picturebooks. Ava suggested she used construction paper so she “didn’t have to color the whole paper” (interview, December 13, 2017). Collin suggested he chose to use a different colored piece of construction paper for each page of his book because he “wanted to make it a rainbow book” (interview, December 12, 2017). Like Ava and Collin, when children described selection of materials they did not indicate rationales based on meaning-making potential. Children’s attention to artistic craft seemed to focus
more heavily on color than any other area. Despite their attention to color and intentionality to convey meaning, they did not demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the potential of color.

When Kennedy suggested the colors she selected were “good color partners,” her understanding was not based on color theory (e.g., primary and secondary colors) and understanding of how colors work together to create mood and convey meaning. For instance, warm colors (i.e., reds, yellows, and oranges) can suggest warmth and cheerfulness. In contrast, cool colors (i.e., blues, purples, and greens) can suggest serenity or sadness. Overall, children’s discussion of their picturebooks showed limited understanding of the way artistic craft and more specifically elements of art and principles of design enhanced meaning in picturebooks. However, their responses did indicate intentionality when crafting the pictures of their picturebooks, just not in sophisticated ways where their choices conveyed deeper meanings.

**Literary craft.** Attention to literary craft, or the meaning-making features of words to convey story, was referenced less often than artistic craft during picturebook making and interviews. Despite limited focus on literary craft, common elements in their discussions were the ways they intentionally used dialogue, engaged the reader, and supported character development through words.

During interviews, when asked to describe the design of the openings, children frequently referenced the use of dialogue, either in speech bubbles or the written story. Several students commented on their reasoning for incorporating dialogue in their picturebooks. Miles pointed to the villain in this picturebook and said, “...this is the
enemy. He’s saying, ‘enemy you’re frozen.’ I wrote it right here, ‘enemy’ to make sure [people know] and that he’s gotten frozen” (interview, December 14, 2017). Collin used dialogue to clarify information to the reader. Children also emphasized the way they used dialogue to convey the characters’ emotions and thoughts to the reader. Ava emphasized the way she used speech bubbles to convey emotion: “I feel like you know that she’s really like, ‘No!’ because she’s not happy about it” (interview, November 13, 2017). Allison suggested she incorporated dialogue because “I wanted to make sure they got if she was feeling sad or a little bit happy or how she’s feeling and stuff. Here I showed her feeling a little bit down [pointing to speech bubble]” (interview, November 6, 2017).

Children’s discussions emphasized their intentional use of dialogue to convey character’s emotions and thoughts. Children not only described ways they wanted to convey character’s emotional state, they described intentional ways they used literary craft to engage the reader.

Children crafted words in intentional ways to engage the reader. Allison suggested that she “made sentences more exciting, not just boring” because she wanted to “show a little bit more excitingness” for the reader (interview, December 11). Kennedy suggested reasons why she used ellipses in her pictures was to build anticipation:

they go to the next page and it's something really exciting, like ... some people go, like, "And the pirates were looking for treasure and treasure for a long, long time, but then, one day, dot, dot, dot, [turns to next opening] they found treasure!"

Kinda to make it exciting. (interview, December 11, 2017)
Kennedy was aware that by crafting the words to stop in the middle of the sentence, she invoked the reader’s excitement for the next opening. Children attended to humor more often than any other emotion. When children discussed words in their interviews, they referenced ways they could craft words to evoke humor (e.g., interviews, November 10, 2017, December 12, 2017). Emmie described her inclusion of character’s singing *Old MacDonald Had a Farm* in her realistic fiction picturebook as a “funny” opening (Emma, November 10, 2017; see Figure 4.39), which she intentionally included in the resolution of conflict and at a point that indicated a change in the tone of the story. In contrast, Miles suggested that he mentioned “all the kids in the orphanage” in the first opening of his picturebook, because he was sad when he learned about orphanages, and he wanted to initiate the picturebook with a sad beginning (interview, November 14, 2017). Children, like Emmie and Miles, were intentional about ways they wanted to engage the reader through words.

*Figure 4.43. Incorporating Old MacDonald Had a Farm to Convey Humor*
Children also attended to the ways they intentionally described the characters or did not describe characters through words in their picturebooks. Chloe acknowledged, that while she usually developed names and descriptions for characters, in this picturebook she decided to refer to her main character as “the boy” and give “nobody in the story a name” (interview, December 14, 2017). When asked why she chose not to give characters a name, she said, “It’s just, as you noticed, there’s no reason I needed to give him a name,” and she suggested she wanted the reader to “just think of a boy.” She indicated that she intentionally left the description of the character vague. Miles described his characters as “aliens that change shape,” but noted the he chose not to tell the reader why (interview, December 14, 2017). His remarks demonstrated ways he was intentional about his vagueness and wanted to leave the reason open-ended. Children’s attention to literary craft in their discussion of the picturebooks was infrequent but demonstrated ways they were intentional in their choices.

**Picturebook design.** In the discussion of their picturebooks, children highlighted several ways they were intentional in the overall creation, which did not focus specifically on artistic or literary craft. Children commented on ways they were intentional about choices in their peritextual features (e.g., covers and endpapers) and attended to genre and format.

Peritextual features were frequently discussed and referenced in interviews with children. Children revealed how they attended to the creation and design of these features in connection with the story conveyed within openings of the picturebook. Crafting titles for the picturebooks were frequently discussed. Titles draw in the reader and young
children are attentive to titles when selecting picturebooks to read (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001); these young children showed particular focus on crafting the titles for their picturebooks. Many children followed a traditional format of using the main character’s name in the story: *Emma Loves to Swim, Missy, Steph Loves to Play Football, Emily Goes to the Forest, Xander’s Dream, and Cali Finds a Unicorn*. Similar to others, Olivia designed her picturebook to highlight the main character of her story, Olivia. When Olivia (the author and illustrator) discussed the development of the title for her story, “Olivia Can,” she described her process:

“I was going to do *Olivia Can Do Baseball* but then I noticed that I don't really have enough room. I could make it, but it just sounds like a really long title. And then I noticed that like nobody believes her, so she's the only one believing in her and her mother and her father. So, I just wrote, *Olivia Can* instead. (interview, November 6, 2017)

Olivia described the way she was intentional about connecting the title of her picturebook to her story and made edits during the process. She not only highlighted the main character of her story; she emphasized the theme of her story as well.

Others chose to include a collective group of characters in their title: *The Lonely Children, The Lost Boys, and Boys Win, Girls Smack Down*. Peyton discussed the way she appropriated and remixed the title *The Lonely Children* from *The Boxcar Children* (Warner, 1942): “Well, at first I kind of wanted to, to make it like *The Boxcar Children*. So, I made it into three [children], I made the characters in the woods, but I didn't make it into a boxcar thing” (interview, November 10, 2017). Children highlighted ways they
were influenced by other picturebooks in the development of not only their story, but also
titles and cover design. Olivia highlighted the read-aloud picturebook, *Mr. Tiger Goes
Wild* (Brown, 2013) as influential to the development of her title and front cover for *The
Tiger with No Friends*: “I wanted it to be in the wild. I copied Mr. Tiger from the *Mr.
Tiger Goes Wild to Mr. Tiger Has No Friends*. I drew it down like that” (interview,
December 11, 2017). Olivia appropriated components of the front cover of *Mr. Tiger
Goes Wild* into her own cover. Children’s discussion of front covers revealed the effort
and intentionality in the design of these features.

Children explained ways they designed the front cover to anticipate elements of
story in the picturebooks. As Evan discussed the front cover of his realistic fiction
picturebook, *The Beautiful Moon*, he described it as “a kind of a preview” of the story
(interview, November 10, 2017). Others explained the ways they included pictures on the
cover to interact with the title in intentional ways. Allison noted in her interview of *Emily
Goes to the Forest*, “I thought of *Emily Goes to the Forest*, I wanted it to look like a
forest a little bit with the grass and the sun showing” (interview, November 6, 2017).
Allison designed the picture of her front cover to work with her title. Other children
indicated they were aware of the ways their cover provided insight to the reader and
cognizant of the ways the cover worked in with or against the story developed in the
picturebook. Chloe deliberately “made a little joke about the little plant” on her front
cover (interview, December 14, 2017). She purposely developed the title, *The Little
Plant*, to contradict the story, which focuses on a plant growing to gigantic size. Similar,
is the way Miles, titled his picturebook, *Orphanage Kid*, to “trick people” into thinking
the setting of the story was in the orphanage (interview, December 14, 2017). Children’s comments highlighted ways the title and front cover was deliberately designed for their picturebook.

In the picturebook making process, children grappled with genre and format of their picturebooks and at times pushed back against both. Children sought ways to incorporate ideas from comics and chapter books into their picturebooks (observations, November 1, 2017, December 5, 2017; interviews, December 11, 2017, December 12, 2017, December 13, 2017). Several children noted ways they were inspired to focus “more on words” than pictures because of their interest in chapter books (observation, November 1, 2017; interviews, November 13, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 12, 2017). Walton described ways he bridged chapter books and picturebooks in his book, *Stickman Shooter*: “I sort of wanted to make this kind of like a chapter book and a picturebook. So, I put lots of words on every page and on [the front cover] more drawing” (interview, December 13, 2017).

With genre, children grappled with staying in the boundaries defined by realistic fiction and fantasy. Children’s discussion highlighted ways genre impacted elements in words, pictures, and the overall development of story (interviews, November 13, 2017, December 11, 2017). Kennedy suggested that the “only reason [she] picked a unicorn for [her] book instead of any other animal, is because it wouldn’t really have that big fantasy touch” that she needed (interview, December 11, 2017). Interesting was how the unicorn was only discussed and shown in one opening and in the title of the picturebook, *Cali Finds a Unicorn*. She goes on to describe the plot events of her story and noted, “it would
be weird because, how is this a fantasy story?” She recognized that to be within the boundaries of fantasy, she needed at least one fantastical element and she incorporated the unicorn. Tripp’s noted the same issue in his fantasy picturebook. Tripp suggested he enjoyed realism and nonfiction in books he reads and had a difficult time designing a fantasy picturebook (interview, December 13, 2017). Tripp chose to develop an animal character, but developed a plot that “could happen in real life.” Children showed recognition of the ways they developed fantasy either through words or pictures or both. In Tripp’s picturebook, he developed fantasy through pictures alone. Boundaries, and for some children, limitations of genre impacted their decision-making when they developed the interaction of words and pictures.

**Word-picture relationships.** Children’s remarks demonstrated ways they were reflective and intentional about the interaction of words and pictures and more specifically, ways they conveyed information through the interactions of words and pictures. Children indicated the many ways they “wanted” the words and pictures in their picturebooks to interact with each other (e.g., interviews, November 14, 2017, December 13, 2017, December 14, 2017).

When children were asked how they used words and pictures on the page, children often responded in ways that indicated how they wanted information conveyed to the reader. Chloe discussed ways she wanted words and picture to interact in her realistic fiction picturebook and demonstrated how she intentional about their interaction (interview, November 14, 2017):
Well I didn't really want them to match exactly because I wanted there to be a little bit more words than pictures and with the very small pictures it can't ... I couldn't really put in, ‘The first quarter she scored two touchdowns, then three, then four, because of her, her team had won.’ I couldn't really put it in the pictures. So, I just decided to do a football field to show, this is the team name and they are playing football in this field.

Chloe’s comment is only one example of many during her interviews that showed she intentionally made decisions about information she placed in words and pictures and was cognizant of their relationship in designing her picturebook. Furthermore, she acknowledged the limitations of pictures to tell part of her story and how that influenced the ways she conveyed information in words. Others noted ways they were intentional about what they “showed” to the reader in comparison to what they “told” (e.g., interviews, November 10, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 12, 2017).

Olivia noted that when she designed one opening with two panels for separate pictures in her realistic fiction picturebook, she wanted to “show Olivia’s coach and all the boys saying no to her. And I also wanted to show the mother and the father cheering her up and the brother saying, ‘I didn’t do it’” (interview, November 6, 2017); these were parts of the words that she highlighted as needing to be shown in the pictures. Olivia highlighted ways she intentionally showed in pictures events described in words. Reagan discussed ways she decided to show more in the pictures of her fantasy picturebook: “I thought it was cool that you could design it like that because it would show what is in the new museum and I was trying to make the pictures tell more than the words” (interview,
Reagan, having previously demonstrated a preference for words in her realistic fiction picturebook, indicated that she was intentional about the ways she furthered understanding through pictures by showing setting and character development; information she did not convey through words.

When the second graders discussed ways they crafted and used pictures in their picturebook, they commented on ways they crafted pictures to bring attention to specific elements of pictures and selected elements of the words to show in the pictures. For instance, the children acknowledged reasons why they did not include a picture. Allison, when discussing her realistic fiction picturebook, suggested she did not need “many details” in her pictures because “it was already in the sentence” (interview, November 6, 2017; see Figure 4.40). When discussing the reason she chose to selectively show the character and speech bubble in her pictures, she said she “put this girl on the page so you could pay more attention to her and know that she was saying that to herself.” Allison’s remarks suggested that she decided words conveyed needed information for story and therefore, pictures were unnecessary for conveying the same information. When making decisions regarding pictures, she chose to selectively convey specific information from the words. Allison summarized her thinking of how she designed her picturebook as:

My goal to make this book— It wasn't really to match the pictures and the words together. I tried to do it a little bit at first, but then I got my mind thinking of what I wanted to happen in my story. I wrote what I felt in my head then I just drew a picture of what was in my sentence. (interview, November 6, 2017)
With Allison, pictures were used to selectively convey parts of the information provided in the words. She goes on to note that, “in a lot of my book, the words tell more, but I like pictures because they do give some information, and the reason I did more words is because I love reading books, and I always like how it has more words.” Like Allison, children’s intentionality with word-picture relationships was often focused on ways they chose to convey or not convey information from the words in pictures. While Allison and others suggested they focused more on attending to words and selectively conveying information in pictures (e.g., interviews, December 13, 2017, December 14, 2017), fewer indicated intentional decision-making in regards to attending to pictures and selectively conveying information in words (interviews, November 10, 2017, November 14, 2017). Some highlighted that the limitations of pictures—“the pictures can’t tell that” (interview, November 6, 2017)—as reasons why they chose to add more to the words. Other children highlighted an intentional choice to convey similar information in words and pictures.

Figure 4.44. Allison’s Selective Use of Pictures
Tripp, when asked how he designed his opening and considered words and pictures in his picturebook, remarked that he wanted the words and pictures “to kind of match” (interview, December 13, 2017). Others echoed Tripp’s focus on designing openings with words and pictures conveying similar information (interviews, November 10, 2017, November 14, 2017). Sydney described the way she wanted to convey similar information in an opening of her fantasy picturebook: “It says Reagan’s heart had a wrinkle in it. And there's the wrinkle in Reagan’s heart. And the information goes with the picture and it's like connected, it can connect” (interview, December 11, 2017). As children discussed openings where they suggested they wanted symmetrical relationships between words and pictures, they also highlighted in other openings the ways words and pictures enhanced the other. Children’s comments demonstrated that they were intentional about the ways they designed the interaction of words and pictures in their picturebooks, but also that they were flexible in their decision-making; they did not design the same interaction across the entire picturebook. Despite many children suggesting they wanted to convey more through words or convey similar information in both words and pictures, there were some who demonstrated difficulty in explaining their choices.

When describing the whys behind their decisions, some children were inconsistent in their ability to describe how they designed their picturebook. Many children across interviews used similar language to describe word-picture relationships and the ways they were intentional about the interactions of words and pictures in their picturebooks; however, others (e.g., Evan, Jamal, and Beth) seemed unsure about their
decisions and instead of explaining, described the words and pictures on the pages. Evan responded with “I don’t know” or provided a description of his opening when he was asked to discuss his decision-making (interview, November 10, 2017). Olivia, though typically capable of describing her choices, responded with, “I don’t know why I designed it this way or drawed it this way,” when attempting to describe why she crafted a picture to work with the words in an opening (interview, December 11, 2017). Overall, children demonstrated intentionality with word-picture relationships; at times, however, they seemed unsure of the decisions they made or were unable to explain them.

Children demonstrated further ability to discuss intentional choices related to word-picture relationships in their fantasy picturebooks in comparison to their realistic fiction picturebooks. For instance, Kate, who had difficulty explaining word-picture relationships and the decisions behind those relationships in her realistic fiction picturebook and responded, “I don’t know” (interview, November 13, 2017), discussed her choices more thoroughly in her interview about her fantasy picturebook. She highlighted that she “chose one element from the words to put in the pictures,” and through words she chose to tell “more than the picture” (interview, December 13, 2017). Children showed more inconsistency in their ability to discuss their decision-making during interviews and picturebook-making sessions for their realistic fiction picturebook, than for their fantasy picturebook.

**Reader Awareness**

As children reflected on their picturebooks during interviews, their responses indicated they were aware of the reader; their discussion often referenced the potential
reader of the picturebook and ways the potential reader influenced their decision-making. When children were asked to discuss ways they designed the openings of their picturebooks and the whys behind their use of words and pictures, children’s responses focused on how they wanted to convey information to the reader through words, pictures, and their interactions.

In Chloe’s discussion of The Little Plant and the whys behind her decision to draw the grandparents in her opening was her desire for the reader “to know what his grandparents looked like, because a lot of times it’s hard to imagine grandparents” (interview, December 14, 2017). She goes on to suggest that she “didn’t want to draw everything” but “wanted to draw a couple of important things” specifically for the reader to attend to in the opening. Chloe’s discussion of her picturebook continued to highlight ways that in her design she was cognizant of a potential audience of her picturebook and ways she could excite her reader.

In the seventh opening of her picturebook (see Figure 4.41), she highlighted ways the reader was influential to her design: “I didn't really want to tell them it grew really, really big.” She goes on to say that if she wrote “its small” and then “growing up” then the reader “won't get excited.” She noted that by writing exactly what happened to the plant, the reader would be less excited than seeing the “dot, dot, dot” [ellipsis] and learning about the plant growing and becoming alive. Instead she intentionally chose to convey information through pictures with limited input in words. In the eighth opening (see Figure 4.41), she suggested she wanted “just a picture on the page” because she wanted the reader to “start looking really deep into the page and [notice] the tiny, tiny,
little details that I put into it.” She continued to highlight ways the reader was in mind throughout the construction of her picturebook, specifically when she discussed how she wanted to convey information to the reader.

Figure 4.45. Opening 7 and 8 from The Little Plant

Some highlighted ways they wanted to clarify information to the reader in words or pictures to support their understanding of story development. Alejandro noted that “it would be really confusing” to the reader “if you only saw the pictures” in his picturebook, The Guy that Made No Sense!? Alejandro noted that the words say “he’s the smartest person in the city,” but the reader has to look at the pictures to see the characters actions. However, he goes on to suggest that the “words are an important part” for the reader to attend to in his story, because he intentionally conveyed information in words so the reader was not confused.

Allison’s discussion of The Big Move focused on ways she was aware of the reader and intentionally brought information to their attention. She insisted that she primarily drew the main character with speech bubbles on many pages so that the reader
“could pay more attention her and know what she was saying that to herself” (interview, November 6, 2017). Allison noted that her use of speech bubbles was to provide the reader with the inner thinking of the character and highlight her emotions. In Allison’s discussion of the fourth opening (see Figure 4.42), she described the reader as influential to her decision-making when designing the picture: “I put her right here. I put goodbye. This is showing her house to make sure that the readers know that she's saying goodbye to the house, not anything else.” Allison’s picturebook focused on the main character’s difficulty to leave her house and her remarks indicated that she wanted to emphasize this to the reader. Children, like Allison, indicated attention to the reader and highlighted the ways they conveyed information to the reader to support the reader’s meaning making.

Figure 4.46. Opening 4 of The Big Move

Appropriation

When discussing their decision-making regarding words, pictures, and their interactions, children referenced other texts as influential to their own decision-making. Children noted Dogman (Pilkey, 2017), the Dragon Masters series (West & Howells, 2014), The Boxcar Children (Warner, 1942), and other chapter books that were
influential to the ways they developed story and designed their picturebook (e.g., interviews, November 13, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 13, 2017). Several children highlighted ways they wanted their picturebooks to resemble the chapter books they were reading (interviews, November 13, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 13, 2017; observation, October 31, 2017), which influenced their dominant use of words to develop story (see Figure 4.43).

Figure 4.47. Influence of Chapter Books on Dominant Use of Words in Picturebooks

Chapter books and other texts children were currently reading or recently finished were influential to the design of their picturebooks. Chloe, during the time of picturebook making, was reading *James and the Giant Peach* (Dahl, 1961), a story of a young boy who lives with his cruel aunts and grows a giant peach, and discussed ways she took “a couple ideas” into her own fantasy picturebook, *The Little Plant* (interview, December 14, 2017): “the plant just kept growing and growing and growing. I never actually mentioned about the seed being magical” but the readers will be able to tell “mostly.” She goes on to suggest that the “plant is kind of following him and wants to interact with him,” which was also influenced by *James and the Giant Peach*. Like Chloe, others
acknowledged ways books and popular culture entertainment (e.g., videos games, movies, and television) influenced their designs.

Children highlighted ways video games and television shows influenced their picturebook. Walton turned a video game called *Stickman Shooter*, a game where “people and cars and planes are attacking him and he shoots the people and they die,” into his fantasy picturebook (interview, December 13, 2017). Reagan adapted character traits and events from *Barbie: Spy Squad*, a web-based game and movie, into the story of her fantasy picturebook (interview, December 12, 2017). Miles, influenced by the wrestling and characters seen in the World Wrestling Entertainment (WWE) television show, incorporated and adapted storylines about wrestling into his realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks (interviews, November 14, 2017, December 14, 2017). Children were influenced by pop culture entertainment in the design of their picturebooks; they appropriated and remixed characters, storylines, and settings into their own picturebooks.

Children appropriated ideas from other texts, but more frequently referenced the picturebooks read aloud during this study as influential to their decision-making regarding the interaction of words and pictures. When Collin was asked to describe his decision-making regarding word-picture relationships in his realistic fiction picturebook, he noted that he considered *The Snowy Day*, “I knew in *The Snowy Day* they went together, so I just wanted to copy a little bit off of it and get the pictures to match the words” (interview, November 10, 2017). Collin acknowledged *The Snowy Day* (1962), a picturebook identified with a symmetrical word-picture relationship, as influential to his decision to use a relationship where words and pictures conveyed similar information.
Across Collin’s discussion of word-picture relationships in this picturebook, he highlighted ways he chose to “match” the words and pictures. Emmie referenced *Sidewalk Circus* (Fleischman, 2004) as influential to the way she designed openings in her picturebook: “In *Sidewalk Circus* the words are kind of part of the picture. [pointing to the words in the opening of her picturebook] This is part of the picture and what’s happening” (interview, November 10, 2017). Emmie appropriated the style of *Sidewalk Circus*, a picturebook where words are integrated into the pictures, into the ways she designed several openings of her realistic fiction picturebook.

When discussing their picturebooks, children appropriated language their peers and I, as the read-aloud facilitator, used during interactive read-alouds. For example, in the read-aloud of *A Sick Day for Amos McGee*, Chloe, Beth, and Peyton discussed “hidden pictures” or “hidden things,” which children used to describe objects or small animals that were incorporated across several openings or on the endpapers of the picturebook, but are not mentioned in words; they discussed these “hidden things” as something the illustrator intentionally added for the reader to find. In *A Sick Day for Amos McGee* (Stead & Stead, 2010), children referred to the mice and balloons as hidden things. In *The Curious Garden* (Brown, 2009), children predicted that the bird would be “hidden in multiple pages.” Discussion of hidden pictures spanned across five interactive read-alouds. In children’s discussion of their own picturebooks, they discussed ways they did or did not include their own hidden pictures.

For example, Reagan and Sydney discussed ways they did not include hidden pictures. As Reagan discussed her reliance on words to tell the story in her realistic
fiction picturebook, she described her rationale as she “didn’t really want to do hidden details” and “wanted to mention basically everything I have [in the pictures]” also included “in the [words]” (interview, November 10, 2017). In contrast to Sydney’s realistic fiction picturebook where she included hidden pictures, she noted that she “didn’t do a hidden picture” in the endpapers of her fantasy picturebook and instead made the pictures obvious to the reader (interview, December 11, 2017). Both Reagan and Sydney highlighted ways children intentionally did not appropriate ideas from interactive read-alouds but appropriated language from the read-aloud to explain their decisions.

Others discussed ways they included hidden pictures in their picturebooks. Kate, as she discussed her fantasy picturebook *Going Camping*, described the hidden pictures in her picturebook: “two little ponies are a hidden picture” and “a little bird is another hidden picture” (interview, December 13, 2017). She goes on to say that the characters in her story do not see these characters “just like Rosie doesn’t recognize the fox” in *Rosie’s Walk* (Hutchins, 1967), a picturebook where children used the term “hidden things” to describe the pictures in several openings. Chloe mentioned that she included hidden pictures in her realistic fiction picturebook because she “thought it was going to be funny” (interview, November 14, 2017). In addition to appropriating “hidden pictures,” Chloe appropriated language from interactive read-alouds in her discussion of her fantasy picturebook. Chloe, in her discussion of *The Little Plant*, echoed the same idea discussed in the read-aloud of *Leave Me Alone* (Brosgol, 2016) and noted that the reader “could read this book completely without looking at the pictures” to emphasize the symmetrical relationship in several of her openings. Children’s appropriation and remixing of ideas
and language from other picturebooks and the read-alouds were often referenced in the ways they discussed their decision-making of words and pictures.

**Juxtaposing Word and Pictures**

In children’s discussion of how the words and pictures conveyed information in their picturebooks and their decision-making behind the interaction of words and pictures, they compared and contrasted the interaction using phrases like “telling more” or “telling the same information” (e.g., interviews, November 6, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 12, 2017). Children’s responses primarily focused on identifying the ways words and pictures were providing different or similar information in the opening of the picturebook.

Children described word-picture relationships across openings of their picturebook and identified ways words and pictures conveyed more information to the reader. Allison described the word-picture relationship in her picturebook as one where “the words tell more” (interview, December 11, 2017). She goes on to explain that she “likes pictures because they do give some information,” but the reason she “did more words is because [she] loves reading books and [she] always likes how it has more words,” and in those books the words convey most of the information. She noted that even though she used the words to convey more information, she recognized the way the words and pictures work together: “the words are pretty important because they can work with the pictures and each one gives some information to the reader.” Like Allison, children highlighted ways they were intentional about the way they provided more
information through words; however, fewer children described the intentional decision-making to convey more information through pictures.

Though fewer, children discussed ways they designed pictures to convey more information to the reader. Reagan, in her discussion of *Puppy Squad*, suggested that she “was trying to make the pictures tell more than the words” (interview, December 12, 2017), which contrasted her decision-making in her realistic fiction picturebook where the pictures selectively conveyed information in words and seemed to act as decoration, rather than prominent in conveying story. In *Puppy Squad*, Reagan goes on to highlight ways she wanted the “pictures to tell more” or to “tell the same thing.” In the third opening of Kate’s fantasy picturebook, *Going Camping*, she described how she conveyed “a little bit more information” through pictures (interview, December 13, 2017). Kate noted that she designed the pictures to provide hidden characters and convey the setting to the reader. Though Kate suggested she conveyed more information to the reader through pictures, the words are essential to understanding the plot events, which she did not convey in pictures. Rather than “more information,” both words and pictures are expanding on the other. Other children like Kate, described ways they conveyed more information either in words or pictures and supported their thinking with adequate reasoning; however, while the words or picture conveyed additional information, they did not carry the story by providing “more information” as children suggested. Despite their descriptions of the way they intended words and pictures to interact within or across openings of their picturebooks, their understandings were not entirely congruent with the way the relationship was conveyed in their picturebook.
Children not only focused on ways words and picture conveyed more information than the other, they indicated ways they designed words and pictures to convey the “same information” or “go together” (e.g., interviews, November 10, 2017, December 12, 2017, December 13, 2017). In Emmie’s discussion of her fantasy picturebook, *The Fairy Land Adventures*, she described the way words and pictures worked together in the first opening of her picturebook (see Figure 4.44) by suggesting that the words and pictures “go together better on this page because ‘once upon a time there lived a kitten’” and pointed to the kitten (interview, December 12, 2017). She continued to read, “‘it's a very, very rainy night’” and suggested “the rainy night part, that wasn't close to pictures.” When Emmie viewed the right-hand page of the opening, she remarked, “I don't think it goes together very well at all.” Emmie’s comments suggested that she analyzed the way she designed words and pictures to interact in her picturebook and evaluated how well they worked together. Her responses indicated that she viewed “going together well” as symmetrical relationships. Ava suggested in the discussion of her fantasy picturebook, *Unicorns Cannot Play*, the words and pictures “don’t go together very well” (interview, December 13, 2017). She continued by saying, “this one goes together [pointing to page], but this one doesn’t because it’s not laughing at her because she’s not in the picture [pointing to another page in the opening].” Ava, like Emmie, in her discussion focused on how well words and pictures conveyed similar information. In addition to Emmie and Ava, others used similar language—“going together well” or “goes together better”—to indicate a value for similarity of information conveyed in words and pictures (interviews, December 12, 2017, December 13, 2017).
Figure 4.48. Opening 1 of *The Fairy Land Adventure*

Children’s discussion of their word-picture relationships focused on ways they designed the opening of a picturebook to convey similar and different information. As Peyton discussed her fantasy picturebook, *Dogman*, she began by describing the way the words of the opening provided the reader with more information than the pictures. She then changed her understanding of her opening by suggesting “it’s actually kind of the same amount of information” provided in both words and pictures, but it was also “different information” (interview, December 12, 2017). As Peyton continued to describe her understanding her comments indicated that she was trying to suggest that she designed a relationship where words and pictures expand or enhance the other. Other children grappled with describing this relationship in the discussion of their picturebooks as well.

Sydney discussed the interactions of words and pictures in her fantasy picturebook, *In the Jungle*, by highlighting ways she conveyed the same information across openings, and then discussed ways she conveyed different information in the same
openings (interview, December 11, 2017). In the second opening, she noted that “it goes together a lot because it shows that there’s a heart and it says ‘Reagan’s heart had a wrinkle in it’ and [pointing] there’s the wrinkle of the heart.” She then described ways that she did not “show in the pictures that Reagan is feeling left out.” Both Peyton and Sydney demonstrated ways children worked to describe an enhancement relationship between words and pictures.

As Kennedy described ways she designed the words and pictures to expand upon the other within her picturebook, *Cali Finds a Unicorn*, she suggested that without pictures the reader would be questioning information described in the words (interview, December 11, 2017). She goes on to say that she liked chapter books because getting the reader to “make a picture in [their] mind is easier” for the designer. She continued to describe how authors develop a visual picture for the reader through words: “they go like, ‘when the icicle falls’ or ‘the pretty moonlight’ and stuff like that and there’s not really a big picture so you want to make a picture in your mind of a pretty night and stuff like that.” As Kennedy described ways she was cognizant of the need for words and pictures to compliment the other to tell the complete story, she pushed back and indicated difficulty for the designer when pictures were included. Like Kennedy, other children indicated that writing words was easier than designing words and pictures to interact in their picturebooks (interviews, November 6, 2017, December 13, 2017). However, several children who indicated a fondness for words in interviews of their realistic fiction picturebook, indicated more attention to pictures when designing their fantasy picturebooks (interviews, November 10, 2017, December 12, 2017)
Peer Designers

Children’s discussions of their decision-making revealed ways they were impacted by the social environment of the classroom during the picturebook-making process. Not only did children highlight the inclusion of their classmates as characters into their picturebooks, they highlighted ways the designing of their picturebooks were influenced by their tablemates and fellow designers. During the picturebook-making process, children were grouped with four classmates at five tables across the room. Tablemates served as peer designers with whom children shared their picturebooks, discussed their ideas, and sought out advice when needed (e.g., observations, October 31, 2017, November 1, 2017, December 5, 2017). While less frequent, some children would visit a peer at another table to discuss (e.g., observations, October 31, 2017, December 4, 2017).

Children revealed ways they were influenced during the picturebook making process by peer designers. Tripp, in the construction of his realistic fiction picturebook, suggested that he wanted “to put a lot of words on the page, kind of like a chapter book, but it’s not a chapter book” (observation, November 1, 2017). He then turned to Emmie, his tablemate, and they had the following exchange:

Tripp: It’s like your book, Emmie. It has a lot of words on the page.

Emma: It’s kind of like a lot of words and one small picture on a page?

Tripp: Yeah. I want to tell all about the jungle in words.

Tripp revealed the way Emmie’s picturebook design was influential to his own. Others highlighted ways their peers’ picturebooks influenced their design process. Chloe, when
discussing several openings of her fantasy picturebook, suggested she “didn’t want to be paying too much attention to the pictures” but rather “wanted it to be a little add on like Walton did” (interview, December 14, 2017). Alejandro noted that he included design features found in comics (e.g., punctuation signs within the pictures, panels, and movement lines) into his picturebook, because Collin, his tablemate, suggested he “do comics instead” when he had difficulty developing an idea for his fantasy picturebook (interview, December 11, 2017). Children were immersed in a social environment where the interactions with peer designers were influential to how they designed their picturebooks, and more specifically, influential to ways children attended to the word-picture relationships in their picturebooks.

**Decision-Making Within and Across Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Genres**

Children demonstrated differences in how they discussed their decision-making between their contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Most children, during their discussion of their contemporary realistic fiction picturebook, seemed less aware of or unable to discuss why they designed an opening in a specific way and instead, when asked, described how they designed an opening. From contemporary realistic fiction children demonstrated a shift in their awareness and capability to explain their choices. Reagan demonstrated a shift in the way she discussed the designs of her picturebook from contemporary realistic fiction to fantasy. When Reagan was asked to explain how she chose to design the first opening of her contemporary realistic fiction picturebook, *The Horse Show* (see Figure 4.45), she responded, “I’m not sure”
(interview, November 10, 2017). Later, in the second opening (see Figure 4.45) her response to the same request was, “I designed it—It said they found a baby horse in a present. The horse is hiding inside the present.” Both responses indicated that Reagan was unsure of why she designed and relied on description rather than explanation. However, in her fantasy picturebook, Reagan demonstrates more awareness of her design choices.

![Image](image_url)

*Figure 4.49. Opening 1 and 2 of Reagan’s Picturebook The Horse Show*

In the second opening of her fantasy picturebook (see Figure 4.46), *Puppy Squad*, Reagan explained that she “picked these (pointing to pictures) to show that what I mean by a mer and a dog and then a flying puppy (left page)” (interview, December 12, 2017). In the right page of the opening, she noted that:

“There's like someone touching the glass around the big diamond and I tried to make it as sturdy as I could. I thought it was cool that you could design it like that because it would show what is in the new museum and I was trying to make the pictures tell more than the words.”
Her responses indicated a change in her understanding. Though she still used descriptions instead of explanations in her fantasy picturebook at times, her responses demonstrated further awareness of her decision-making. In later openings she suggested that she “chose to do that (pointing to the picture) because it's what one of the puppies said when they caught the cat” and she “chose to design this one (pointing to the picture) because I was going to put a sign right here that said, ‘Home sweet home’, but then I thought it could be inside the house.” Both responses indicate an awareness of her choices and decision-making process. Furthermore, her responses indicate that she was aware of how word and pictures interacted in the openings.

![Figure 4.50. Opening 2 of Reagan’s Picturebook Puppy Squad](image)

Few children, like Olivia, demonstrated the capability to explain their designs across both contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Olivia, when asked to describe why she designed the first opening in her contemporary realistic fiction picturebook (see Figure 4.47), responded: “Because you can see her brother is thinking that inside of him. But you can see that Olivia doesn't know that and she just believes herself that she can do it” (interview, November 6, 2017). Her response indicated that she
designed the appearance of the brother to show his thoughts that she conveyed through words, “she cannot do it because she is a girl.” For Olivia, the sad face conveyed his thoughts. In contrast, she suggested that Olivia is happy because she is unaware of her brother’s thoughts. Olivia demonstrated intentional decision-making in regards to words and pictures and understanding of her design. Olivia’s explanations of her fantasy picturebook demonstrated this awareness and understanding in her discussions as well.

![Figure 4.51. Opening 1 of Olivia’s Picturebook Olivia Can](image)

When Olivia was asked to discuss her designs in the seventh openings of her picturebook (see Figure 4.48), she responded, “why I did the words was because I wanted to have a happy ending, so Mr. Tiger wasn’t left out and had no friends. But I wanted Mr. Elephant to be left out because he did the wrong thing” (interview, December 11, 2017). Olivia then suggested that Mr. Elephant was facing away from Mr. Tiger and Mr. Dog in the pictures because “he's sad that he did a wrong thing and he lost a friend because of that but now he's lonely because Mr. Tiger was his only friend.” Olivia demonstrated intentional thought in the design of her opening. Her explanations, as shown, and later in the interview, demonstrated that the words and pictures worked together to indicate that
Mr. Elephant was left out of the friendship with Mr. Tiger and Mr. Dog as a result of his wrong behavior. Her discussion suggested that she was aware of the choices she made in her picturebook and how the words and pictured interacted to convey the narrative.

Figure 4.52. Opening 7 of Olivia’s Picturebook *The Tiger with No Friends*

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the ways children responded to, applied, and discussed word and picture relationships within contemporary realistic and fantasy picturebooks. Responses indicated the different ways children attended to words, pictures, both words and pictures, and the interaction of words and pictures to make sense of the read-aloud picturebooks. Though there were similarities in the patterns of response across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres, there were notable differences, including the ways children attended to personal and intertextual responses. Children’s attention to word-picture relationships indicated higher responses focused on contrasting words and pictures in comparison to comparing words and pictures across both contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres. However, children demonstrated more responses focused on word-picture relationships in fantasy picturebooks. Fantasy
picturebooks identified with counterpoint narratives presented unique patterns of response, which included increased attention to genre and wrestling with the word-picture relationship.

Children’s application of word-picture relationships within their contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks revealed ways children used words, pictures, and their interactions to develop the narrative. They conveyed literary elements within their picturebook in various interactions of words and pictures, but within fantasy picturebooks they were more attentive to pictures as a meaning making resource. In addition, inconsistency in the interaction of words and pictures across openings of one picturebook was infrequent in contemporary realistic fiction. However, children demonstrated more frequent and dynamic interactions of words and pictures within their fantasy picturebooks.

Lastly, children’s discussion of their decision-making indicated ways they attended to words, pictures, both words and pictures, and word-picture relationships. Children revealed the intentional choices they made in regards to the design of the picturebook. Though responses indicated intention choices were made in regards to literary and artistic craft, they were few. More frequent were children’s discussions of intentional ways they designed the interaction of words and pictures. Despite evidence that children were capable of discussing word-picture relationships in their picturebooks, their capability was inconsistent. Some children demonstrated difficulty with explaining their decisions and sometimes leaned more towards descriptions. However, there was a notable shift in the ways children were more capable of explaining their decisions in
fantasy picturebooks. In the next chapter, chapter 5, I discuss the findings and implications of this study.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to describe ways second graders respond to, apply, and discuss words, pictures, and their interactions in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks with symmetrical (words and pictures loosely provide similar information), enhancement (words and pictures expand upon the other), and counterpoint (words and picture provide alternative information) narratives. More specifically, I explored ways children: (a) analyzed and made meaning with words, pictures, and word-picture relationships during interactive read-alouds; (b) attended to word-picture relationships to convey information and developed narrative in their own picturebooks; and (c) discussed and reflected on their decision-making during the picturebook making process. The findings from this study provide a better understanding of ways children make sense of the complexities of word-picture relationships within picturebooks.

In this embedded, single-case design, I used observations, video recordings, interviews, and picturebook artifacts to collect information about ways children responded to and applied word-picture relationships in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Participants in this study were 20 second-grade children. The study was guided by the following three research questions:

1. What is the nature of second graders’ responses to word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres?
2. In what ways do second graders use word-picture relationships in their own contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebook productions?

3. How do second graders discuss and describe their decision-making related to word-picture relationships in their productions of contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks?

In the previous chapter, I presented the findings for the contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy interactive read-alouds and picturebook making sessions. More specifically, I presented the findings from analysis of 18 interactive read-aloud transcripts and transcripts from eight semi-structured interviews to determine how children responded to picturebooks and analysis of 40 picturebook artifacts, transcripts of 40 semi-structured interviews, five hours of unstructured interviews, and observational notes to determine how children applied and discussed word-picture relationships in their own picturebook productions. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss interpretations, significance, and implications of these findings. In this next section, I foreground the major findings of this study.

Revisiting Findings

Through careful analysis of the data collected, several overriding findings emerged. Children’s responses suggest that they recognized ways words and pictures worked to convey and develop the narrative and that complex word-picture relationships presented a challenge for children as they worked to navigate and interpret the narratives. Findings related to children’s own picturebooks suggest young children have the capacity to identify and incorporate a variety of word-picture relationships into their own
picturebooks and can discuss word-picture relationships as part of their decision-making. However, findings also suggest that these second graders had limited understanding of the complexities of word-picture relationships beyond the amount of information words and pictures convey. In this next section, I discuss the analysis of findings and significance, organized by each research question.

**Connections to Previous Research**

In my analysis, I described several findings that are important to understanding ways children respond to, apply, and discuss word-picture relationships within contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks. Furthermore, I suggest that the description of the ways children responded to word-picture relationships provides insight into their literary understanding of word-picture relationships and the impacts of genre on their responses. In addition, I posit that my descriptions of children’s picturebooks and decision-making provides insight into the composing processes of young children and their understandings of the complexities of picturebooks.

**Research Question 1: Children’s Responses to Word-Picture Relationships**

The second graders’ responses revealed ways they navigated contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks and provided insight into their literary understanding (Sipe, 2008a). Children’s responses showed significant attention to analyzing and constructing narrative meaning (85% of responses) across interactive read-alouds of both genres. Sipe (2000), primarily using traditional literature (e.g., folktales), found similar attention to the analysis of the narrative (73%) in his work with first- and second-grade children, which was later confirmed with kindergarten children’s responses.
to folktales and fairy tales (Sipe & Bauer, 2001). Also similar to Sipe (2008a; Sipe & Brightman, 2005) and other studies (Madura, 1998; Walsh, 2003), children attended to pictures as a significant meaning-making resource during interactive read-alouds. Where Aukerman & Schuldt (2016) found a gradual shift towards increased references to words and decreased use of pictures, children in this study remained consistent in their attention to pictures across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy. Children were also more attentive to artistic craft in comparison to literary craft, which confirmed the findings of Madura (1998). Children’s attention to pictures made up 38.3% of all read-aloud responses; this percentage is slightly higher than the percentages of response found by Sipe (2008a, Sipe & Brightman, 2005). It may be that the intentional use of picturebooks with enhancement and counterpoint relationships in this study—picturebooks that solely convey parts of the narrative through pictures—contributed to the higher percentage; this was highlighted in the ways children attended to pictures more often in enhancement ($n = 522$) and counterpoint ($n = 418$) narratives than in symmetrical ($n = 269$). This finding suggests that picturebooks with enhancement and counterpoint relationships place more demands on children that require them to attend to the pictures to gather essential information about the narrative.

In my analysis, I examined ways children analyzed literary elements with the meaning making resources of words, pictures, and both words and pictures. Analysis of literary elements significantly contributes to ways children make sense and interpret stories (Lukens & Cline, 1995; Prior, Willson, & Martinez, 2012), and therefore, offer pathways for researchers to understand how children make sense of stories in
picturebooks. Children analyzed plot, setting, and character in contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks by relying heavily on pictures. Similar to Sipe and Brightman’s (2005) study on young children’s responses to folktales, children’s responses to setting and character, across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres, almost exclusively referenced information conveyed through pictures; this finding connects to Martinez and Harmon’s (2012) study, which suggested a significant percentage of narrative picturebooks for young children developed character and setting either primarily or exclusively through pictures. In contrast, children’s analysis of plot relied almost equally on pictures as it did with both words and pictures, which also connects to Martinez and Harmon’s (2012) finding that plot was more dependent on both words and pictures for development within picturebooks for young children.

Within the response category analyzing and making meaning with pictures, the largest subcategory was describing pictures (46% of responses). Within this subcategory, children’s responses indicated they were bringing attention to elements and labeling objects in pictures. Other studies focused on young children’s responses to pictures (Beck & McKeown, 2001; Kiefer, 1995; Sipe & Brightman, 2005; Walsh, 2003), found similar attention to making observations about pictures. I examined responses focused on describing pictures further to determine how they contributed to children’s construction of the narrative. In this study, some of the children’s descriptions were connected to an analytical point made by that child or their peer. For example, in Tripp’s comparison of two frames in an opening of Silly Billy, he suggested that the frame conveying Billy’s “imagination” was a “mystery picture,” which prompted others to describe elements of
the picture (e.g., “there’s shadows of hats on the wall”). However, many responses in the subcategory describing pictures did not indicate a clear connection to analysis of literary elements. Walsh (2003) suggested that describing and labeling pictures are one of the behaviors children engage in to accumulate further understanding about picturebooks. Furthermore, the increased number of responses focused on describing pictures in enhancement ($n = 223$) and counterpoint ($n = 202$) in comparison to symmetrical ($n = 132$), suggests that perhaps describing pictures is a valuable behavior for furthering understanding of more complex narratives. It appears that describing pictures is perhaps the initial work that children engage in and continue as part of their complex analysis and that such analysis is valuable for comprehending pictures and perhaps recognition of word-picture relationships.

Responses suggested that the amount of talk focused on pictures during interactive read-alouds differed across word-picture relationships but remained consistently high across genres; however, there were notable differences across genres when examining other response categories. The limited research on young children’s response styles within genres (i.e., fiction and nonfiction genres; Shine & Roser, 1999) suggested that children’s type of talk was considerably different across genres. In this study, responses across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres suggested differences in the frequency and percentage of responses across categories of responses. Responses within connecting to words and pictures and more specifically, the amount of talk focused on personal responses were a notable difference.
Reader response theorists (Iser, 1978; Rosenblatt, 1938, 1978, 1982; Sipe, 2008a) recognized the significance of the reader and the experiences they bring in constructing narrative meaning; this suggests the value of personal responses in a reader’s transaction with the text. Sipe (2008a) found that one out of ten responses in his study was a personal response and he suggested this indicated a “universal impulse of readers to link the events or characters in a narrative with their own lives” (p. 152); this study confirmed Sipe’s findings with 9.4% of all read-aloud responses (approximately one out of ten) focused on personal connections. Significant in this study were the increased number of personal responses within contemporary realistic fiction ($n = 218$) in comparison to fantasy ($n = 77$).

Analysis revealed personal responses were significantly higher in the contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks *Silly Billy*, *The Snowy Day*, and *The Sound of Silence*. In *Silly Billy*, personal responses were high because children shared their own worries or related to Billy, the main character, in each opening where his worries were conveyed. For instance, when Billy worried about giant birds, children shared their own concerns for giant birds: “I’d be scared of giant birds too, because they could just put me in their nest or eat me” (read-aloud, October 17, 2017). During the read-alouds of *Silly Billy*, *The Snowy Day*, and *The Sound of Silence*, children’s personal connections revealed how the experiences of the characters were relevant to their own lived experiences: Billy’s worries, Peter’s day in the snow, and Yoshio’s search for silence. Perhaps the realism in realistic fiction prompted children to connect their own personal
world to those picturebooks, in comparison to a fantasy narrative, which is not bound to real-world events, characters, and settings.

Personal responses were also more frequent in picturebooks with symmetrical \((n = 115)\) and enhancement \((n = 134)\) relationships in comparison to picturebooks with counterpoint relationships \((n = 46)\). It may be that fewer personal connections in counterpoint narratives were a result of less relatable themes and content; however, examination of the narratives does not suggest this is the case. Picturebooks presented opportunities to discuss neighborhood walks, vacations, experiences of being on a farm, and other events that are potentially relatable for young children. Furthermore, Sipe (2008a) found that even when children felt distant from the narrative, they continued to respond with personal resistance; this means that children make personal responses by identifying ways they do not identify with the character and their experiences. I suggest that the unique challenges presented by counterpoint narratives, such as differences in genre and character perspectives being conveyed across words and pictures, may have contributed to fewer personal connections to the narrative.

Increased responses within the category, *analyzing the word-picture relationship* are also a potential factor for fewer personal responses within counterpoint narratives. In enhancement narratives, response categories focused on analyzing (e.g., *analyzing and meaning making with pictures* and *analyzing the words*) outnumbered those in counterpoint narratives except in one category of response, *analyzing the word-picture relationship*. Within read-alouds of counterpoint narratives, there were unique patterns of responses, which were more prevalent within fantasy than within contemporary realistic
fiction picturebooks; children wrestled with the “weird” (children’s words) word-picture relationship and were more attentive to the portrayal of genre and reality within these narratives. Though these unique patterns of responses were found in both genres, I was curious why they were more prevalent in fantasy picturebooks. I examined the type of counterpoint narratives present within each genre; it was apparent that the types of counterpoint relationships within the picturebooks were different across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy (see Table 5.1).

Counterpoint relationships between words and pictures are presented within picturebooks in a variety of ways; these included, differences in: (a) style (e.g., funny and serious); (b) genre (e.g., realism and fantasy); (c) perspectives (e.g., between one character and another); (d) characterization (e.g., characters not portrayed in either words or pictures); and (e) space and time (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). In some picturebooks, there are more than one type of counterpoint narrative and in others there may only be one. In this study, contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks employed counterpoint of characterization and style in contrast to fantasy, which employed counterpoint of genre and perspective. It seems the type of counterpoint narrative may have influenced children’s increased responses to the subcategories, referencing reality and referencing genre and ways they wrestled with the word-picture relationship in picturebooks with counterpoint narratives; these response patterns were more prevalent in fantasy picturebooks, which employed counterpoint in genre and perspective.
Table 5.1

Differences of Counterpoint Relationships Within Genres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Type(s) of Counterpoint</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
<th>Type(s) of Counterpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosie’s Walk</em></td>
<td>Characterization</td>
<td><em>Come Away from the Water, Shirley</em></td>
<td>Genre, Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sidewalk Circus</em></td>
<td>Characterization, Style</td>
<td><em>Lily Takes A Walk</em></td>
<td>Genre, Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Grandpa Green</em></td>
<td>Style</td>
<td><em>This is Not My Hat</em></td>
<td>Genre, Perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research has provided inconsistent information on ways children are able to grasp counterpoint relationships in picturebooks (Arizpe & Styles, 2016; Pantaleo, 2002).

Arizpe and Styles (2016) found young children (age 7 and below) had difficulty making sense of counterpoint relationships, which conflicted with the results of Pantaleo (2002).

Similar to the findings of Pantaleo (2002), children in the current investigation recognized the differences in the narratives conveyed through words and pictures and were highly engaged in the discussions of these picturebooks; however, in contrast to Pantaleo (2002), some children did not demonstrate confidence in how they discussed these picturebooks, but instead, several displayed confusion with making sense of these narratives (“this does not make any sense”) and judgment (“weird”) towards the unfamiliar nature of these picturebooks. Significant was how responses of confusion and judgment were connected to children’s efforts to make sense of a narrative that they suggested “just doesn’t make sense” (interview, December 4, 2017). Unlike Serafini’s
finding with intermediate children, the young children in this study continued to engage in conversations about the picturebook even though they questioned whether the narrative made sense. Picturebooks with counterpoint narratives required readers to fill in more gaps (Iser, 1978) in order to make meaning, and therefore, “demanded a higher level of sophistication and complexity with respect to gap filling” (Pantaleo, 2002, p. 186). These narratives demanded children to take a more active role in narrative construction, which may have contributed to children’s confusion and judgment, as demonstrated by their negative evaluation of how the narrative was conveyed.

Significant in this study were ways children’s analyses of these picturebooks, even those that demonstrated confusion and judgment, connected to responses that indicated they were working to make sense of why the words and pictures were different. In fantasy picturebooks, responses that indicated children were developing a rationale for the counterpoint relationship were more prevalent; these responses revealed ways children wrestled with the word-picture relationship. In chapter 4, I used responses from the interactive read-aloud of *Come Away from the Water, Shirley* to describe ways children worked to make sense of the complex word-picture relationship. *Come Away from the Water, Shirley* employs a counterpoint in genre, which according to Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) most often occurs when the “verbal story is told from a child’s point of view, presenting the events as ‘true,’” and “the details in pictures suggest that the story takes place only in the child’s imagination” (p. 24); this means the words convey realism and in contrast, the pictures convey elements of fantasy. *Come Away from the Water, Shirley* is designed with this ironic counterpoint and pushes it further. Not only does the
picturebook employ this type of counterpoint between words and pictures; it employed this counterpoint type between the left and right pages in each opening. For example, in opening 9 the left page of the opening the mother says, “your father may have a game with you when he’s had a little rest” and shows the mother and father lounging in chairs on the beach, while the right page of the opening shows Shirley and a dog on an island in the ocean digging up buried treasure. Each page presents two seemingly disconnected narratives.

Children’s responses suggested they were unsure about this “weird” (their word) relationship and worked to determine why there were differences in the information conveyed in words and pictures. Several children noted ways the picturebook was like “two different books” and hypothesized that one page was nonfiction and the other was fiction (read-aloud, November 27, 2017). As children wrestled with the counterpoint narrative, their responses demonstrated sophisticated interpretations, such as Collin’s conclusion that the mother thought she was responding to Shirley, but she was really responding to the dad: “I think on that [picture] page, like three times now, she thinks it's Shirley, but it's actually the dad and like everything she thinks, she's thinking it's Shirley [she’s talking to], but then it's actually the dad.” Children’s confusions and judgments were often made in connection with their sophisticated interpretations. It seems responses that demonstrated confusion and judgment to counterpoint narratives, particularly those within fantasy, were valuable sentiments for furthering their own analysis and the analyses conducted by the group.
Unexpected in this study were the ways children analyzed and referenced genre and more notably associated characteristics of these picturebooks with genres. Responses referencing genre were minimal within Sipe’s work with kindergarten through second grade children (2008a). Though these type of responses in the current study occurred across genres and word-picture relationships, they were most prevalent during the read-aloud of fantasy picturebooks with counterpoint narratives. It seems the counterpoint in genre (see Table 5.1; Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001) found in these picturebooks contributed to increased responses focused on referencing genre and the connection of genre to their understanding of the real-world (subcategory, world knowledge/content knowledge). In chapter 4, I used responses within the picturebook Lily Takes a Walk to highlight these responses. Lily Takes a Walk employs a counterpoint in perspective and genre; pictures convey the fantasy narrative of the dog’s perspective of lurking terrors and in contrast, the words convey the simple, realistic story of a young girl going on a walk. Picturebooks with counterpoint narratives, such as Lily Takes a Walk, are a small number of published picturebooks (Sipe, 2011; Sipe & Pantaleo, 2008); it is possible that the limited experiences children have had with this type of picturebook, counterpoint narratives, contributed to the increased amount of responses relative to genre and connections to world knowledge/content knowledge.

Cochran-Smith (1984) employed Culler’s (1975) “literary competence” and Jauss’s “horizon of expectations” to describe the ways children, through repeated experience, develop expectations for how books work, and furthermore build expectations for ways narratives unfold within different genres. In counterpoint
narratives, and more specifically, counterpoint in genre and perspective narratives, children’s expectations are likely incongruent with these picturebooks. It may be this incongruence contributed to ways children wrestled with the word-picture relationship, displayed confusion and judgment, and referenced genre and world knowledge in connection to genre more frequently in fantasy picturebooks with counterpoint relationships, than in symmetrical or enhancement relationships. Analysis of responses suggested that children resisted with ways the book conflicted with their understanding of the real world (i.e., “reality testing”) and did not meet their expectations for the known and what constitutes a good narrative (i.e., “literary critical resistance”; Sipe & McGuire, 2006, p. 7).

In counterpoint narratives, children demonstrated literary critical resistance (Sipe & McGuire, 2006) and critiqued faults in literary and artistic craft. Confusion and judgment were found in children’s responses to the design of the picturebook and were most often connected to children’s responses within the category, analyzing the word-picture relationship. In contrast with symmetrical and enhancement narratives, in counterpoint, across both contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres, children questioned the design of the picturebook and in some instances, offered alternative ways for designing the picturebook. For example, when Tripp discussed the eighth opening of Grandpa Green, he responded, “I don't know why they would put, ‘when the war was over.’ It never tells about any war.” He goes on to say, “on that page it does (referencing the seventh opening), but I would have told about it on this page instead, ‘when the war was over,’ and then something different over here. It goes from the war, to something
different, back to when it was the war” (interview, October 30, 2017). In his response, he noted that the words and pictures conveyed different information that supported narrative development and suggested alternative ways that the picturebook could be designed. His response was a result of the counterpoint in style (see Table 5.1) where the words conveyed information from the past (historical), and the pictures did not match the time period being conveyed in words (anachronistic; Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001). Responses that indicated children resisted the design of the picturebook were a small percentage of responses across read-alouds but demonstrated ways children’s responses were unique within counterpoint narratives.

I conclude this section on children’s response by discussing the ways children responded in the category, analyzing the word-picture relationship. Children’s responses indicated that, despite genre, they more often responded within the subcategory, contrasting words and pictures than in the subcategory, connecting words and pictures. This suggests children attended to the ways words and pictures conveyed different information more than they attended to the ways they conveyed similar information. Unlike the finding of Aukerman and Schuldt (2016), children in this study juxtaposed words and pictures within one response. Aukerman and Schuldt selected picturebooks that had symmetrical relationships or relied slightly more on words to convey elements of the narrative. The intentional use of picturebooks with enhancement and counterpoint narratives may account for the increase of children’s juxtaposing words and pictures in this study. Children’s attention to differences and similarities in information seems to indicate that they were capable of recognizing that the two meaning making resources,
words and pictures, were part of a larger synergistic relationship where words and picture interact to convey meaning (Sipe, 1998). However, children’s responses suggested much of their understanding was limited to “more” or “less” and “same” or “different.” Though children demonstrated sophisticated interpretations when discussing picturebooks with complex word-picture relationships, they did not have the language or understanding beyond simplistic terms. Responses indicated children understood word-picture relationships as the amount of information conveyed by either words or pictures.

**Research Question 2: Children’s Use of Word-Picture Relationships**

Previous studies have explored ways young children craft words (e.g., MacKay, Ricks, & Young, 2017; Ray, 2004a, Ray, 2004b), pictures (Pantaleo, 2017a, 2017b, 2018), and multimodality in picturebooks (Martens et al., 2012/2013; Mills, 2011; Ranker, 2009). The current investigation extends understanding by placing word-picture relationships at the forefront of the study and describes the way second graders craft the interaction of words and pictures to convey meaning.

Literary elements are the building blocks of narratives and through these elements young children are taught to discuss books in classrooms (Martinez & Harmon, 2012; Temple, Martinez, & Yokota, 2014); this knowledge prompted my analysis of the ways the children in this investigation used the interaction of words and pictures to convey literary elements—character, setting, plot, and mood—in their own picturebook productions. Findings suggest that in comparison to their contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks, children were more flexible in how they used the interaction of words and pictures to develop narrative within their fantasy picturebooks, the second picturebook
they created; this suggests children did not confine themselves to one interaction (e.g., words depend on pictures and pictures support the words) during picturebook making. Though some children incorporated an individual style and preference for a word-picture relationship that was apparent across the openings of both their contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks (e.g., Beth’s reliance on words), ten of the 20 children designed fantasy picturebooks where the relationship did not remain consistent from the first opening to the last; this inconsistency within children’s picturebooks reflected Lewis’ (2001a, 2001b) description of word-picture relationships.

Lewis (2001a, 2001b) described the word-picture relationship as an ecological system where words and pictures are interdependent and thrive through their interaction with the other; this relationship is defined by their complexity and flexibility to change throughout the picturebook. In Chapter 4, I used Chloe and Tripp’s picturebooks to describe the flexibility of interactions within children’s picturebooks. Openings in Chloe and Tripp’s picturebooks demonstrated ways the weight of words and pictures shifted throughout their picturebook to convey the narrative and more specifically, develop literary elements. Lewis (2001a) referred to this as a “shift in narrative weight” between words and pictures (p. 49). This shift was apparent in the way Chloe, in the initial openings of her picturebook, The Little Plant, primarily relied on words with pictures providing limited support. However, in the last few openings of her picturebook, Chloe relied on pictures with minimal to no story development in words. Pantaleo (2005) suggested that children’s pictures, and I would argue children’s picturebook productions, potentially reveal children’s understanding of how narratives work and are constructed to
convey meaning. Chloe and others’ flexibility in design is a significant finding, because it shows children had, at the least, developing understandings of how words and pictures work together to convey meaning and made deliberate design decisions related to the interaction of words and pictures within their picturebooks; this flexibility is a complex process, which required children to actively transform and re-transform meaning from one meaning-making resource to the other from opening-to-opening (Kress, 2000).

Children’s flexibility is particularly interesting because the picturebooks chosen for this study were identified by one dominant word-picture relationship and did not serve as textual models of this flexibility. In addition to flexibility, children demonstrated increased attention to the meaning-making potential of pictures in their fantasy picturebooks.

This increased understanding of the meaning-making potential of pictures was illustrated in the findings of chapter 4, where I described how Reagan, Derrick, and Kate demonstrated changes in ways they developed narrative across the two picturebooks. Reagan and Derrick went from using pictures for decorative purposes to representing and developing elements of the narrative through pictures. Research suggested that children rely on modes that are familiar during the composing process (Albers, 2006; Dyson, 2002) and therefore, children’s shift in how they used words and pictures across picturebooks is significant. It seems that the children’s social environment and what was valued in their social environment may have shaped their picturebook making and therefore, this shift in ways they used pictures as a meaning-making resource (Mavers, 2011; Pantaleo, 2017; Siegel, 2006).
Mavers (2011) suggested “what and how children draw and write are framed by what is valued” and what is valued impacts how children create texts and see themselves as text-makers (p. 3). It seems that the interactive read-alouds of fantasy picturebooks and children’s discussions around their contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks may have influenced their perceived value of pictures and therefore, account for the shifts in children’s use of pictures as a meaning-making resource. Such repeated experiences with literary and artistic features during interactive read-alouds were likely to influence children’s writing and drawing styles (Chapman, 1994; Eckhoff, 1984; Kamberelis, 1998). Moreover, children’s discussions (semi-structured interviews) around word-picture relationships and more specifically, the questions that I asked about their pictures (e.g., “Why did you make this picture?” or “How do you think the picture goes with the words?”) during their contemporary realistic picturebook interviews may have further indicated a value for pictures to these second graders.

Though children demonstrated increased understanding of the meaning-making potential of pictures in their fantasy picturebooks, it was apparent in the opening-by-opening analysis of children’s picturebooks across genres that they relied heavily on words to convey narrative; some children almost exclusively conveyed their narrative through words. However, this occurred less in fantasy where four picturebooks were identified as words carry primary narrative, pictures are selective (Golden, 1990) in comparison to nine contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks. Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) would describe this relationship as “words carry the main load of the narrative” (p. 15) with pictures being more decorative in their function than narrative. Development
of narrative—across all literary elements—suggested that children favored words over pictures.

Children do not privilege words above pictures, but instead draw upon familiar modes of communication (Albers 2006; Dyson, 2002) and the “semiotic landscape” of the classroom, described by Jewitt (2009) as “the way resources are used in a specific historical and social-cultural setting…[including] people’s attitudes towards specific semiotic resources, and the way in which their use is learned and regulated” (p. 304). The dominance of writing in the classroom was illustrated in chapter 3, where I described my observations of writing tasks and review of writer’s notebooks. Moreover, Allison suggested that the contemporary realistic fiction picturebook was the first time children made books in their classroom (interview, November 6, 2017). It may be that children were relying on a mode of communication that they understood and used regularly during composing events and therefore, accounts for the increased dominance of words across the study, but more so within children’s contemporary realistic fiction picturebooks, the first picturebooks composed within this study.

**Research Question 3: Children’s Decision-Making Related to Word-Picture Relationships**

Martens et al. (2012/2013) explained that when young children have opportunities to discuss their decision-making about pictures they have created—and I argue picturebooks—it demonstrates respect for their work and is powerful for children’s learning and the learning of adults who work with them. Interviews with the second graders about their picturebooks and observations during picturebook making provided
valuable insight into the ways they intentionally used words and pictures. Significant in this study were the capabilities of young children to discuss their decision-making and the intentionality of their choices regarding word-picture relationships; this finding extends on others who found that young children were capable of discussing their decision-making regarding the pictures of their picturebooks (Martens et al., 2012/2013; Pantaleo, 2017, 2018).

Children were not instructed on the codes and conventions of writing and pictures. However, children described intentional ways they crafted words and pictures and their interactions to convey meaning; this finding suggested children made intentional choices during their picturebook-making process. Despite their intentionality, second graders’ discussions revealed limited understandings beyond color use in artistic craft and invoking emotion through literary craft. It appears that some children did not have the metalanguage or sophisticated understandings of artistic and literary craft to make or express the intentionality of their choices. In addition to artistic and literary craft, children indicated in their discussions ways they “wanted” (their word) words and pictures to interact in the openings of their picturebooks. Children also suggested they were intentional in the ways they “told” the reader information in comparison to ways they “showed” the information.

Interesting was how children associated to tell with words and to show with pictures; this is a point made by Nikolajeva and Scott (2001). Nikolajeva and Scott suggested that when developing character and settings, what words can only tell, pictures can show, “doing so more effectively and often more efficiently” (p. 61). When children
described ways they wanted to show information, they almost exclusively discussed character and setting development. Children also described ways pictures had limitations in the information they could convey. Such insights echo theorists who have acknowledged that words and pictures each have limitations in the information they can convey (Lewis, 2001a; Nikolajeva & Scott, 2001), and the other fills in the gaps of information. Children’s semi-structured interviews about their own picturebooks suggested they recognized some limitations of pictures (e.g., “the pictures can’t tell that”) and in some instances used this as a reason they relied more heavily on words to convey information.

Despite the capabilities of many children to discuss their decision-making, I do not suggest that all children were confident and capable in doing so. Though children demonstrated deeper understanding in their discussions from the first to second picturebook, there were still some children who were unsure of their choices, particularly in regards to word-picture relationships. Data analysis revealed that some children provided descriptions of their openings rather than explanations of their designs and the decision-making behind those designs. Pantaleo (2018) found similar difficulty for some of the seven and eight-year-old children in her study when they were asked to explain the pictures in their own picturebooks. Pantaleo (2018) and Machin (2007) suggested that children’s descriptions are too often undervalued and that descriptions are the initial steps children make that lead to the ability to analyze, interpret, and intentionally design. Though some children were only capable of describing their designs, I suggest their descriptions were valuable for developing an awareness that may lead to greater
metacognition. It may be that the descriptions during contemporary realistic fiction interviews led to the increased capability of children to explain their decision-making in their fantasy picturebooks.

Important to remember in this study, is that children were not provided with explicit instruction on word-picture relationships, but rather, were supported as they attended to and discussed them with peers during interactive read-alouds; these read-alouds became influential to children’s picturebook productions. Findings in this study extend on others that have suggested exposure (e.g., Chapman, 1994; Eckhoff, 1984; Kamberelis, 1998) and limited instruction (Pantaleo, 2018) can influence the writing and artistic features children appropriate into their own work. Significant in this study were the influence of the interactive read-alouds on children’s awareness, understanding, and intentionality of word-picture relationships in their designs. During interviews, children discussed ways they appropriated ideas for word-picture relationships from interactive read-aloud picturebooks, as Collin did when he described ways he “[got] the picture to match the words,” to reflect the relationship in *The Snowy Day* (Keats, 1962). Read-aloud picturebooks became textual models for children’s designs.

Where previous studies suggested young children appropriated literary (Corden, 2007; Eckhoff, 1984) and artistic features (Zapata, 2013) from mentor picturebooks, this study extends such findings to suggest that young children can appropriate interactions of words and pictures as well. Children not only described ways they appropriated word-picture relationships from read-aloud picturebooks; their interviews suggested they appropriated language from read-alouds in their discussions of their picturebooks. As
children described the interaction of words and pictures in their picturebook creations, they used language from their peers and myself, as the read-aloud facilitator, that occurred during interactive read-alouds. I described this in chapter 4 when I discussed several children’s use of “hidden pictures” (e.g., interviews, November 10, 2017, December 11, 2017, December 13, 2017) and Chloe’s suggestion that the reader “could read this book completely without looking at the pictures” (interview, November 14, 2017). This finding suggests that the group discussions during interactive read-alouds functioned as an “interpretive community” (Fish, 1980) where children’s thinking and talk about the read-aloud picturebooks informed later thinking and talk about their own picturebooks. Children also brought language from read-alouds that indicated how they conceptualized the word-picture relationship in their own picturebooks.

Children often conceptualized the word-picture relationships as how much information was conveyed either through words or pictures. How children described the interaction of words and pictures resembled the typography of Golden (1990), a typography that Nikolajeva and Scott (2001) suggested did not encompass the range of complex interactions within the spectrum of word-picture relationships. Though I agree with Nikolajeva and Scott, children’s conceptualization of word-picture relationships as “how much” was an important starting point that may lead to more complex understanding and analysis.

Also significant in this study, was an awareness of a potential reader for their picturebook and that potential reader’s influence on children’s designs. Audience awareness in an important and valuable part of a writer’s development (Durán, 2016;
Where others noted young children can write for an intended audience (Durán, 2016, Wollman-Bonilla, 2001), findings in this study suggest that children can design with an audience in mind as well. Children not only negotiated the complexities of the written word to convey information to the reader; these second graders had to design the interaction of words and pictures in the openings of their picturebooks, a negotiation that I argue is more complex than solely understanding the codes and conventions of words. Significant were the ways children, without prompting, considered a future audience for their picturebook during the picturebook making task and suggested this audience impacted their decision-making. Wollman-Bonilla (2001) found that when young children are engaged in purposeful, authentic writing, they could demonstrate audience awareness. Perhaps the authentic practice of picturebook-making prompted the young designers in this study to anticipate the needs of a potential reader to understand the narrative being designed in their picturebooks.

Dyson’s work (e.g., 1985, 1989, 1993, 2012, 2013) suggested that social talk occurring around and during the time of writing influenced how children’s wrote texts. Dyson (1995) also found that ways young children wrote their stories and used words and pictures shifted over time and “those shifts of function and form were dynamically linked with their participation in the peer social life of the classroom” (italicized in article)” (p. 19), in much the same way as the interactive read-alouds in the current study. Dyson (2013) found that first graders, to her surprise, would reference peer’s writings in the sharing of their own. Similar to Dyson, second graders were at least partially aware of the influence of peer designers on their decision-making as indicated by their discussions
during interviews. Children referenced ways their peers gave them permission to incorporate ideas in their picturebook, provided them with ideas, and ways they took ideas from their peers and made them their own. In chapter 4, I described how Tripp indicated that he modeled the interactions of words and pictures in his picturebook after his tablemate, Emmie, and provided their brief exchange about Tripp’s appropriation of her work. Findings suggest that not only does the social talk of the classroom influence children’s writings and drawings as separate meaning making resources, but it influenced ways they attended to the interactions of words and pictures as well.

**Implications of the Study**

Findings in this study extend the work of others who investigated young children’s pictures within their picturebook productions and multimodality within texts (Martens et al., 2012/13, Pantaleo, 2017a, 2017b, 2018). Young children can interpret, discuss, and use multimodality and more specifically, words and pictures as meaning-making resources in their own picturebooks. However, findings in this study build upon previous research to suggest that children were aware of the interaction of words and pictures and applied their understandings to their own picturebook productions. Despite the limited instruction and minimal support from myself, as the read-aloud facilitator, interactive read-alouds served as an “interpretive community” (Fish, 1980) where children shared and constructed knowledge with their peers about word-picture relationships; these conversations impacted their awareness and use of word-picture relationships as suggested by their discussions of their own picturebooks.
Through an awareness, and what I suggested earlier in this section was a starting point for their understanding, word-picture relationships and their complex interactions are more than understanding the amount of weight words or pictures have in carrying the narrative. Pantaleo (2017a, 2018) argued that children need to learn the language of pictures to “enrich their responses and increase their ability to comprehend, interpret, and systematically analyze what they see” (2018, p. 557) in her work on young children’s picturebook making. I argue for the same reasons that children need to obtain the language to discuss the interactions of words and pictures. I suggest that children cannot simply learn the codes and conventions of words and pictures as two separate meaning making resources, but that instruction needs to demonstrate ways words and pictures interact to convey meaning.

I propose that next steps in the study of young children’s interpretations and use of word-picture relationships is to investigate the implications of explicit instruction on children’s understandings. Teachers and researchers, through design-based research (Reinking & Bradley, 2008), could co-design curriculum that engages children in intentional study of word-picture relationships and offers them a metalanguage to use in their discussion of these relationships. Arizpe and Styles (2008) suggest that “providing or expanding the terms or metalanguage to discuss visual aspects is crucial to developing better [student] understanding of the texts” (p. 369). Others have echoed the important of providing a metalanguage to discuss their multimodal texts and suggest when children have the metalanguage, they can better discuss their own work (Pantaleo, 2017; Thomas, 2012). Several typologies and conceptualizations for word-picture relationships are
available and would need to be considered. I suggest the relationships used for this study—symmetry, enhancement, and counterpoint—are possible options for future work in developing curriculum. Studies such as these would help to determine the language to use with young children and offer insights about the essential elements of a curriculum for meeting pedagogical goals focused on increased understanding and analysis of word-picture relationships.

Lastly, I propose that before teachers can develop curriculum around word-picture relationships and instruct their students, they must first have their own understandings of the complex ways words and pictures interact within picturebooks. One way to provide teachers with this understanding is for teacher educators to share this knowledge with preservice and inservice teachers in their conversations around picturebooks. If we expect our children to develop such knowledge, teachers must gain this knowledge themselves.

**Additional Ideas for Future Research**

In addition to collaborating with teachers to design a curriculum that supports children’s understanding of word-picture relationships, I propose several other ways that this study can be extended. First, an interesting finding of this study was the differences in the amount of personal responses across contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy genres. I suggest that further research is needed to confirm whether this is a consistent finding across genres. In addition, if consistent, I suggest further exploration on the impact of genre on ways children use personal responses to construct narrative meaning, similar to Sipe’s (2001a) investigation using traditional literature. Sipe (2001a) suggested in his theoretical model of young children’s schema-building for traditional stories that
personal responses were used in traditional stories to: (a) recognize the familiarity of the story, (b) express empathy for characters in the story, or (c) convey opinions by connecting to their life experiences. Research in the same way, could examine how personal responses are used to construction meaning within contemporary realistic fiction and fantasy picturebooks.

Second, similar to Pantaleo (2002), children in this study continued to demonstrate high rates of engagement with counterpoint narratives even after expressing confusion and judgment. In contrast, Serafini (2005) found with older children that they disengaged after they identified the picturebook as weird and unfamiliar. Findings suggest that younger children’s reactions after resistance to counterpoint narratives were different than older children. Further research could explore the differences in younger and older children’s engagement with counterpoint narratives after demonstrating resistance. Sipe and McGuire’s (2006) typology of resistance to stories would be valuable in examining how children resist counterpoint narratives and build upon the findings of this study with second graders. Additionally, studying ways teachers handle resistance to counterpoint narratives would provide further insight on how to support children’s engagement after resistance.

Lastly, this study suggested that there were differences in how children responded during the interactive read-alouds of each word-picture relationship. Research could offer further insight by exploring ways children independently read and discuss these picturebooks. The multimodal transcript, like the one developed by Kachorsky, Moses, Serafini, and Hoelting (2017) in their examination of young children’s meaning making
with picturebooks, would be a valuable tool to explore ways children draw upon words, pictures, and their interactions in their independent reading of picturebooks with different word-picture relationships. Further research on ways young children navigate word-picture relationships as they read independently could offer insight to teachers on how to scaffold the meaning making of different word-picture relationships. As suggested by Serafini (2014), the reading strategies we use to teach students to make meaning with words is insufficient to help readers strategically process pictures. The same argument can be made for word-picture relationships.

**Limitations of the Study**

Kiefer (1995) suggested that the creation of the picturebook is a “personal experience, sometimes taking decades to reach fruition” (p. 96). A limitation of my study was the length of time given for children to take on the laborious and creative-intensive task of picturebook making for each picturebook. Children had one week (approximately five hours) to plan, design, and publish their picturebooks; this is significantly less time than other studies that provided children weeks or months to study and craft picturebooks (Martens et al, 2012/2013; Pantaleo, 2015; Zapata, 2013). Children commented on time as a limitation in their interviews about their own picturebooks. In fact, children mentioned “time” 56 times across the forty picturebook interviews as an issue during their picturebook making process. With additional time, children would have spent more time working through the planning, developing, and revising phases of the picturebook making process.
Time not only presented an issue during picturebook making, time was also an issue during interactive read-alouds. In the first few read-alouds of the study, it became apparent that children, if given the time, would have spent more than 45 minutes discussing each picturebook; however, to respect Mrs. Bryant’s own instructional time and because of feasibility issues with my teaching schedule at the university, there were times when “before reading” and “after reading” portions of the read-aloud ended prematurely (see Appendix A for read-aloud protocol). This likely impacted the number of responses in the subcategory, peritextual analysis, which most often occurred before reading the picturebook.

In addition to time, another limitation of this study was the influence of children’s experiences and learning during the realistic fiction genre study on the activities of the fantasy genre study. Children developed understandings related to word-picture relationships during the contemporary realistic fiction interactive read-alouds and picturebook making sessions that inevitably had some influence on the ways they responded during the interactive read-alouds and applied word-picture relationships in their own picturebooks during the fantasy genre study, which followed. Therefore, future studies would benefit from identifying ways to counterbalance the effects of one genre study on another.

Lastly, this class, as mentioned in Chapter 3, were in their second year together; the students looped from first to second grade with Mrs. Bryant. Therefore, they were comfortable with each other, which likely increased the amount of responses and discussion that occurred during the interactive read-alouds. If this study was replicated in
other classrooms where children had not spent a significant amount of time with each other, the researcher may find less talk occurring and more time needed at the beginning of the study to develop children’s comfort with discussing picturebooks among their peers.

Conclusion

In this dissertation study, I described ways children responded to, used, and discussed word-picture relationships and suggest that this study demonstrated that children can interpret, use, and discuss the interactions of words and pictures. However, this study also suggests that children have limited understanding and experience navigating more complex word-picture relationships.

As words and pictures became more complex, children’s responses demonstrated that they worked harder to navigate and make sense of how the narrative was being conveyed. This study suggests that more complex word-picture relationships placed more demands on children in their analysis and meaning making of the narrative. My analysis demonstrated that as word-picture relationships become more complex, young children might not have the necessary understanding and processing strategies to meet their unique demands.

Though research has investigated the potential of picturebook making for young children, studies have neglected to examine how children use the interactions of words and pictures to convey meaning in their picturebooks and furthermore and how they make decisions regarding the interaction of words and pictures as part of the picturebook design. Findings demonstrated ways children were intentional during the picturebook
making process and flexibly used words and pictures to convey meaning. In addition, findings suggested that even minimal instruction influenced their understandings of word-picture relationships. Despite children’s understandings, findings further suggested the need for more explicit and intentional instruction to make sense of word-picture relationships beyond conceptualizing word-picture relationships as the amount of weight words and picture carry in the narrative. I posit that providing children with a metalanguage to discuss these interactions would be valuable for their understanding.

This investigation can help teachers, teacher educators, and researchers better understand the demands word-picture relationships place on young children and how children, such as these second graders, attend to and need support to develop these relationships within their own picturebooks. Reading picturebooks places different processing demands on readers than reading written narratives (Martinez & Harmon, 2012). Where the written word is processed in a linear way, pictures are processed simultaneously (Sipe, 1998; Schwarcz & Schwarcz, 1991). In turn, writing the written word requires different processes than conveying narrative through pictures, and it becomes more complex when the designer must consider words and pictures. By becoming more knowledgeable in the ways children make sense of this complex process teachers can help children to navigate these relationships in ways that help them to process interactions of words and pictures in their own reading and in the construction of their own picturebooks.
APPENDIX A

Interactive Read-Aloud Protocol (Adapted from Fullerton, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Before Reading:</strong> Overview/Introduction of the Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Activate Prior Knowledge:</strong> Ask a question(s) that helps students connect their background knowledge—whether academic or personal—to the content of the picturebook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Title:</strong> Introduce the title, author, and illustrator of the book to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Gist Statement:</strong> Provide one or two sentences that give a brief introduction of the main idea overview of the picturebook. Include the main character and problem in the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Set a Purpose:</strong> Ask students to attend to ways words and pictures interacted in the picturebook. (e.g., “Remember how we talked about the words and pictures in The Snowy Day yesterday? As we read this story today, think about the ways the words and pictures go together in this story.”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>During Reading:</strong> Read-Aloud/Planned Stopping Points for Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Planned stopping points:</strong> Number of stopping points varies depending on the book, purpose, and children’s understanding. For consistency, maintained 5-7 planned stopping points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Mark pages where there were strong demonstrations of that word-picture relationship in the picturebook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ask questions or make comments that prompt students’ responses.

Examples:

- “What are you noticing?”
- “What are you thinking about the word and pictures on this page?”
- “Why do you think the designer choose to…?”
- “Hmm. The words and pictures are interesting on this page.”
- “What information is the author giving you in the words?” “Why?”
- “What information is the illustrator giving you in the pictures?” “Why?”

• **Unplanned stopping points**: When students respond to the picturebook without prompting, these are unplanned stopping points. Tell students prior to read-alouds that they can respond at any time during reading. Use the following to encourage responses during reading:
  - Wait several seconds after reading before turning the page.
  - Read the book with slow page turns from opening to opening.

• **Discussion**: Students were encouraged to discuss the picturebook. Examples of prompts to encourage discussion about the book (Fountas and Pinnell, 2006, p. 276):
  - “Say more about that.”
  - “Talk more about your thinking.”
  - “What made you think that?”
  - “Do you agree with [student’s name]?” “Why?”
After Reading: Read-Aloud Discussion & Revisiting the Text

• **Summarize:** Prompt students to discuss the overall meaning of the picturebook.

  Examples:
  
  o “Why do you think….?”
  o “What was your favorite part of the story?” “Why?”
  o “What happened to….?” “Why?”
  o “Why did [the character]…?”

• **Word-Picture Relationships (Return to Purpose):** Prompt students to remark on their observations of words and pictures and their interactions in the picturebook.

  Examples:
  
  o “What did you notice about the words and pictures?”
  o Return to an opening in the picture to visit further. “Talk to me more about why you think…”
  o “Do you think the words and pictures went together in this story?” “Why?”

• **Invite Further Response:** Encourage students to make *any* remarks about or related to the picturebook.
APPENDIX B

Questions for Brief Semi-Structured Interviews (After Read-Alouds)

Introductory Statements: Today I am going to ask you some questions about the picturebooks we read. There are no right or wrong answers. I just want to find out what you think about the picturebooks we read. (Provide brief [2-3 sentences] introduction of the picturebook.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Semi-Structured Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is the nature of young children’s (second-graders) responses to and interpretations of word-picture relationships in picturebooks within and across genres? | 2-3 double-page spreads (openings) are selected from the picturebook that demonstrate strong examples of the word-picture relationship.  
  - “Tell me what is happening on these pages.  
  The interview questions (while looking at the openings) will focus on children’s interpretations of the word-picture relationship.  
    - Are the words and picture telling you same story? Why?  
    - How do the words and pictures go together on this page?  
      - Why do you think the author/illustrator did that?  
    - Why don’t the words and pictures match on this page?  
    - The author says, “…,” but the pictures don’t tell that story? Why is it different? |

Closing Statements: Thank you for talking with me about the book we read today and answering my questions. Is there anything else you’d like to tell me about the book we read?
APPENDIX C

Questions for Semi-Structured Interviews (After Picturebook Making)

**Introductory Statements:** Today I am going to ask you some questions about the picturebook you made. There are no right or wrong answers. I just want to find out about your picturebook and how you made your picturebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Semi-Structured Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do second graders discuss the word-picture relationships of their own picturebook productions?</td>
<td>I will ask children to flip through the pages of their book and talk about their creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Tell me about your picturebook and how you made it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The interview questions (while looking at their picturebook) will focus on children explaining their choices and the whys behind those choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On this page you wrote [text]. Why did you make this picture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why did you [example from picturebook] on this page?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do the words and pictures go together on this page?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Why did you do that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why did you make the words and picture match on this page?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why don’t the words and pictures match on this page?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there a reason why you [example from the book]?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closing Statements:** Thank you for talking with me about your picturebook and answering my questions. Is there anything else you’d like to tell me about the picturebook you made?
# APPENDIX D

Codes and Definitions for Responses to Word-Picture Relationships

During Interactive Read-Alouds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code (in alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Characters</td>
<td>Analyzed characters’ actions, feelings, thoughts, intentions; no direct reference to the words or pictures for analysis (Sipe, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Character Using Pictures</td>
<td>Used pictures to analyze of characters’ actions, feelings, thoughts, intentions, and the ways their external appearance may give us information about these elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Character Using Words</td>
<td>Used words to analyze of characters’ actions, feelings, thoughts, intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Layout</td>
<td>Referenced the physical arrangement of word and/or pictures on the page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Narrator</td>
<td>Identified narrator of the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Narrator Using Pictures</td>
<td>Used pictures to identify the narrator of the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Narrator Using Words</td>
<td>Used words to identify the narrator of the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Plot</td>
<td>Described, speculated, evaluated, or made inferences about the plot events; made predictions about plot events (Sipe, 2008); subcode – analyzing plot through questioning plot event; no direct reference to either the words or pictures for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Plot Using Pictures</td>
<td>Used pictures to describe, speculate, evaluate, or make inferences about the plot events; made predictions about plot events; emotional reaction or opinion of plot events relayed through pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Plot Using Words</td>
<td>Used words to describe, speculate, evaluate, or make inferences about the plot events; made predictions about plot events; emotional reaction or opinion of plot events described in words; questioned information in words to make sense of plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Setting Using Pictures</td>
<td>Used pictures to describe, speculate, evaluate, or make inferences about the setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Relationship Across the Picturebook</td>
<td>Described the differences and similarities in the relationship of words and pictures across the sequence of openings of the picturebooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artistic Craft</strong></td>
<td>Referenced the technique and creation of the pictures. (e.g., discussion of the medium); evaluative remarks (opinion of technique) included; recognized the illustrator as maker of the picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparing Words and Pictures</strong></td>
<td>Analyzed and evaluated the connectedness or similarities of information between words and pictures in an opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contrasting Words and Pictures</strong></td>
<td>Analyzed and evaluated the disconnect of information between the words and pictures in an opening; analyzes differences of information and amount of information provided in words and pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining Vocabulary Using Pictures</strong></td>
<td>Used pictures to determine the meaning of an unknown word used in written text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining Vocabulary Using Words</strong></td>
<td>Used words to determine the meaning of an unknown word used in written text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describing Pictures</strong></td>
<td>Described the appearance of pictures; labeled objects in pictures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intertextual</strong></td>
<td>Connected the text being read aloud to other cultural product involving language and/or visual art (e.g., books, movies, TV programs, writing and/or art of other classmates, etc.) (Sipe, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literary Craft</strong></td>
<td>Referenced the technique (e.g., word order, word choice, sentence continues from one page to another [“…” is used]); evaluative remarks (opinions of technique) included; recognized the author as writer of the words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peritextual Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Referenced peritext as a source of potential meaning (Sipe, 2008). “Peritext refers to any part of a picturebook other than the sequence of double page spreads…” (Sipe, 2008) e.g., front and back covers, dust jacket, end pages, half-title and title pages, and dedication page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td>Connected the text to their own personal lives (Sipe, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picturebook as Production</strong></td>
<td>Referenced the construction of the picturebook—publication, sequence of pages, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning Pictures</strong></td>
<td>Questioned the objects, events, and characters in the pictures to make sense of plot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Questioned the meaning of words used in written text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referencing Genre</strong></td>
<td>Identifying and grappling with the genre of the picturebook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparent</strong></td>
<td>Entered the narrative world of the story; reaction not directed to an audience, but verbalized “inner speech” (Sipe, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Knowledge/Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Connected knowledge of the world (i.e., academic and content area knowledge) to the text for interpretive purposes (Sipe, 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Meta-Matrix: Cross-Case Analysis of Responses

Within Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Genres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</th>
<th>Fantasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering the Storyworld</td>
<td>Occurred during counterpoint narrative when attending to the pictures. (All occurred in Rosie’s Walk by the same child.)</td>
<td>Occurred during enhancement and counterpoint narratives when attending to pictures. (responses by several children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting to Words and Pictures</td>
<td>Personal responses are frequent. Children connect their live experiences to the story. Relatable events for children (e.g., snow day) Minimal intertextual connections (n = 9) World-knowledge used to describe why the designer crafted words or pictures a certain way (e.g., the many things at the circus in Sidewalk Circus, which led to increased responses in this read-aloud)</td>
<td>Personal responses are minimal and occur mostly before reading during the activation of prior knowledge. However, those are minimal as well. Intertextual connections are mostly to other read-aloud texts and demonstrate children connecting to the word-picture relationship of another book (e.g., Lily Goes for a Walk is connected to This is Not my Hat and Rosie’s Walk). World-knowledge used in connection to referencing genre to make sense of the genre (e.g., Lily Goes for a Walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with Words and Pictures</td>
<td>Use both words and pictures to analyze the development of plot. Less frequent in the analysis of other literary elements. Minimal attention to development of character and setting.</td>
<td>Use both words and pictures to analyze the development of plot. Less frequent in the analysis of other literary elements. Almost no attention to character and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning through the Design</td>
<td>Much more attention to artistic craft in comparison to literary craft. Almost no attention (n = 3) paid to genre.</td>
<td>Significant attention to peritextual features for analysis. Much more attention to artistic craft in comparison to literary craft. Some attention to referencing genre, particularly in counterpoint narratives (much more than in contemporary RF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Making Meaning with the Pictures</td>
<td>Significant attention paid to analyzing plot, character, and setting using pictures. Frequent attention to describing pictures. <em>Silly Billy</em> (Anthony Browne) elicits significantly more descriptions in comparison to other picturebooks across genre. Descriptions are found more in enhancement and counterpoint narratives than in symmetrical. Analyzing plot is found more in enhancement and counterpoint narratives than in symmetrical.</td>
<td>Significant attention paid to analyzing plot, character, and setting using pictures. Descriptions are found more in enhancement and counterpoint narratives than in symmetrical. Analyzing plot is found more in enhancement and counterpoint narratives than in symmetrical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Words</td>
<td>Minimal responses of children referencing the language or craft of the words. More attention towards plot than other literary elements. Words used for clarification of incorrect interpretations. Dear Primo, with the increase in Spanish words, caused more attention to words than in other picturebooks.</td>
<td>Minimal responses. Minimal responses of children referencing the language or craft of the words. More attention towards plot than other literary elements. Words used for clarification of incorrect interpretations. Used in counterpoint narratives on occasion to make sense of the differences in information between words and pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the Word-Picture Relationship</td>
<td>Minimal intentional response to word-picture relationships. More focus on contrasting than comparisons (across all word-picture relationships). Children</td>
<td>Contrasting occurred more frequently in fantasy and more so in counterpoint narratives. Children are confused by the word-picture relationships in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noted differences and similarities despite the word-picture relationship.</td>
<td>counterpoint narratives (this leads to more discussion and analysis of the narrative using pictures).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample from Multimodal Transcript

(See next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Descriptive Analysis</th>
<th>Grammar of Design</th>
<th>Book in Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words are placed below the image—<strong>separated</strong>; distinct separation of meaning making resources. Speech bubbles used within pictures. Sky and ground are separated with children in between in the center. No noses on children. (similar to read-aloud picturebook <em>Sam &amp; Dave Dig a Hole</em>)</td>
<td><strong>Character:</strong> Verbal: introduces 4 boys characters’ names: Bob, Boby, Jack, Tripp Visual: 3 characters smiling with excited speech bubbles; one frown with eyes rolled back and speech bubble says, “ow man” <strong>Setting:</strong> Verbal: “in the summer” Visual: blue sky, green grass <strong>Loosely symmetrical relationship:</strong> setting and characters pictured in mentioned words; information about the disappointed child not reflected in verbal information</td>
<td>“One day…” “in the summer…” “there was…” <strong>appropriated story book language</strong> Introduces setting and character Realistic fiction within words and pictures – both are bound to the real-world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traits and Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traits and Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOOD/FEELING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Words are placed below image—separated with line; distinct meaning making resources; speech bubbles used within the pictures.

**Jungle** is the only word in bold. (Intentional?)

Yellow, brown, and green vertical, horizontal, and diagonal lines overlap – Grass? Sticks?

**Plot:**
Words: “so they got on a plane” (no reflection in pictures)
Words: “started on there shelter” (not reflected in the pictures)

**Character:**
Words and Pictures: Emotional
Boy 1) mouth open, saying “wow”
Boy 2) smile, saying “cool”
Boy 3) frown, saying “creepy”
Boy 4) smile, saying “awesome”

**Setting:**
Words: “jungle”
Pictures: trees, tall grass

**Pictures clarify words** – plot events and setting told in words, picture shows characters and setting

**Change in setting**
Realistic fiction within words and pictures – both are bound to the real-world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>PLOT</th>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th>MOOD/FEELING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words: Traits and Interests</td>
<td>Words: Event – (not a problem)</td>
<td>Words: Time</td>
<td>Words: Pictures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures: Traits and Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brief Summary of Word-Picture Relationships

in Children’s Contemporary Realistic Fiction Picturebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Word-Picture Relationship</th>
<th>Summary of Narrative Development</th>
<th>Narrative Through Words</th>
<th>Narrative Through Pictures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td><strong>Pictures carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Minimal text with both words and picture providing critical information for story development.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. Pictures provide emotion (character).</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td><strong>Pictures enhance words</strong></td>
<td>Words and pictures provide information that is critical for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. Pictures primarily provide setting and character.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td><strong>Symmetrical</strong></td>
<td>Words and pictures provide similar information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td><strong>Symmetrical</strong></td>
<td>Words and pictures provide similar information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words provide critical information, which needs clarification from pictures.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, S, M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **flexible use of relationship*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>C, P, S, M</th>
<th>C, P, M, S, P</th>
<th>C, P, S, M, C, P, S, M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derrick</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development—mainly plot. Pictures mostly provide setting, but clarify other elements.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>S, P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. Pictures clarify all areas of story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td><strong>Symmetrical</strong></td>
<td>Mostly similar information is provided through words and pictures.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp</td>
<td><strong>Pictures enhance words</strong></td>
<td>Both words and pictures provide different but critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words provide the narrative, but lead the reader to pictures for clarification. Pictures provide some additional character information.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. Pictures provide some character and setting information.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, S, M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = character; P = plot; S = setting; M = mood
## Brief Summary of Word-Picture Relationships in Children’s Fantasy Picturebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Word-Picture Relationship</th>
<th>Summary of Narrative Development</th>
<th>Narrative Through Words</th>
<th>Narrative Through Pictures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td><strong>Pictures Only</strong></td>
<td>Wordless Picturebook</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. However, openings are inconsistent across picturebook (enhancement).</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>C, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Symmetrical</td>
<td>Words and pictures provide similar information for story development. In two openings the pictures enhance the words.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td><strong>Pictures enhance words</strong></td>
<td>Both words and pictures provide information that is critical for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>C, S, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td><strong>Words carry narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. However, there are times when pictures enhance the words.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td>C, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td><strong>Pictures enhance words</strong></td>
<td>Words and pictures provide information for story development. Setting is not developed.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyton</td>
<td><strong>Words carry the narrative</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick</td>
<td><strong>Pictures clarify words</strong></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical information for story development. However, pictures clarify</td>
<td>C, P</td>
<td>C, P, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Pictures carry narrative</td>
<td>C, P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pictures provide information that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is critical for story development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words selectively provide plot and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Pictures clarify words</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information for story development.</td>
<td>S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Words carry narrative</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td>Symmetrical</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly similar information is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provided through words and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pictures. Setting is minimally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>developed across words and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pictures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Pictures clarify words</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, pictures clarify literary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp</td>
<td>Pictures enhance words</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words and pictures provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>critical information for story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development. In several openings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pictures clarify words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>Pictures clarify words</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words mostly provide critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information for story development.</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Walton used peritextual features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to enhance understanding of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narrative [significantly]).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Pictures enhance words</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words and pictures provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information that is critical for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>story development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Pictures carry narrative</td>
<td>C, P, S, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pictures carry the narrative with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>words selectively highlighting plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = character; P = plot; S = setting; M = mood

APPENDIX I
### Codes and Definitions for Talk of Decision-Making During and After Picturebook Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding (in alphabetical order)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriating from Other Texts</td>
<td>Discussed the inclusion of ideas for words, pictures, and word-picture relationships from other texts beyond read-aloud picturebooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriating from Read-Aloud Picturebooks</td>
<td>Discussed the inclusion of ideas for words, pictures, and word-picture relationships from read-aloud picturebooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriating Language from Read-Alouds</td>
<td>Appropriated language from read-aloud discussions into their description and explanation of word-picture relationships in their own books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Appearance</td>
<td>Described choices for physical appearance of characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Description</td>
<td>Described word choice related to character development/understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Described purposeful use of color; mentioned blending and tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiquing</td>
<td>Evaluated their picturebook, pictures, and/or words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Discussed inclusion of dialogue to support story development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>Referenced what was easy and hard and how that impacted their choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Described how they modified ideas; Added more or took away in the pictures, words, and pictures; changed their plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Referenced how much work they put into their picturebook making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evoke Emotion</td>
<td>Described purposeful use of words in picturebook to evoke emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgotten</td>
<td>Described what was forgotten during the picturebook making process; forgot to include an idea or go through with an idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional Choices</td>
<td>Described how they wanted the words and pictures to interact on the page; the information they wanted in pictures vs. information they wanted in words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposing Words and Pictures</td>
<td>Described the way words and pictures interact and how information is provided in words and pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>Discussed physical arrangement of words and pictures on the page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Discussed the use of media/tools in the picturebook making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Designer (Environmental Influence)</td>
<td>Referenced the work of another writer in the class or received support from another writer in the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritextual Features</td>
<td>Referenced the inclusion or lack of inclusion and choices related to peritextual features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Referenced their life; desires; relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>Described purposeful use of perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot Development</td>
<td>Discussed the overall plot development of the picturebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Awareness</td>
<td>Referenced the reader and audience of the picturebook; evoking emotion in the reader; providing information to the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Described the impact of time and the restraints of time on their choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX J

306
Meta-Matrix: Cross-Case Analysis of Decision-Making

Within Contemporary Realistic Fiction and Fantasy Genres

(See next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Genre</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intentional Choices</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reader Awareness</strong></th>
<th><strong>Appropriation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Juxtaposing Words and Pictures</strong></th>
<th><strong>Peer Designer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Realistic Fiction</td>
<td>Some discussion of artistic and literary features; discussion of color is most prominent in children’s discussions and focus on showing or telling about the character “I wanted to make her look very girly.”</td>
<td>Some discussion of the reader. Focused more on ways they convey character for the reader.</td>
<td>Other texts noted as reasoning for more words (mostly discussed chapter books; e.g., <em>Boxcar Children</em> and <em>Anne of Green Gables</em>)</td>
<td>Suggested use of symmetrical relationship “same”; “tell the same information”</td>
<td>Informal interviews during picturebook making suggest the influence of peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturebook design is primarily focused on reasoning for designs of peritextual features (mention of endpages is more frequent than others)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some mention of read-aloud picturebooks influence on word-picture relationship (e.g., <em>Sidewalk Circus</em> most noted)</td>
<td>Suggested use of words conveys more than pictures (“the words tell more information”)</td>
<td>Rarely mentioned during semi-structured picturebook interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>WP Relationship:</em> Discussion of wanting writing to convey more (“I just like writing.”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responses focused on “matching”, “not matching” or “just a little”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children describe opening when asked to describe thinking rather than explain choices or demonstrate being unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language not descriptive of complex word-picture relationship. Relationship is described as pointing and highlighting “it says…” and “it shows…” either as the same or different. Children determine word-picture relationship by pointing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fantasy | Some discussion of artistic and literary craft. Color is mentioned more frequently than others and intentional appearance of characters. Few children demonstrate intentionality with literary craft frequently throughout their discussion—others neglect.  

*Picturebook design:* Discussion of genre. Need for fantasy element so that the book can be fantasy.  

**WP Relationship:** Demonstrates intentionality using “I wanted…”  

Some children continue to describe opening when asked about decision-making. | Intentional mention of reader and way they were conveying information to reader. Reader is often referred to as “them” or “they” rather than using the word reader.  

Used read-aloud picturebooks as inspiration for plot, pictures (color use)  

Used language from the read-alouds to discuss word picture relationships (e.g., “hidden pictures”)  

Attention to other texts that are more popular culture entertainment (e.g., video games and television shows) and comics as inspiration for graphic features (e.g., speech bubbles); other texts referenced are fantasy (e.g., Dogman) | Responses focused on “matching,” “tell more,” “equal amount,” “they’re different”  

Descriptive, but relies on the amount of information conveyed to the reader.  

Little to no complexities in their discussions that indicate the child attended to enhancement or clarification through the use of pictures or viewed the relationship as an interaction rather than same/different and more/less. |

Children reference others for suggesting ideas or using their observations of others work. Cognizant of fellow designers’ influence on work.
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